

15

—

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1996 American Political Network, Inc.
The Hotline

May 3, 1996

SECTION: NATIONAL BRIEFING

LENGTH: 1134 words

HEADLINE: LIABILITY VETO: LAWYERS, GUNS AND MONEY

BODY:

"In a move fraught with election year-politics," Pres. Clinton vetoed a bill limiting awards in product liability lawsuits. In announcing his veto, Clinton "said that while he agreed the legal system needs reform, this bill 'would deprive Americans of the ability to recover fully when they are injured by defective products. It would mean more unsafe products in our homes. It would let wrongdoers off the hook.'" The veto was Clinton's 15th since taking office, and the second in which Clinton "has come down on the side of the Democratic Party's most powerful and controversial constituencies: the nation's trial lawyers" (Cannon, Balto. SUN, 5/3). Clinton delivered "on a promise to plaintiffs' attorneys and some consumer groups." By "rejecting a measure that passed Congress by large bipartisan majorities," Clinton was aware "his action would provoke a political backlash. Clinton at times sounded defensive in explaining his reasons for vetoing" the bill. He said he will sign some version of liability reform -- but not this version, which he called "extreme" (Broder, L.A. TIMES, 5/3). Clinton defended "himself on safety and states' rights grounds against" GOP "charges of repaying trial lawyers for campaign contributions." GOPers "promised" to make a campaign issue of the veto, "which was denounced by business groups but welcomed by" Ralph Nader and "opponents of the tobacco and firearms industries." Clinton "suffered similar criticism" when he vetoed a bill restricting securities-fraud lawsuits in 12/95. Congress responded with its first override of a Clinton veto. But the product-liability bill did not pass either the House or the Senate by a 2/3 majority (Kasindorf, L.I. NEWSDAY, 5/3). Speaker Newt Gingrich's press sec. Tony Blankley "said 'We may take a stab'" at an override, but he "wasn't optimistic" (SUN, 5/3).

GOP REACTION: Bob Dole said the veto proved "it is the trial lawyers who are calling the shots" at the WH. Trial lawyers, who "fought hard" to defeat the bill, contributed \$2.5M to the Clinton re-elect during the first nine months of '95 (Rankin, PHILA. INQUIRER, 5/3). House GOP conf. chair John Boehner (R-OH): "Money may not be able to buy you love, but if you're a fat-cat trial lawyer it sure can buy you a Bill Clinton veto" (Nichols, USA TODAY, 5/3).

DEM REACTION: Dems "charged" the bill was a GOP "payoff to big tobacco companies, which would have won some insulation from

(c) 1996 The Hotline, May 3, 1996

costly lawsuits." DNC spokesperson David Eichenbaum: "Tobacco, tobacco, tobacco ... For Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich, this was about tobacco." The American Cancer Society joined "most national consumer organizations" in opposing the bill and supporting the veto (PHILA. INQUIRER, 5/3). MS AG Mike Moore (D), whose state was "one of the first to pursue litigation against tobacco companies": "This bill ... was a bailout bill, a tobacco industry relief bill" (USA TODAY, 5/3). Handgun Control Inc's Sarah Brady was among those behind the president during the veto announcement. "Among other provisions, the bill exempts gun makers from liability suits filed by people injured by firearms" (L.A. TIMES, 5/3). But the bill's sponsors included "moderate" Dem Sens. Joe Lieberman (CT) and Jay Rockefeller (WV). Clinton's mid-March indication he would veto the bill caused Rockefeller, "a consistent political ally of Clinton's," to say: "Special interests and raw political considerations in the White House have overridden sound policy judgement" (L.A. TIMES, 5/3).

POLITICS, ANYONE? NBC's Miklaszewski, on Clinton's veto: "It's shaping up as a major issue in the presidential election" (5/2). "The issue is a vivid example of how difficult policy questions become wrapped in politics in the shadow of a Presidential race." Both Clinton and Dole "have seized it to define their differences." Yet, "underneath all the frenetic political image-making is the high stakes issue of how the nation should structure its civil-litigation system" (Lewis, N.Y. TIMES, 5/3). Under the header, "Product liability conveys a certain political liability," USA TODAY's Shapiro writes, "Even though the moral position may be shaky, the Dole campaign intends to hang the trial lawyers (an intriguing idea) around Clinton's neck like an albatross" (5/3). The veto "set off a round of partisan sniping ... over who was on the side of consumers and who had fallen victim to special interests" (Harris, W. POST, 5/3). Under the header "Clinton uses human props to put a spin on liability veto," W. TIMES' Strobel writes Clinton "turned an unpopular election-year veto into a high art form of White House communication, image-making and damage control. Mr. Clinton surrounded himself with a human phalanx of political protection in the Oval Office" (5/3). W.S. JOURNAL editorial: "The President continues to do favors for the trial lawyers ... Wrap this veto around Bill Clinton's neck and make him defend it without letup between now and the election" (5/3). The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, called the veto a 'defining issue' for Clinton" (L.A. TIMES, 5/3).

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 3, 1996

House
REPUBLICAN
Conference

NEWS

JOHN BOEHNER
Chairman
8th District, Ohio

Contact : John Czwartacki
(202) 225-5107

May 2, 1996

RAPID RESPONSE...

**Response to presidential veto of bi-partisan,
pro-consumer product liability reform**

"The administration, up to now, said they would support (Congress' product liability reform). But unfortunately, special interest and raw political considerations in the White House have overridden sound policy judgment... (Clinton) has his eye on the electoral college."

Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) (3/18/96)

"Passage of common-sense product liability reform this year was a tremendous victory for American workers, and a stunning defeat for the powerful trial lawyers' lobby, which has stonewalled these reforms for 18 years now, at the cost of \$80 billion a year in lost American jobs."

"Today, however, Bill Clinton gave the Trial Lawyers the gold, while U.S. factory workers got the shaft."

**Rep. Thomas Bliley (R-VA)
Chairman, House Commerce Committee**

"Money may not be able to buy you love, but if you're a fat-cat trial lawyer it sure can buy you a Bill Clinton veto."

**Rep. John Boehner (R-OH)
Chairman, House Republican Conference**

PRODUCT LIABILITY

House Sustains Clinton's Veto; GOP Seizes a Campaign Issue

The House on May 9 easily upheld the veto of a bill (HR 956) that would have limited the liability of companies that make faulty products, confirming that such legislation is dead for the year.

While the outcome had been expected — the 258-163 vote was 23 votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for an override — the debate offered Republican leaders an opportunity to highlight what they contend will be a key campaign issue.

Repeating the GOP political mantra on HR 956, Commerce Committee Chairman Thomas J. Bliley Jr., R-Va., said the veto exemplified President Clinton's alliance with special interests. In ascribing a motive to the president's actions, he singled out Clinton's alliance with the nation's trial lawyers, who along with consumer groups have led the charge against the product liability bill.

Bliley said the president had "put the interests of rich trial lawyers" ahead of the needs of workers who have lost their jobs because their employers can no longer afford to manufacture products as a result of the cost of litigation.

By Allan Freedman



BOXSCORE

Bill: HR 956 (conference report: H Rept 104-481) — Product liability.

Latest action: House failed to override veto, 258-163, May 9.

Reference: Veto, Weekly Report, p. 1220; House clears, p. 878; Senate passage, p. 789; conference agreement, p. 689; bill highlights, p. 690.

"When we talk about the fat cats and special interests, they ought to be at the front of the list," Bliley said of the trial lawyers.

Democratic opponents of the legislation, however, asserted that they were sticking up for the rights of consumers who have been injured by

faulty products.

Democrat Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts said HR 956 would prevent consumers from seeking legal redress against companies that have a history of producing faulty goods. He cited a list of products that have injured consumers, including cars that exploded.

Picking up on the anti-consumer theme, John Conyers Jr., D-Mich., said, "This proposal to override is a continuation of the majority Republicans' war on public safety, on women and on seniors."

The conference report would have rewritten the rules governing product liability suits in state and federal courts and placed limits on damage awards intended to punish negligent behavior. For large businesses, the awards would be limited to the greater of \$250,000 or two times the total of economic damages, such as lost wages, and non-economic damages, such as pain and suffering. A limit for small businesses would be the lesser of the two limits.

What remains to be seen is to what degree the product liability issue will actually resonate with voters.

But Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry J. Hyde, R-Ill., said that in any case, the vote had sent an important message.

"We're serious about this issue," said Hyde. "And we think the people who worked so long and so hard to get this bill out of conference and out of the Senate deserve one last vote on this."

TRANSPORTATION

Panel Approves NTSB Bill

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on May 9 gave voice vote approval to a bill reauthorizing the National Transportation Safety Board through fiscal 1999, after narrowly rejecting a Democratic amendment that would have increased funding levels.

The bill (HR 3159), under a substitute amendment by Chairman Bud Shuster, R-Pa., would authorize \$40.3 million for the board in fiscal 1997, \$42.4 million in fiscal 1998 and \$44.5 million in fiscal 1999. In comparison, the board's budget in fiscal 1996 was

BOXSCORE

Bill: HR 3159 — National Transportation Safety Board reauthorization.

Latest action: House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved HR 3159 by voice vote May 9.

Next likely action: House floor, not yet scheduled.

authorized at \$45.1 million, but \$38.8 million was appropriated.

The legislation would extend the board chairman's term of office from two years to four, although the vice chairman's term would remain at two years. It also would restrict the board

from disclosing information about accident investigations involving U.S. aircraft that crash in other countries. The information would not become public until the nation investigating the accident released its report, or until two years after the accident, whichever came first.

The bill also would allow the board to conduct accident safety courses for state and foreign investigators. The investigators would pay for the training.

On a party-line vote, the committee rejected, 26-27, an amendment by James L. Oberstar, D-Minn., to authorize an additional \$5.2 million in funding over three years to help the board hire additional employees.

The safety board, an independent agency, investigates and determines the causes of fatal accidents involving all modes of transportation.

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	Senate Contents	CR Issues by Date

Congressional Record entry 3 of 100

PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM VETO (Senate - May 02, 1996)

[Page: S4575]

Mr. DOLE. Later this afternoon, President Clinton is expected to veto the product liability reform bill--a bipartisan measure to curb abusive, predatory lawsuits.

This bill passed the Congress overwhelmingly, with the support of Democrats and Republicans alike. And for good reason: In 1994, lawsuits cost the American consumer a staggering \$152 billion--a price tag that exceeds the entire Federal budget deficit.

Lawsuit abuse hurts consumers by raising the costs of goods and services. It limits employment opportunities for those seeking jobs. It hurts the competitiveness of U.S. businesses overseas. And, perhaps worst of all, it can prevent new, lifesaving drugs and medical devices from ever reaching the market.

As Linda Ransom of Phoenix, AZ explained to us earlier this week, abusive lawsuits have forced manufacturers to stop selling the materials that are needed to make the medical device that is keeping her 9-year-old daughter, Tara, alive. This is truly a life-and-death issue.

It is time to stop lawsuit abuse before lawsuit abuse stops America.

So, why will President Clinton veto this important legislation? The answer can be summed up in three words: The trial lawyers. President Clinton vetoed the securities litigation reform bill because of the strong-arm tactics of the trial lawyers. And he will veto the product liability bill because he believes what is good for the trial lawyers is also good for America.

America's legal system is broken and fundamental reforms are needed--and need now. Our legal system must be reformed to encourage people to be responsible for their own actions. And it should quickly and efficiently compensate victims--not lawyers. Quite simply, legal reform is a key ingredient of any serious plan to promote job creation and economic growth.

Unfortunately, with today's veto, the President will be confirming what we already suspected: It is the trial lawyers who are calling the shots at the White House.

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	Senate Contents	CR Issues by Date

3RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1996 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

May 3, 1996, Friday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 1; Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 789 words

HEADLINE: PRESIDENT VETOES LIMITS ON LIABILITY

BYLINE: By NEIL A. LEWIS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, May 2

BODY:

In a move likely to reverberate throughout the election campaign, President Clinton today vetoed a bill that would restrict the amount that people injured by faulty products could win in lawsuits.

The measure would set limits in both state and Federal courts on punitive damages, money juries may give beyond awards to compensate victims for their losses. It involves products as diverse as school buses, heart valves, cigarettes and microwave ovens.

Supporters of the measure contend that it would put a cap on multimillion-dollar jury awards that they say inhibit manufacturers and add to consumer costs. But opponents say that limiting such awards, which are given to punish reckless or outrageously negligent actions, would give companies an incentive to sell unsafe products.

The issue is a vivid example of how difficult policy questions become wrapped in politics in the shadow of a Presidential race. Both Mr. Clinton and his presumptive Republican opponent in November, Senator Bob Dole of Kansas, have seized it to define their differences.

When Mr. Dole and Speaker Newt Gingrich sent the measure to the White House earlier this week, they held an unusual ceremony that included a girl who they said could be denied a needed medical device because of lawsuits against its maker.

Today in the Oval Office, Mr. Clinton responded by presiding over an even more richly staged event highlighting what he said would be the bill's human costs. He was joined by three people who suffered because of faulty products.

White House officials said that the measure would prevent the three from being properly compensated.

Mr. Clinton said the bill "tilts the playing field against consumers." He also said it "inappropriately intrudes on state authority."

He was joined by Janey Fair of Radcliff, Ky., whose 14-year-old daughter was

The New York Times, May 3, 1996

killed in 1988 when her school bus's poorly designed fuel tank burst into flames after it was struck by a truck operated by a drunken driver. White House officials said that the bill would have limited compensation available to Mrs. Fair by prohibiting her from seeking punitive damages from the bus's manufacturer.

Also in attendance were Carla Miller of Blue Springs, Mo., whose husband was killed in 1990 when his tractor rolled over and Jeanne Yanta, who became infertile because of her use of an ill-designed contraceptive device.

But while the three stories were moving, it was unclear how the changes in the bill that Mr. Clinton has said he wanted would make any difference in the Miller case. Mr. Clinton has said he favors having some national standards for product-liability lawsuits.

One of the principal sponsors of the measure vetoed today, Senator John D. Rockefeller 4th of West Virginia, was so angered by Mr. Clinton's opposition that he made an extraordinarily harsh criticism of a President of his own party, accusing him of selling out to trial lawyers, among the President's major campaign contributors.

Mr. Clinton's veto, the 15th of his Presidency, is unlikely to be overridden. That would require two-thirds votes in both houses of Congress.

Underneath all the frenetic political image-making is the high-stakes issue of how the nation should structure its civil-litigation system. The bill was initially part of a much larger measure that was included in the "Contract With America," the campaign manifesto of Republican House members in 1994. The House passed much of that proposal, but Mr. Dole was unable to get the Senate to go along.

The plan would have drastically overhauled the litigation system, sharply reducing incentives for people to try to resolve disputes in court by imposing even more drastic limits on damages than the vetoed bill and extending them to all civil cases. It would have also increased penalties for filing frivolous lawsuits.

Although the vetoed bill would not limit the amount a person may collect for actual damages caused by a faulty product, typically lost wages and medical expenses, it would limit punitive damages to \$250,000 or twice the actual damages, whichever is greater.

Those supporting the measure included the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. The major opponents were trial lawyers and consumer groups.

"This bill shot at lawyers but hit consumers, workers and families," said Joan Claybrook, the president of Public Citizen, a consumer group. She praised Mr. Clinton, who she said had stood up to powerful business lobbies.

But Representative John Boehner of Ohio, the chairman of the House Republican Conference, said Mr. Clinton's action was a payoff to trial lawyers. Money from those lawyers, he said, "can buy you a Bill Clinton veto."

- By using thier own more optimistic economic assumptions, instead of honest numbers, **Clinton and the Democrats will falsely claim \$475 billion in deficit reduction** without changing a single government program." [Statement by RNC Chairman Haley Barbour, RNC News Release, December 6, 1995]
- "As a candidate for president, Bill Clinton promised to submmmit a plan to balance the budget in five years. He broke that proomise. The first budget he submitted to Congress this year had huge deficits as far as the eye can see. The Senate rejected it by a vote of 99-0 (May 19, 1995) This June, just a sRepublicans in Congress were completing work on their plan to balance the budget, CLinton hurriedly announced he had a plan to balance the budget in ten years. But **that plan turned out to be a phony**. ...The real reson Clinton is shutting down the govenrment is he doesn't have the courage to change. ...he's become an agent of gridlock. ...The time has come to stop borrowing from our children and our grandchildren." [Statement by RNC Chairman Haley Barbour, November 13, 1995]
- "He says he can get to balance by spending more and cutting less. It sounds a little bit phony. That is because the President's so-called budget hides **about \$475 billion in the smoke and mirrors** of different economic assumptions from those of the Congressional Budget Office, which dictates our economic assumptions and our costs of programming." [Sen. Domenici, remarks on the Senate Floor, November 17, 1995]
- "Most of those familiar with capital litigation know that support for true habeas reform - support for **an end to frivolous death penalty appeals** - is the most authentic evidence of an elected official's support for the death penalty. ...But then I began to consider all of the steps this president has taken to undermine the death penalty. For example, President Clinton vetoed legislation late last year which contained language identical to the terrorism bill's habeas corpus proposal.

- "The American people didn't send Republicans to Congress to do **what is easy and convenient but phony**. They sent us here to do what is necessary to put our fiscal house in order and balance the budget. Republicans are doing just that. We are keeping our word. Politicains like Bill Clinton -- who go back on their word, as he is doing by refusing to honor **his November 19 commitment to use CBO estimates in developing an honest budget** with honest numbers -- give politics a bad name and contribute to public cynicism about our leaders and institutions." [Statement by RNC Chairman Haley Barbour, RNC News Release, December 6, 1995]

- "Bill Clinton has taken his veto pen and pointed it like a dagger at the hearts of the innocent unborn. ...a brazen betrayal of his solemn promise to make abortion rare." [Ralph Reed, Washington Times, April 11, 1996]



HR 1561

JOHN E. TRINIDAD

7414 Arrowood Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
email: 104036.3562@compuserve.com

H: (301) 469-9627
O: (202) 456-2702
FAX: (703) 281-0676

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: May 22, 1996

TO: Todd Stern
202-456-2215

FROM: John Trinidad

SUBJECT: Veto stuff

NUMBER OF PAGES (Including cover sheet): 3

COMMENTS: Here are a few more quotes.

More quotes:

S 21

Dole on foreign policy during th Clinton Administration: "...short, sad interlude of American waffling and weakness in world affairs. ...From the halls of Port-au-Prince to the shores of Somalia, to Bosni, where **President Clinton allowed Iran, of all nations, to conduct American foreign policy**, Mr. Clinton's conduct of foreign policy has telegraphed indecision and weakness to the world." ["Dole Steps up Attack on Clinton; U.S. on 'Dangerous Road of Weakness,' GOP Leader Says" by Blaine Harden, Washington Post, May 4, 1996, p. A1]

"And I believe that President Clinton's foreign policy, track record of weakness, and indecision and double talk and incoherence has diminished American credibility, and undermined American interests." [CNN Transcript, "Dole Attacks President on International Issues." Inside Politics, Aired May 9, 1996, 4:04 pm]

HR 2586

QUOTES REGARDING HABEAS CORPUS REFORMS

"Three times (Clinton) has had the opportunity and vetoed the needed [habeas corpus] reforms..." [Gov. Pete Wilson, criticizing the President on habeas corpus reform at a campaign event for Bob Dole, *Sacramento Bee*, March 24, 1996, p. A1]

"Dole suggested Clinton was the 'obstacle to enacting legislation that would limit the appeals of death row inmates.'" ["Summary - Weekend Events: Dole Targets Clinton on Four key issues." The Hotline, March 25, 1996]

HR 2099

Nothing specifically was found. you had asked for something regarding "bloated, inefficient public housing" This quote seems good, but was not in direct reference to the veto of HR 2099.

"Public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism in the world. Imagine, the United States government owns the housing where an entire class of citizens permanetnly live. We are the landlords of misery. Let me be clear. I believe the government has an obligation to maintain a safety net, but these programs have failed in that mission. They have not alleviated poverty. They have not - In fact they've deepend it, rather than alleviated it." [Senator Dole, CNN Transcript, "Dole Attacks Housing in Contrasting himself to Clinton", Inside Politics, Aired April 29, 1996, 4:03 pm]

HR 1530

"The fact is we can't destroy even a single missile. That's not because America is lacking the technical know-how....It's because America is lacking the presidential leadership to get it done." [Dole on Clinton veto of Defense Authorization Bill, "Dole hammers Clinton on Missile System Veto in Indiana Speech," By Karl Vick, *The Washington Post*, p. A14]

"Clinton objects to immediately deploying an effective ballistic missile defense... Clinton objects to my limitations on placing U.S. troops under foreign and U.N. command, even though this is precisely the reason why he cost 19 Americans their lives in somalia. ...It's obvious 'Peacenik Clinton' is more interested in supporting Third World dictators with missiles, the United Nations, and communists in Russia than supporting the United States military and the United States taxpayer!" [Bob Dornan on Clinton Veto of Defense Bill, House of Representatives January 3, 1996, H.Doc. No. 104-155]

HR 1833

He's trying to satisfy both sides, as he always does, and as a result he's not going to satisfy anyone. But he made a mistake. He's out on the extreme fringe. There are a lot of pro-choice, bipartisan support for this bill, and I think he made a big mistake." [Dole on veto of 'Partial Birth Abortion Ban', CNN Transcript, "Dole Attempts to Contrast himself to President," Inside Politics, Aired April 11, 1996, 4:04 pm]



SUMMARY - WEEKEND EVENTS: DOLE TARGETS CLINTON ON FOUR KEY ISSUES

THE HOTLINE

Mar. 25, 1996

Making his first foray into CA as the presumptive GOP nominee, Bob Dole "directly challenged" Pres. Clinton by endorsing the CA Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI), the "hot-button" fall ballot measure to ban race and gender preferences in state hiring. Dole's statement "puts pressure on Clinton to take a formal stand on what could be the most controversial initiative" on CA's 11/96 ballot. Noting that Dole kept his CCRI comments short, analyst Sherry Bebitch Jeffe suggested Dole is "not very comfortable with the hard-right conservative rhetoric" that some, including Pat Buchanan, have brought to the issue (Garcia/Yoachum, S.F. CHRONICLE, 3/25). CBS' Douglass: "Struggling to make a dent in President Clinton's popularity in California, Bob Dole reached for a hot button issue" ("This Morning," 3/25). Earlier, Dole "castigated President Clinton's opposition to increased production of the B-2 Stealth bomber and vowed to essentially double the size of the fleet" as pres. The CA-produced bomber accounts for about 25,000 jobs. In 2/96, Clinton "all but killed the production program by saying he would not order any beyond the 20 then on order. But this week, in apparent anticipation of Dole's sentiments, Clinton unexpectedly agreed to order one more" (LaGanga/Braun, L.A. TIMES, 3/23). Rep. David Dreier (R-CA), traveling with Dole, dismissed Clinton's move as "cynical election politics": "It is transparent to the people who are building the B-2 that the president is just throwing out bones" (Harden, W. POST, 3/23). Dole suggested Clinton had "undermined military readiness and unduly punished [CA's] economy by supporting defense cuts far deeper than he suggested when campaigning" in '92 (AP/N.Y. TIMES, 3/24). Dole "joked that he would return to the state at least 19 more times, and perhaps the president would agree to build 19 more bombers" (Zuckman, BOSTON GLOBE, 3/23). Visiting the Mexico border, Dole again previewed his fall campaign against Clinton by declaring his "unabashed support for a federal crackdown on illegal immigration." Dole "sought to contrast himself" with Clinton, who urged CA voters in '94 to reject Prop 187, which would allow CA to deny services to undocumented children (Chavez, SACRAMENTO BEE, 3/23).

AT SAN QUENTIN: With the prison guard tower looming behind him, Dole 3/23 argued for tougher law enforcement in CA -- "but flubbed an attack on President Clinton's crime record, for which aides later offered a retraction." Dole toured death row with Wilson, whose "largest campaign contributor" is the prison-

guards' union (Marinucci/Capps, S.F. EXAMINER, 3/24). Dole suggested Clinton was the "obstacle to enacting legislation that would limit the appeals of death row inmate." Dole's measure on the habeas corpus issue would limit death-row inmates to one timely appeal (King, AP/PHILA. INQUIRER, 3/24). AG Dan Lungren, Gov. Pete Wilson and finally Dole "took turns misstating" Clinton's record on habeas, contending that GOPers have given Clinton three chances to change the law. Actually, Clinton vetoed a provision to limit prisoners' rights to federal appeals only once -- and it was part of a debt-limit extension bill last year, according to Wilson press sec. Sean Walsh. Walsh added that "confusion" was the blame for the misstatements of the three men (Yoachum, S.F. CHRONICLE, 3/25). Many GOPers "questioned" Wilson's decision to take Dole to San Quentin for an event on the death penalty, which may have made Dole seem "too harsh." They "raised concerns that it could spur comparisons to George Bush's controversial use of Willie Horton as a prop" in '88. GOP strategist Lyn Nofziger, an informal Dole adviser: "A trip to San Quentin is not a way to show your concern for crime -- going up there and looking at a bunch of people in cages." But in an interview, Wilson said, "It's an entirely appropriate setting. Everybody in [CA] knows that San Quentin is where the law is carried out. Californians have voted overwhelmingly to reinstate the death penalty" (N.Y. TIMES, 3/24). Wilson, on "Face the Nation," again defended the trip: "[Clinton] has said one thing and then he's done another. ... He is sounding like a Republican, governing like a liberal, and this is one more instance in which it's very clear that he is doing that again. Bob Dole was [at prison] because he believes in the death penalty" (CBS, 3/24).

ECLIPSING BUCHANAN: The events "represent the opening salvo of Dole's attempt to steal [CA] from Clinton, who is popular here" (Trounstine, S.J. MERCURY NEWS, 3/23). ABC's Cochran: "Running as much as 20 points behind [Clinton in CA polls], Dole is testing the waters to see whether he really has a chance here" (3/22). Dole's CA visit "underscored his campaign's belief" that the CA primary exists "largely as a practice exercise" for the fall. His target all day was Clinton, rather than Pat Buchanan, who continued his "bound-for-defeat campaign in an effort to increase his pull" at the convention. Nevertheless, Buchanan, traveling through Fresno, "sounded a more conciliatory note than he has in recent weeks." Dole's border trip -- which followed Buchanan's by a day -- Dole's "willingness to echo conservative themes, Buchanan said, marked a 'real difference'" (La Ganga/Braun, L.A. TIMES, 3/23). For Buchanan, his CA trip will help "reinforce a dogged political protest movement he says will continue" to San Diego (Marinucci, S.F. EXAMINER, 3/23). He is expected to pull 25% of the vote in the primary, "mirroring the percentage of state Republicans who identify themselves as hard-line conservatives" (Stewart, USA TODAY, 3/25).

PRIMARY-TIME TV: "To exist, in [CA] politics, is to appear on television." And neither Dole nor Buchanan "has the money ...

to finance the \$1.2 million or so it takes to get a single idea across statewide ... That means Buchanan is unlikely to broaden his vote beyond the slice of true-believing conservatives who would walk through fire for him. And it means Dole likely will not be able to use this trip to pull within striking range of Clinton in the polls in the short term." Dem media consultant Bill Carrick: "The [CA] primary, in term of laying a foundation for [Dole], is not very useful because there's no [TV ads]. On L.A. TV, he's getting crowded out by the Menendez brothers, the Oscars and Alec Baldwin's trial. They don't have time for Bob Dole" (Trounstine/Ostrum, MERCURY NEWS, 3/24).

*Click on your browser's **Back** button to return to search results.*

[News](#) | [Inter-Action](#) | [Web Guide](#) | [Rec Room](#) | [Advocates](#) | [Campaign '96](#) | [Issues](#) | [Poll Track](#) | [Resources](#) | [Marketplace](#)

[HOME](#)[FEEDBACK](#)[CONTENTS](#)[ABOUT
POLITICSUSA](#)

5-16-

Todd -

these are articles in which
Clinton's veto record is
discussed. Mainly, they are attack
pieces (i.e., "veto Bill" type stuff).

— — John

General Attack on Clinton Vetoes

Copyright (c) 1996 by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

Access No: 9603200078 ProQuest - The Wall Street Journal (R) Ondisc
Title: REVIEW & OUTLOOK (EDITORIAL): VETO DEFINITION
Source: The Wall Street Journal
Date: Wednesday Mar 20, 1996 Sec: A p: 14
Length: Long (847 words) Type: Editorial
Subjects: Editorials; Vetoes; Governmental reform
Names: Clinton, Bill

Abstract: An editorial says it is up to the GOP to make clear that over the past year President Clinton has been an obstacle to reform, despite his rhetoric. The editorial says his record is evidenced by the number of vetoes he has signed.

Copyright 1996 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All rights reserved.

Article Text:

If Congress doesn't give him what he wants, namely more government spending, President Clinton threatens to veto new spending authority to replace a continuing resolution expiring Friday. There's a chance another temporary spending package would keep the government open for one more week, but after that expect the President to veto what Congress sends him and then blame Congress for shutting down the government. Why not, it worked last time. Last November, he vetoed a continuing resolution that would have kept the government open, and blamed the GOP. The Republicans had bragged about their willingness to close the government, of course, so no one noticed that it would have stayed open if only the President had signed the bill on his desk. The debt-limit debates went pretty much the same way, with the President vetoing a temporary increase on November 12, and sending his Treasury Secretary out to warn that default was imminent. If so, of course, it could have been avoided with a stroke of the President's pen.

The tactic is by now pretty well tested, and Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich are going up to the White House today to learn the terms of their surrender. The Senate, with the concurrence of the GOP Presidential nominee, has agreed to give the President \$4 billion, above current spending levels, of the \$7 billion he seeks for education, job training, environment and apple pie.

Maybe Republicans should stop banging their heads against this wall. If they're looking for an alternative, we'd suggest the President's dozen vetoes of the past year; they look like promising election issues to us. With Mr. Clinton soooo smooth about saying one thing and doing the other, the Republicans need to define him for what he is.

While Mr. Clinton likes to say that 'the era of big government is over,' he's vetoed every bill that would actually reduce the size of government. His first veto, last June 7, was a bill to cut \$16.4 billion in spending for Fiscal Year 1995. His veto statement pulled the old bait and switch: Claim to want to cut other spending, but oppose the spending cuts actually on the table. This set the pattern, even as Republicans kept imagining that Mr. Clinton was going to sign their grand 'balanced budget.'

Instead he vetoed 11 other bills, eight of them about spending. On December 18, he killed a spending bill for Veterans and Housing and another for Interior. A day later he vetoed the bill to keep Commerce, State and Justice open. His objection in each case was that Congress wanted to make government too small.

On December 6, Mr. Clinton vetoed the giant budget 'reconciliation,' nixing the balanced budget he claims to favor, welfare reform, historic

changes in New Deal farm programs, cuts in corporate welfare (if not as many as we'd like), tax cuts, and thousands more key policy changes.

Incredibly, Mr. Clinton is now running a re-election TV ad claiming to support welfare reform. Yet he's already vetoed welfare reform twice: Once in the overall budget on December 6 and again on January 9.

On December 28, Mr. Clinton vetoed a defense authorization on grounds that it sought to defend the U.S. against ballistic-missile attack. Earlier he'd vetoed a bill to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia, preferring, as it turned out, to send American troops instead.

On December 19, the President offered his first payback to the trial lawyers, vetoing the securities reform bill. This was too much even for superliberal Chris Dodd, who joined Republicans in helping to override his President. Now he threatens to veto a product liability reform that is likely to pass the Senate this week. Though the bill has been so watered down it is now supported even by West Virginia liberal Jay Rockefeller, Mr. Clinton can't sign it without infuriating his trial-lawyer donors, not to mention Ralph Nader, who is threatening to mount a third party challenge in November in crucial California.

Mr. Clinton wants voters to forget that he was the first President in decades not to cast any vetoes in his first two years, when Democrats ran Congress and he was a wholly owned subsidiary of George Mitchell. Now he wants to associate himself with the goals of the GOP Congress, but cast vetoes on the 'extreme' details. Republicans can't win by trying to satisfy him on those details. Their hope is to force Mr. Clinton to choose: Either govern like he talks, or expose the talk as this election year's version of his 1992 'New Democrat' dodge.

Republicans have been feeble in getting out news of this record, though out on the stump last week Bob Dole began to call his adversary in the White House 'Old Veto Bill.' Mr. Dole is likely to win in November only if he makes this election a fight over big themes, not legislative fine print. It's up to the GOP to make clear that over this past year Bill Clinton has been an obstacle to reform; whatever his misleading rhetoric, that record is written in his vetoes.

Copyright 1996 Plain Dealer Publishing Co.
The Plain Dealer

March 15, 1996 Friday, FINAL / ALL

SECTION: NATIONAL; Pg. 11A

LENGTH: 722 words

HEADLINE: DOLE CALLS CLINTON 'OLD VETO BILL'

BYLINE: TOM DIEMER and JOE HALLETT; PLAIN DEALER REPORTERS

DATELINE: COLUMBUS

BODY:

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, laying claim to the Republican presidential nomination, brought his campaign to Ohio last night, calling for party unity and attacking his next opponent, President Clinton, as "old veto Bill."

"I am very proud to be - and I will be - the Republican nominee for president of the United States," Dole told about 1,500 partisans at a rally organized by Gov. George V. Voinovich.

Dole never mentioned his last serious rival remaining in Tuesday's Ohio primary, Pat Buchanan, who insists he will fight all the way to the Republican National Convention, despite Dole's virtually insurmountable lead in delegates.

"What we want to do as a party now is come together, close ranks and understand that our political target is not each other, but Bill Clinton," Dole said.

Given a chance to audition for the vice presidential sweepstakes, Voinovich offered Dole a history lesson. No Republican has been elected president, he reminded him, without also winning Ohio.

"We are going to make sure," Voinovich assured Dole, "that on Nov. 5, the headline will be, 'Ohio goes for Dole.'"

Nelson Warfield, Dole's press secretary, said Ohio was still an important primary state for Republicans. "But it is a vital state in the general election," he said. "The Midwest will be the battleground."

Consequently Dole is focusing more attention on President Clinton and less on his remaining primary opponents.

Voinovich joined the battle.

He attacked Clinton for vetoing the Republican versions of welfare reform, an overhaul of Medicaid and a balanced-budget plan. To make his point, he handed Dole an Ohio license plate, marked with the word "Veto."

"He talks the talk but does not walk the walk," Voinovich said of the Democratic president who has embraced different approaches to reforming welfare and restraining federal spending.

Dole dubbed the president "old veto Bill." Clinton, he said, wants to "spend money, spend money, spend more money."

Dole gave his standard speech, punctuated with barbs at Clinton and anecdotes about his youth in Kansas and service in World War II in Italy, where he was seriously wounded as a member of the Army's 10th Mountain Division.

But he unknowingly put himself at odds with Voinovich by saying: "I happen to believe that in America English ought to be the official language."

Just last week, an Ohio House-passed bill to make English the official state language died in the Senate due to a threatened Voinovich veto.

Many in the crowd acknowledged that Dole had an uphill battle against Clinton.

"Dole has to emphasize more of a future vision, where he intends to take our country," said Ottawa County GOP Chairman Harry Thompson, conceding that the candidate had "not adequately done that yet."

An hour before the main event, Republicans held a private reception for large donors, elected officials and aides to Voinovich, who was the first governor to endorse Dole.

Dole was scheduled to mingle with several hundred people, but missed most of it.

When the 72-year-old Dole appeared, however, a crowd mobbed him as if he were a teenage heartthrob. Chief Justice Thomas Moyer, State Treasurer J. Kenneth Blackwell and Ohio Attorney General Betty D. Montgomery were among those who rushed to shake the nominee's hand.

It was another day of triumph for Dole, who earlier picked up the endorsements of former rival Steve Forbes and Michigan Gov. John Engler. Forbes folded his campaign after deciding he could not make the "breakthrough" he needed in Ohio or any of the other three Midwestern states holding primaries on Tuesday.

Engler - with Voinovich among those being mentioned as a possible running mate for Dole - had remained neutral in the Republican race until yesterday.

Dole can come within a hair of clinching the nomination if he scores lopsided wins over Buchanan in Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin next week. If Dole were to capture all of the 229 delegates available on Tuesday, he would be just 26 shy of achieving the 996 needed to become his party's nominee.

Dole, who is bumping up against the primary spending limit of \$37.1 million, limited his campaigning in Ohio to last night's appearance in Columbus and stops today at the Honda plant in Marysville and in Cleveland for an ethnic heritage celebration at Karlin Hall.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 16, 1996

Copyright 1996 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

April 4, 1996, Thursday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section D; Page 20; Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 357 words

HEADLINE: POLITICS: THE AD CAMPAIGN;
Taking On Dole in a New Commercial

BYLINE: By JAMES BENNET

BODY:

The Democratic National Committee has begun broadcasting a new 30-second television commercial around the country.

ON THE SCREEN -- The advertisement opens with Senator Bob Dole declaring that President Clinton vetoed "the first balanced budget in a generation." As the announcer cuts in to present what he calls the facts, the advertisement intersperses full-color shots of Mr. Clinton speaking on the stump with black-and-white footage of Mr. Dole. Also included is film of elderly people reading, young people studying and children carrying recycling bins. The closing shots are of a young couple walking, the woman holding a baby.

SCRIPT -- Bob Dole: "We sent him the first balanced budget in a generation. He vetoed it. We're going to veto Bill Clinton."

The announcer: "The facts? The President proposes a balanced budget protecting Medicare, education, the environment. But Dole is voting no. The President cuts taxes for 40 million Americans. Dole votes no. The President bans assault weapons; demands work for welfare while protecting kids. Dole says no to the Clinton plans. It's time to say yes to the Clinton plans -- yes to America's families."

ACCURACY -- The advertisement is accurate, but voters could draw false inferences -- for example, that Mr. Dole opposes a balanced budget, tax cuts, or welfare changes that would force recipients to work. Further, Mr. Dole has not voted against Mr. Clinton's budget, which was never voted on in the Senate. But Mr. Dole has opposed the President's budgetary priorities, and the "Clinton plans" in general.

SCORECARD -- The advertisement presents itself as a defense of Mr. Clinton, but functions as an attack on Mr. Dole. It seeks to inoculate Mr. Clinton against Republican accusations that he stands in the way of a balanced budget and changes in welfare, while portraying Mr. Dole as uninterested in protecting the environment, the elderly, or children. One risk to the strategy is that voters might believe that the President, given the powers of his

office, should have been able to accomplish his goals, and is making excuses for not doing so. JAMES BENNET

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 4, 1996

Copyright 1996 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

May 9, 1996, Thursday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: NEWS; Page A19

LENGTH: 851 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON OFFERS TO BREAK LOGJAM / DOLE, PRESIDENT SPAR
OVER WAGE, GAS TAX BILLS

BYLINE: By Martin Kasindorf. WASHINGTON BUREAU

DATELINE: Washington

BODY:

Washington - In a politically charged call for a 90-day legislative truce, President Bill Clinton yesterday offered to break a congressional "logjam" by signing a repeal of his 1993 gas tax increase if Republicans will allow Democrats a vote on raising the minimum wage.

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.) responded by accusing Clinton of using his veto to block important measures. "If the president used the same spirit he talked about today," Dole said, "we'd already have a balanced budget, we'd have real welfare reform, we'd have tax cuts for families with children, and we'd have pension reform."

Clinton went on to list a broad agenda for bipartisan action despite the already raging election campaign and conditioned his goodwill upon Republicans sending him "clean" bills without "poison pill" provisions meant to provoke presidential vetoes.

"It's no secret to anybody that this is an election year," Clinton told reporters in the White House briefing room. "But there will be plenty of time for all the politics in the world after we do the work we were sent here to do."

The president's words fell far short of nonpartisanship. Clinton warned Republicans that if they don't maintain the "positive" spirit they showed toward telecommunications, anti-terrorism and lobbying bills, they would leave voters with "a memory of extremism, deadlock and government shutdowns."

Clinton repeatedly linked the name of Dole, the virtually official Republican presidential nominee, with that of the less-popular House speaker, Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). And he used the term "poison pill" 12 times as inoculation against campaign criticism for possible vetoes

of budget-balancing, welfare-toughening and other appealing bills that his foes are loading with objectionable additions emphasizing party differences.

The president's bill-trading offer came with the Senate knotted by Democratic filibusters aimed at forcing Dole to schedule a direct vote on raising the hourly minimum wage from \$4.25 to \$5.15.

Dole reluctantly agreed Tuesday to allow a vote on the Democrats' potent issue, but only as part of a bill including his equally popular 4.3-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax cut and a labor-law change. Dubbed the TEAM Act, the revision would permit unionized employers to deal with company-selected workers on workplace issues outside of the collective bargaining process. Businesses and Senate conservatives back the idea. Democrats reject it as a union-busting ploy.

"We think what we are offering is good medicine," Dole said at a news conference after Clinton spoke. "It may be hard for him to swallow, but it's good medicine." If Clinton wants to end deadlock, Dole said, he should ask Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) to stop blocking votes on the gas tax repeal and other bills.

Later, in an inartful remark during Senate debate, Dole appeared to endorse separate voting on the tax, wage and labor measures. The White House quickly issued a statement "accepting" Dole's inadvertent concession, whereupon the senator backtracked but promised to confer with Democrats on compromise.

By signing a repeal of the 1993 tax hike, which was passed as a deficit-reduction tool without Republican votes, Clinton would be handing Dole a needed political win. Trailing by up to 31 points in presidential polling, Dole skillfully capitalized 11 days ago on a public outcry over soaring gas prices and heartened Republicans with his tax rollback idea. Clinton's apparent object: Getting the tactical defeat on the tax behind him and resuming his winning streak.

In saying he'd accept a suspension of the gas tax increase until the end of the year, Clinton appeared to undercut Senate Democrats in failing to insist on amendments making oil companies pass the price reduction through to consumers and specifying spending reductions offsetting the \$3 billion cost.

Although he called for a moratorium on bitter politicking inside the Capital Beltway, Clinton said he wasn't asking Dole to refrain from campaigning through speeches or TV ads. "I don't ask him to stop that," Clinton said. "All I'm saying is, we're supposed to show up for work here every day."

Asked if he'd tone down his own partisanship, Clinton said he hasn't condemned Dole and Gingrich "in the kind of intense personal terms that they have used." Clinton was scheduled to appear last night at a dinner raising \$11 million for the Democratic National Committee. Meanwhile, the Republican National Committee began airing TV spots blasting the 1993 tax

increases and urging support of the gas tax repeal.

Aside from Clinton's gas-tax strategizing, political observers discerned another motivation for going before news cameras yesterday: Countering image problems stemming from the expected playing of his videotaped testimony in the Little Rock criminal trial of his former Whitewater business partners. As it turned out, the tape probably will be played today - when cameras will show Clinton ceremonially welcoming the president of Greece on a state visit.

GRAPHIC: AP Photo - 1) Clinton ponders question during news conference yesterday. 2) Clinton briefs reporters on bills stalled in logjam in Congress (A02 NS^

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: May 9, 1996

Copyright 1996 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

May 08, 1996, Wednesday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A04

LENGTH: 381 words

HEADLINE: Dole Says He Can Eliminate Gender Gap

BYLINE: Dan Balz, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

Acknowledging that he badly trails President Clinton among female voters, Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) vowed last night to overcome that gender gap by campaigning on a record he said was sympathetic to women and by exposing the "credibility gap" between the president's words and his actions.

"You've seen the poll numbers that show there's a gender gap," Dole told a Republican women's audience. "Does that bother me? You bet it does. . . . Do I have a plan to eliminate it? Yes, I do."

Dole said he would "proudly discuss my record on issues of concern to American women" and cited votes to make it easier to convict repeat rapists and to fund fully the Violence Against Women Act as examples of his record "on issues of concern to American women."

But he spent most of his time attacking the president, escalating his attacks on Clinton as a candidate who is campaigning for reelection with little regard to his own record in office.

"It's time we talk about the credibility gap, talk about his words, talk about his actions, because they believe at the White House that rhetoric is action," Dole said.

The presumptive Republican nominee said the president suffers from a credibility gap on tax cuts, balancing the budget, welfare and other issues.

Dole also pointed to Clinton's recent endorsement of Republican-sponsored legislation to provide a tax credit for adoptions. "He vetoed it last year," Dole said. "He didn't mention that when he talked about it. . . . We could have had it last year, Mr. President, but you vetoed it."

Dole spoke sarcastically about a new Democratic National Committee television ad touting welfare reform as part of the president's agenda, despite two Clinton vetoes of such legislation passed by Congress last year. "I never cease to be amazed," Dole said, adding, "Sooner or later the American people are going to understand."

Dole, like House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) earlier in the day before the same audience, blamed the news media for failing to hold Democrats to the same standards as Republicans in the legislative jockeying.

Dole said that both Democrats and Republicans have used delaying tactics to block the other in the Senate but that only the Republicans receive criticism for it.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 08, 1996May 08, 1996

Copyright 1996 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

April 10, 1996, Wednesday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A04

LENGTH: 462 words

HEADLINE: GOP Ad Campaign Hits Clinton for Vetoing Tax Relief

BYLINE: David S. Broder, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

The Republican National Committee yesterday launched a \$ 1.5 million tax-season ad campaign rapping President Clinton for vetoing tax relief for working families with children.

The new ad is the latest in a tit-for-tat advertising battle between the two major parties, which are gearing up for a campaign of blaming each other for blocking action on popular items.

Democrats began the effort last week with an ad criticizing Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), the prospective GOP presidential nominee, for blocking a balanced budget that the ad said also would have provided tax relief for working families.

Yesterday, Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour previewed a 30-second ad that he said would start airing today in 22 states. A husband and wife who have just finished their tax returns are lamenting that the bill is "worse than I thought," according to the husband. "What about the thousand dollar tax credit for the two kids?" he asks. "Clinton vetoed that," his wife replies. "You know, if we could just keep more, we could do more with our kids, our church, our community."

In alternative versions, the ad finishes with the announcer either praising a Republican House member who voted for the tax credit or criticizing a Democrat who voted against it. There is no reference to Dole, but Barbour indicated he plans to put up ads that will mention the nominee directly.

Dole, whose battle for the nomination pushed him up against the legal limits on what a candidate can spend before the convention, is at a serious disadvantage to Clinton, who has millions left before he hits the ceiling. But both parties are free to do issue advertising, even mentioning candidates by name, so long as they do not expressly advocate their election or defeat.

Barbour used the news conference to tee off on both the Democrats and organized labor, which has announced a \$ 35 million campaign of issues ads targeting vulnerable

congressional Republicans. As he has done before, Barbour complained that the AFL-CIO is using "compulsory dues money to try to buy back control of Congress and [isn't] even reporting it to the FEC," the Federal Election Commission.

Barbour said his counteroffensive begins with the tax issue because "there is no more fundamental difference between Bob Dole and Bill Clinton, between

Republicans and Democrats."

"Bill Clinton vetoed these tax cuts for working families and economic growth," Barbour said, "so the federal government gets more money and families get less money."

The Democratic National Committee responded that the GOP budget was vetoed "because President Clinton would not let Bob Dole or Newt Gingrich slash Medicare for our senior citizens and education for our youth."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 10, 1996April 10, 1996

Copyright 1996 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

March 7, 1996, Thursday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A04

LENGTH: 650 words

HEADLINE: CAMPAIGN '96 / On the Road / DOLE / Front-runner's Focus: Veto President Clinton

BYLINE: By James Toedtman. WASHINGTON BUREAU CHIEF

DATELINE: Austin, Texas

BODY:

Austin, Texas - The Dole campaign shifted to overdrive yesterday.

Energized by his sweep of eight Junior Tuesday primaries, and with the prospect of collecting most of New York's 102 delegates today, Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole relished his presumptive nominee status, won the support of a key state governor and refocused his campaign beyond the primaries to the general election and "the real target, Bill Clinton."

In the process, he spent a bittersweet afternoon meeting in Houston with his long-time nemesis, former President George Bush, who had crushed Dole's two previous presidential campaigns. And in a reminder of his age, the 72-year-old Dole collected the endorsements of Bush's 49-year-old son, Texas Gov. George Bush Jr., and of another Bush son, Jeb, 43, who lost a gubernatorial race in Florida in 1994. Distracted slightly by Jack Kemp's unexpected endorsement of millionaire publisher Steve Forbes yesterday and by conservative columnist Pat Buchanan's refusal to say he'd endorse the eventual Republican nominee, campaign aides still anticipated few problems with today's New York primary. "I know I'll win nine there," Dole quipped, referring to the state's nine at-large delegates who are chosen by party leaders. The remaining 93 are selected in congressional district voting.

Instead, Dole's focus was the 123 delegates at stake in Tuesday's Texas primary and the 32 electoral votes at stake here in November. Both Dole and the Texas Bushes were buoyed by the Harte Hanks Texas Poll released yesterday showing Dole with a lofty 16-point lead over Clinton if the presidential election were held today, a poll taken last week before Dole had begun his rush of nine primary victories since Saturday.

Dole stated what the new campaign emphasis will be: "My mission and our mission as Republicans is to unify the Republican Party and close ranks and face the real political target, Bill Clinton. That's my obligation, my responsibility, and I'll continue to do that for the next

several weeks."

At two appearances yesterday, and at four scheduled for today in Florida, Dole is to contend that the president is an obstacle to economic growth, is blocking a balanced budget and was wrong in vetoing Republican welfare and Medicaid reforms and budget cuts. "Our goal is to veto Bill Clinton in November," Dole said.

Dole bridged the generations yesterday, collecting the younger George Bush's endorsement in Austin, then flying to Houston for a 20-minute meeting with the former president. The elder Bush said he was staying neutral in the Republican contest, but called Dole "a real leader, a great friend" with "great credentials for president of the United States."

If George Bush Jr. - who had earlier endorsed Texas Sen. Phil Gramm's presidential bid - can replicate for Dole his own 1994 success, when he upset former Gov. Ann Richards, a Democrat, he could provide a major assist.

Dole's Texas visit begins a swing through the South aimed at bolstering his position in next Tuesday's six Super Tuesday primaries with their 362 delegates. The front-runner repeated his support of tax reform yesterday, but he said that a "fairer, flatter and simpler tax system" should protect deductions for mortgage interest and charitable contributions. Those conditions have vexed Forbes and provoked Kemp's endorsement of the flat tax advocate yesterday. "That won't change my campaign any," Dole said. "I don't know about Jack's."

Dole also showed some frustration at Buchanan's burst of independence and pledge to continue his campaign. "If you don't have any delegates for San Diego, why make the trip?" he asked.

The endorsement by George Bush Jr. came in the shade of the 146-year-old governor's mansion in Austin and was witnessed by 31 children from an elementary school and a cluster of local dignitaries including Mesa, Texas, oilman T. Boone Pickens.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 07, 1996

✓
Copyright 1996 The Kansas City Star Co.
THE KANSAS CITY STAR

January 24, 1996 Wednesday METROPOLITAN EDITION

Dole veto
articles
worth
including

SECTION: NATIONAL/WORLD; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 774 words

HEADLINE: Dole answers with campaign message

BYLINE: JAKE THOMPSON, Washington Correspondent

BODY:

WASHINGTON - Following the president's longer, upbeat message, Bob Dole wasted little time Tuesday night reminding Americans that this election year presents starkly different political philosophies.

"President Clinton may well be the rear guard of the welfare state," said the Senate majority leader.

In the official Republican response to the State of the Union speech, Dole seemed to aim his words to conservative voters in the Iowa and New Hampshire GOP primaries. They begin selecting the party's nominee in less than a month.

Dole said the word "values" seven times and complained about "liberals" and "elites." The Kansan talked often of America's future, saying Americans have always worked with the "half-silent consciousness we were doing the work of the Lord."

Smiling briefly several times in his 12-minute address, Dole stuck to his prepared text, something he rarely did in his two previous presidential bids.

His rhetoric frequently rose to lofty terrain of hope and promise. But the Kansan also sharply criticized Clinton's actions and agenda.

Dole vowed to continue challenging the president on the budget, taxes and welfare, suggesting that a great clash over ideas, values and the nation's direction is underway.

"I am a practical man," said Dole, "but I do believe in the miracle of America.

"I have never gone in for dramatics, but I do believe we have reached a defining moment. It's as if we went to sleep in one America and woke up in another.

"It's as though our government, over institutions and our culture has been hijacked by liberals and are careening dangerously off course," Dole continued.

"We know the way back, but we must act now."

Turning to the ongoing budget battle, Dole admitted politicians like himself may seem petty and remote. Agreement has not been reached, he said, because of "starkly different philosophies of government and profoundly different visions of America."

Without mentioning Clinton's lack of military service, Dole spoke of men and women who, like himself, sacrificed and fought in wars to protect America's freedoms.

Trying to blunt Clinton's gift for oratory, he urged listeners to focus upon the president's deeds.

It was Clinton, Dole said, who defended with his veto a welfare system "that daily assaults the values of self-reliance and family."

Clinton defended an education system, Dole said, "run by liberals whose goal is to operate every school in America by remote control from Washington."

Dole also chastened Clinton for vetoing a defense bill aimed at protecting the nation from missile attack and defending the status quo on Medicare.

Worst of all, Dole said, Clinton vetoed the first balanced budget in a generation. Unlike Republicans, Clinton sees the nation's problems solved by more and more meddlesome government, he said.

Trying to bring the confusing budget battle down to where Americans live, Dole noted that many parents would check on their children before going to sleep.

Dole said at times election-year debates will seem like arguments over "a maze of conflicting numbers, assertions and high-sounding words. But what we're really arguing about are the values that will shape our nation, our government, and the future of your child sleeping down the hall."

He encouraged listeners to think: "If we continue down this path we will place a tremendous burden on every child in America," Dole said. "How can we betray them, their parents and grandparents? How can we fail to act?"

"We cannot and we will not."

At several points, Dole's address steered directly onto themes he has spoken about in his presidential campaign. He talked of reining in government, returning power to the people and reducing taxes.

In the months ahead, he said, if no agreements can be reached on the budget, Republicans will again send him bills to reform welfare, curb government regulations and to balance the

budget.

And yet, Dole promised Republicans would protect the poor, the disadvantaged, education and the environment.

"There comes a time when even practical leaders must refuse to yield or bend," Dole said, in an apparent effort to assure Republicans who criticize him for too often seeking compromise. "For Republicans, and countless Democrats and Independents, we have arrived at that time.

"America's troubles are real, but our choices are clear and our will is strong."

GRAPHIC: Photo, Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole of Kansas delivered the Republicans' response to President Clinton's State of the Union address Tuesday night. Dole spoke on television from his Capitol office.; The Associated Press

LOAD-DATE: January 24, 1996

Copyright 1996 Times Publishing Company
St. Petersburg Times

January 28, 1996, Sunday, City Edition

SECTION: NATIONAL; Pg. 3A

LENGTH: 793 words

HEADLINE: Dole on road for a rebound

BYLINE: CECI CONNOLLY

DATELINE: CONCORD, N.H.

BODY:

Four days after his sluggish response to President Clinton's State of the Union address, Sen. Bob Dole is trying to turn a low moment into a long-term asset, pitching himself as the substance to Clinton's admittedly better style.

"I gave a fireside chat the other night and the fire went out," Dole told a group of firefighters Saturday. "But we have a message."

As Senate majority leader, Dole opted to give the Republican response to Clinton's speech Tuesday night, hoping the free time on national TV would give him an opportunity to attract primary voters. But pundits and many Dole supporters around the country complained he looked pale and stumbled over some words.

He blames the poor ratings on the press.

"The media didn't like it because I didn't talk about their issues," he said at another campaign stop in Concord, the capital. "I'm concerned about America, not about the media. They're having little heart palpitations about my speech because it wasn't the liberal message they wanted to hear."

In a one-day visit to three communities in New Hampshire, whose presidential primary is Feb. 20, Dole and aides argued he beat Clinton with content and credibility.

"No one's going to compete with President Clinton on packaging and presentation," said Dole's spokesman, Nelson Warfield. "That's not what this campaign is about; it's about substance."

Describing Clinton as the "rear guard of the welfare state," Dole rattled off a list of bills Clinton vetoed in 1995 - from welfare reform to a GOP balanced budget.

"Every time, President Clinton says no, no, no," Dole told police officers. "Then he stands before the American people and talks about the balanced budget and talks about welfare reform and talks about Medicaid reform and talks about crime and truth in sentencing and I wonder where he's been the last three years."

Clearly miffed that Clinton appropriated many Republican themes in his televised address, Dole joked: "I think he left the White House and grabbed the wrong speech. He got some Republican speech."

The Republican front-runner also continued his criticism of Steve Forbes, the wealthy magazine publisher whose self-financed campaign has gained steam in recent weeks with a barrage of anti-Dole commercials.

"I don't believe you can buy this election with television," he said.

Dole himself has replied to Forbes' ads with equally forceful spots. But he acknowledged, "There's a limit on negative advertising."

Campaign strategists picked up on Dole's anti-media, anti-Clinton themes.

"On substance Bob Dole was talking about what I think this country should be thinking about," said Sen. Judd Gregg, the New Hampshire Republican running the New England campaign. "Regrettably, he didn't have a full audience; if he had, I think he would have had the same flamboyance as Clinton."

Yet some New Hampshire voters remained disappointed that the party's standard bearer did not seem able to match Clinton in the back-to-back appearances.

"He was down a little; it was not Bob Dole at his best," said Roger King, a Deerfield retiree who said he is 90 percent for Dole.

"He looked tired," added his wife, Margaret King.

In four appearances to supporters, Dole focused on the standard themes of his candidacy: leadership, character and experience.

"I want to be president of the United States because I think America is headed in the wrong direction," he told veterans gathered at the American Legion in Manchester. "Not too many veterans working at the White House either.

"I want to change directions in America," he said. "I'm concerned about a balanced budget; I'm concerned about lower taxes. I'm concerned about values."

Acknowledging he never won any "oratory contests in high school," Dole said he plans to stick with his conservative message. "I can only imagine how the press would've reacted to

the first draft of the speech - before I took out the tough stuff."

IN LOUISIANA: Sen. Dole is boycotting Louisiana's bid to pick the first delegates of the Republican presidential campaign.

But fellow Republicans Patrick Buchanan, Sen. Phil Gramm and Alan Keyes were out in force there Saturday. They think of Louisiana as the first and crucial tile in a domino theory in which they surprise all by finishing the opening month of the primary season leading in the delegate count.

This is the Louisiana GOP's first stab at staging caucuses, and no one knows whether an appreciable number of voters will show up at the 42 caucus sites for the Feb. 6 primary.

Still, the state will choose 21 delegates that day - more than New Hampshire in its primary.

- Washington Post

GRAPHIC: BLACK AND WHITE PHOTO, Associated Press; Republican Sen. Bob Dole greets firefighters while campaigning in Concord, N.H., Saturday.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: January 30, 1996

VETO
Power
in —
Gen.

Clinton Veto Tally: Up to 11

President Clinton's rejection of the fiscal 1996 defense authorization bill on Dec. 28 brought to 11 the number of measures he has vetoed during his presidency. All came in 1995.

Clinton ranks far behind his most recent predecessor in the number of vetoes: George Bush issued 25 vetoes during his first three years in office, including several pocket vetoes that Congress was unable to contest. President Reagan vetoed 22 bills during his first three years in office.

Of Clinton's 11 vetoes, only one was overridden by Congress. That bill — a securities litigation measure — was the first veto to be overridden in three years, the last being George Bush's 1992 veto of a bill to regulate cable television.

Clinton also allowed two bills to become law without his signature: a bill to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and the fiscal 1996 defense

appropriations bill. President Bush twice allowed bills to become law without his signature: a bill limiting advertising during children's television shows in 1990, and a bill to prohibit desecration of the U.S. flag in 1989.

The Constitution gives the president 10 days (Sundays excepted) after receiving a bill to sign it into law or return it with his objections — at which point Congress can override by a two-thirds vote of each chamber. If the president does neither within 10 days, the bill "shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it . . . unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law." The latter case constitutes a pocket veto, a favorite tool of President Bush.

Grover Cleveland holds the record for issuing the most vetoes in one term — 414 — while Franklin D. Roosevelt, who served just over three terms, vetoed the most measures — 635. Clinton's vetoes:



Bill	Description	Date
HR 1158	FY 1995 Recissions/Supplemental	June 7
S 21	Lift Bosnia arms embargo	Aug. 11
HR 1854	FY 1996 Legislative branch appropriations	Oct. 3
HR 2586	Temporarily increase public debt limit	Nov. 13
HJ Res 115	FY 1996 Continuing appropriations	Nov. 13
HR 2491	FY 1996 Budget reconciliation	Dec. 6
HR 1977	FY 1996 Interior appropriations	Dec. 18
HR 2099	FY 1996 VA-HUD appropriations	Dec. 18
HR 2076	FY 1996 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations	Dec. 19
HR 1058	Shareholder lawsuits	Dec. 19
HR 1530	FY 1996 Defense authorization	Dec. 28

—Mark T. Kehoe

advocate of tighter restrictions on immigration, as is Republican Rep. Lamar Smith of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims.

Dole and others have called for crime legislation that would limit appeals made by death row inmates.

Other items with a high probability for action — or attempts at action — this year are:

• **Glass-Steagall repeal.** A bill to allow bank holding companies to engage in a wider range of activities has been hung up in a battle between banks and insurance companies. If the House acts, a similar battle is likely to break out in the Senate.

• **Term limits.** Dole has said he would call for a vote in April on a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment limiting the terms of members of Congress. A test vote in the Senate last year, however, showed little support for the issue.

• **Farm policy.** If congressional negotiators and the White House fail to resolve major agricultural policy issues as part of the budget-balancing bill, lawmakers probably would extend the authorization for existing subsidy programs for a year as they try to work out agreements affecting subsidies for powerful farm groups, including cotton, rice, grain and peanut growers.

• **Istook amendment.** Republican Rep. Ernest Jim Istook Jr. of Oklahoma says he will resurrect a controversial provision to deny federal grants to groups that use even a small

portion of their budgets to lobby the federal government.

• **Anti-terrorism.** House leaders are likely to take another run at stalled anti-terrorism legislation, which was written in response to the Oklahoma City bombing but ran into resistance by an unlikely coalition of conservative gun advocates and liberal civil liberties proponents. Both groups fear the bill would confer law enforcement with too many new powers.

• **State Department.** Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., will continue a quest to abolish three State Department agencies, the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the United States Information Agency. Though Helms failed in the Senate last year to abolish them, he has another chance in conference on the State Department reauthorization bill. The House-passed version of the legislation would eliminate the agencies.

• **Legal Services.** Critics of the legal aid organization will be back to try to stop funding for it. Although supporters last year fended off such attempts, conservatives won deep cuts in the fiscal 1996 appropriations bill that funds the departments of Commerce, Justice and State.

Other 1995 holdovers are still alive, but just barely. They include legislation to grant the president the line-item veto and to limit dramatically the ability of federal agencies to enforce health, safety and environmental regulations, which has been hobbled by a Democratic filibuster. A summary of major legislation acted upon in 1995 or awaiting action in 1996 begins on the following page:

THE PRESIDENCY

Clinton Holds His Veto Power Over Heads of Republicans

Blocking bills may be his only way to influence GOP legislation, but the strategy is risky

Heading into a summer of heavy legislative work, President Clinton has made the veto threat his weapon of choice for trying to influence the Republican Congress.

In recent weeks, Clinton and other administration officials have threatened vetoes against a slew of major bills, including a welfare overhaul measure, a spending cut and disaster aid package, a House rewrite of the clean water law, and a bill that would slash and reorganize foreign aid programs.

In almost every case, Clinton wants to reshape the GOP agenda. He wants welfare reform, but not if it hurts children or slights work incentives. He wants spending cuts, but not in certain education programs. He wants regulatory reform, but not if it loosens environmental controls.

"I don't want to have a pile of vetoes," Clinton said at a Montana town meeting June 1. "So here I am — all dressed up and ready to cooperate. . . . I want to cooperate [with Congress], but it takes two to tango."

A veto strategy presents risks and opportunities for any president.

Using his power to block legislation provides an unavoidable reminder of the president's relevance in the legislative process. It forces Congress to consider his views more carefully when drafting bills.

On the other side, the veto or even the threat of one can make the president appear obstructionist, allowing him to be blamed for legislative gridlock. It can also prove an ineffective check of legislative ambitions if Congress overrides the veto.

For veto threats to magnify Clinton's influence over the legislative process, the president will first have to prove that he is prepared to use the veto and to make it stick by commanding enough votes not to be over-



REUTERS

Clinton traveled to Montana on May 31 to press his case with voters.

ridden by Congress.

Clinton has yet to reject any legislation during his presidency — a statistic that reflects his first two years with a Democratic Congress, but also his fondness for ameliorating differences with his opponents, not sharpening them.

The latest threats are serious, White House officials insist, and they say Clinton will prove it soon by vetoing a spending cut and disaster aid bill (HR 1158) that, they assert, would cut too much out of education and social programs. The override threat is acute with this bill because it contains disaster relief funds for Oklahoma and California.

"The veto has always been real to us," said White House lobbyist Patrick Griffin. "The only difference now is it's becoming more evident that it will manifest itself in the process."

Clinton faces only a moderate risk that his vetoes will be reversed, since the Republican majorities in the House and Senate are slim and large numbers of Democrats did not cross

over to support the Republican legislation now facing veto threats.

Clinton does not want to be perceived as obstructing the GOP agenda, but rather as exerting a moderating influence.

The challenge will be making that case in the face of inevitable GOP claims that he is blocking the changes voters called for in last year's election.

The biggest difficulty for Clinton may be picking which bills to seek to block. He is under pressure from factions in the Democratic Party to blunt the Republican agenda, but Clinton will have to be selective, observers say.

"If he vetoes everything, he looks like he's trying to satisfy his core constituency. If he signs everything, he looks weak," said Yale University political scientist David R. Mayhew.

Another complication is that many Republicans blanch at the idea of watering down their agenda to get Clinton's signature.

More ideologically driven members favor confrontation with Clinton, rather than the accommodation preached by Democrats and a few GOP colleagues.

A case in point is the welfare bill. To the extent they have concerned themselves with Clinton, Republicans in the House and Senate have said that they cannot imagine Clinton vetoing a bill to overhaul the widely unpopular federal welfare system. Such a step would be disastrous politically, they say.

"If he wants to make the case against reforming welfare, we'll take it to the American people in November of 1996," said Ed Gillespie, spokesman for House Majority Leader Dick Armey, R-Texas.

The House passed its welfare bill (HR 4) on March 24, and, like the version Senate Finance approved May 26, it would end the federal guarantee of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the main cash welfare

By David S. Cloud

program, to all eligible applicants.

The administration has avoided public statements outlining exactly what would provoke a veto, an administration official said, because they do not want to give Republicans "a road map" for producing a welfare bill that Clinton would be forced to veto. Clinton promised to overhaul the welfare system during his campaign and, above all, he wants a bill he can sign. (*Weekly Report*, p. 1503)

Lines in the Sand

Most presidents facing a Congress controlled by the other party must rely heavily on the veto to affect legislation and to communicate their priorities. President Harry S Truman, the last Democratic president in office during a GOP Congress, issued 250 vetoes during his two terms — a record Clinton is unlikely to match. (*Box*, this page)

Yet Clinton will face a stream of legislation this summer designed intentionally to overturn his policies and to highlight the differences between the White House and Congress. This dynamic is playing out in an environment increasingly dominated by presidential politics as Clinton and the field of GOP contenders maneuver in preparation for the 1996 race.

Clinton's caution about delineating differences between his priorities and those of congressional Republicans frustrates some Democratic Party allies. Vetoes alone may not help Clinton's image or restore his influence on Capitol Hill, they argue, unless voters understand — and support — the president's motives for blocking the GOP agenda.

"You've got to be making the case consistently with some broad principles," said Will Marshall, president of the Progressive Policy Institute, a group of centrist Democrats. "One day there's a veto threat from the White House, and the next day they are saying something else. There's no strategy for drawing crucial lines with the Republicans."

Yet administration allies contend that the White House is smart to remain vague about what welfare provisions would be acceptable and instead to concentrate on issues where polls suggest the Republicans are vulnerable, such as environmental protection and education funding.

"It's important from the presi-

Veto Scorecard				
Presidents	Vetoes	Regular/Pocket	Overrides	
Harry S Truman	250	180	70	12
Dwight D. Eisenhower	181	73	108	2
John F. Kennedy	21	12	9	0
Lyndon B. Johnson	30	16	14	0
Richard M. Nixon	43	26	17	7
Gerald R. Ford	66	48	18	12
Jimmy Carter	31	13	18	2
Ronald Reagan	78	39	39	9
George Bush	46	31	15	1
Bill Clinton	0	0	0	0

MARILYN GATES-DAVIS

dent's point of view to show that he stands for something," says Democratic pollster Mark Mellman, who is advising Senate Democrats. "People want action on the domestic front, especially on welfare, but they don't want it at the expense of cutting education or rolling back environmental standards."

All or Nothing

House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., said in a June 2 speech that he expects a midsummer stare-down between Congress and the White House, with Clinton attempting to veto every major GOP initiative sent to him. Congressional Democrats have the numbers to block any effort to override a veto, although some members could stray on widely popular bills. Still, Gingrich has vowed to package vetoed bills into a must-pass omnibus measure, daring Clinton to veto it late this year.

"I don't believe we're going to have any choice but to wrap a lot of the year into [an omnibus bill]," said John A. Boehner of Ohio, chairman of the House GOP Conference, "because the president from a political standpoint is going to have to veto most of the Congress' initiatives."

White House officials say they would prefer to avoid an all-or-nothing showdown. "We certainly hope they don't pursue a train wreck strategy," said Griffin. "There's got to be a way this stuff can be resolved on a case-by-case basis."

Not all of the political heat will automatically fall on Clinton if congressional Republicans dig in their heels. Republicans could be blamed by voters for inaction if they fail to send Clinton bills he can sign.

Already there are signs in the Sen-

ate that both parties are trying to avoid veto showdowns. The administration has focused on winning concessions allowing it to support some GOP bills. In a veto threat May 30, Clinton denounced the House-passed rewrite of the clean water act, saying the measure would allow "companies to get around the standards that have been designed to protect us all."

Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman John H. Chafee, R-R.I., a longtime proponent of strong environmental protections, favors fine-tuning the existing law, not a sweeping rewrite like the House bill.

The more difficult dilemma for Clinton may be in handling the appropriations bills sent to him this year. For the first time in years, these 13 annual spending bills that fund most government programs and agencies will contain many deep cuts in areas Democrats have long protected. Some of the deepest cuts Republicans are proposing come from non-defense appropriations.

Democrats are already warning that dire consequences will accompany spending cuts the Republicans want to make in domestic appropriations. Publicly, the White House is saying it will wait for the specifics before passing judgment on cuts made by Congress.

Clinton has said he will be reluctant to accept cuts in programs he deems investments in future U.S. productivity. The House is slated to begin the appropriations process the week of June 5.

Gingrich is assuming Clinton has almost no choice but to accept deep cuts eventually unless he wants to shut down the government, although the voters may not appreciate brinkmanship by either side. Still, said Yale's Mayhew, "On appropriations bills, the Congress has got a lot of leverage. The president has got to finally sign something."

Knowing this, Clinton is wielding veto threats now, hoping that what he ends up signing will reflect his priorities more than those of Republicans. ■

CLARIFICATION

Legislative Service Organizations. *Weekly Report*, p. 1483, third column, fifth paragraph. The Environmental and Energy Study Conference's publications were privatized. ■

Copyright 1996 Chicago Tribune Company
Chicago Tribune

March 30, 1996 Saturday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1; ZONE: N; ELECTION '96.

LENGTH: 854 words

HEADLINE: VETO POWER MAY SHAPE ELECTION;
CLINTON FOCUSES ON BLOCKING GOP AGENDA

BYLINE: By William Neikirk, Washington Bureau.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

The presidential race could boil down to the veto.

President Clinton is basing much of his campaign not so much on what he would do if re-elected, but what he would block from a Republican-controlled Congress that he paints as extreme.

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.) is basing much of his campaign on how he would not stand in the way of a conservative GOP agenda that includes a balanced budget, smaller government and lighter regulation.

"We have two moderates running for president, but you would have two entirely different administrations depending on the outcome," said Stephen Skowronek, a political science professor at Yale University.

"I think Dole would be hard-pressed to veto the stuff coming out of the Republican Congress," he added. "Clinton would veto much of it. You would get a Republican 'Great Society' of legislation."

The two candidates may seem to be close on many issues, from balancing the budget to reforming welfare. The difference, though, is that a Dole administration would wind up with a much more conservative agenda because Congress tilts more sharply to the right than he does.

Dole signaled his intention to depict Clinton as an obstructionist in a speech Thursday to Republican members of Congress. He called the GOP the "reform party."

"The trouble with Clinton (is) he got mixed up," the senator said. "He signed the bad bills and vetoed the good bills. But that won't happen in my administration. I'll sign the good bills

and veto the bad bills, and there won't be any (bad bills)."

Though Dole is a moderate compared with House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and many GOP members elected in recent years, the president is poised to label him a tool of the far right when the campaign gets under way.

The public could get a preview of what might happen in a second Clinton presidency during the next few months, when the president is expected to exercise his veto frequently.

The Clinton-Dole fight over the legislative agenda has been called the "Pennsylvania Avenue campaign," with the White House at one end of the street and the U.S. Capitol at the other.

Democratic political consultant David Doak said the political resurgence of Clinton since the GOP gained control of Congress in 1994 has been based on his criticism of Republican proposals such as restraining growth in Medicare and Medicaid.

It not only has helped define him with voters, Doak said, but also has won him support among suburban middle-class voters who hold the key to the election this year.

Although Clinton has his own legislative agenda that he will push in the campaign, the fact that the GOP has a solid grip on both houses of Congress will make his proposals less important than his promises to veto Republican proposals.

The danger for Clinton is that his campaign will have more of a negative tone than his successful race in 1992. Doak said, however, that "in our society, stopping the excesses have become more important. Most people have turned against Washington."

By contrast, Dole said in his speech that "we need to focus on all the positive things that we do as a party. Who can argue about giving tax cuts for families with children? Who can argue about welfare reform or balancing the budget, which would lower interest rates about 2 percentage points?"

The election is likely to turn on the question of whether Americans want to continue the kind of divided government they've elected for much of the post-World War II period or are willing to let one party take charge.

The jury is still out on that question, although recent polls putting Clinton ahead of Dole indicate that divided-government sentiment remains strong.

The GOP during the next few months is expected to try to demonstrate what continuing divided government would look like in a Clinton second term. It is expected to send the president many bills he will be inclined to veto.

One such measure is a bill that would ban late-term abortions unless the life of the mother is endangered. Clinton plans to veto the bill in the next several days, arguing that it should

permit such abortions to protect the health as well as the life of the mother.

Another bill the president has threatened to strike down would put limits on product liability claims. Congress approved it Friday. He also opposes provisions in a health-care overhaul bill and is still in conflict with conservatives in Congress over welfare reform and the budget.

The White House is urging Dole to spurn conservatives in his party and push legislation that Clinton can sign. Press Secretary Michael McCurry noted that Gingrich had declared Dole "undisputed legislative champ on Capitol Hill. That's good news for us, because it means we can get some work done."

But making Clinton look good is not seen as in the Republicans' self-interest in an election year.

Who wins the war of the vetoes will depend on who wins the rhetorical battle with the American people.

The president won the first round during the fight over the budget, but the next round will not be as easy.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 30, 1996

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	THIS CR ISSUE	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	[Part] Contents	CR Issues by Date

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-155) (House of Representatives - January 03, 1996)

Congressman Robert K. Dornan Rebukes Clinton for Veto of Defense Bill

'It's absolutely absurd for Bill Clinton to send our troops into civil war in Bosnia and then veto a defense authorization bill which provides them and their families so much support,' commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan of California who, as the chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel, was one of the prime authors of the FY 1996 defense bill which the president rejected yesterday.

'General Omar Bradley once said that 'Fairness, diligence, sound preparation, professional skill and loyalty are the marks of American military leadership.' Where's your fairness; where's your loyalty, Mr. President?'

Dornan firmly believes this defense bill contains exactly what the troops and their families scheduled for deployment to Bosnia need. Among the provisions in the bill Dornan helped develop and pass include a modest 2.4 percent military pay raise, a 5.2 percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters/housing, and new guidelines for accountability of American POWs and MIAs. Dornan, who introduced the first and only free standing legislation to restore the pay raise two years ago, had harsh words for the President. 'After twice canceling a modest pay raise for our military, a raise that was twice restored by the U.S. Congress, Clinton now is attempting to gain credit for this raise by separating it from the rest of the defense bill. The troops already were expecting this raise! Other real benefits, such as the additional housing funding and POW/MIA legislation, are being held hostage to cheap liberal politics!'

In his veto statement, Clinton described his objections to three major provisions of the bill. All three provisions were major initiatives by Congressman Dornan. 'Clinton objects to immediately deploying an effective ballistic missile defense, despite the fact that we Republicans have identified a near term/low cost system known as 'upper tier' which would modify existing Navy ships and missiles for wide area missile defense. Clinton objects to my limitations on placing U.S. troops under foreign and U.N. command, even though this is precisely the reason why he cost 19 Americans their lives in Somalia. Finally, Clinton objects to restrictions on U.S. defense funding going to Russia, including my provision to restrict some aid pending an end to Russian work on offensive biological weapons. It's obvious 'Peacenik Clinton' is more interested in supporting Third World dictators with missiles, the United Nations, and communists in Russia than supporting the United States military and the United States taxpayer!'

THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Republicans Restore Defense Spending After Clinton Cuts Combat Readiness

President Bill Clinton has more than doubled the defense cuts promised by Candidate Clinton—\$120 billion!

Clinton's defense plan—the 'Bottom Up Review'—should be called the 'Bottom Out Plan'—it's underfunded by as much as \$150 billion!

Republicans, under the leadership of Floyd Spence, have restored just \$7 billion to defense, including programs I personally helped initiate such as: additional funding for Army 'scout' helicopters—both the OH-58D 'Kiowa Warrior' and RAH-66 'Comanche', additional funding to build 'more' than 20 B-2 bombers and equip the B-1B with precision guided munitions, and additional funding for a near term ballistic missile defense capability using existing Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers.

My Subcommittee on Personnel, thanks to the efforts of my ranking Democrat Owen Pickett and the hard work of all my subcommittee members, improved military quality of life by: increasing military housing allowance by 35 percent, setting permanent personnel levels to stop the 'drawdown,' and increasing the number of national guard technicians.

I also included several initiatives that reverse the trend of liberal social programs within the department designed to conduct combat operations.

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	[Part] Contents	CR Issues by Date



Inside Politics

Dole Attacks President on International Issues

Aired May 9, 1996 4:04 pm

JUDY WOODRUFF, Anchor: Bob Dole's presidential campaign may still be trying to get some traction. But as Candy Crowley reports, Dole has scored a hit on one of his favorite issues. Bill Clinton's judges.

CANDY CROWLEY, Capitol Hill Correspondent: Bullseye, score a direct hit for Bob Dole and his campaign against Bill Clinton's judicial nominations. The name of Florida attorney Charles Stack [sp], picked by the president to serve as an appellate judge, has been withdrawn.

Sen. ROBERT DOLE (R-KS), Presidential Candidate: It never should have been sent up. His only qualification was he raised a lot of money for Bill Clinton - \$10 million for the Democratic Party, so much for the Clinton campaign. And that's not the way we ought to dispense judgeships in America.

CANDY CROWLEY: The White House says it was Stack who made the decision to withdraw, and continues to insist that Stack was qualified seeing him as a victim of partisan politics. Stack's removal from consideration comes less than three weeks after Dole zeroed in on judicial selections as a way to portray the president as a liberal whose appointments are undermining the fight against crime. Dole may also have boosted his fortunes with the newly proposed, newly moderated Republican budget. Even as the White House backed off the Stack nomination, it took a tentative step toward the GOP budget plan.

Pres. BILL CLINTON: There are a lot of things I don't agree with, but it is a movement in the right direction. And this is the point that I'm trying to make now, that what we ought to do is to resume our negotiations and reach an agreement.

CANDY CROWLEY: Combine that news with the administration's conditional acceptance of Dole's bid to repeal the president's 1993 gas tax hike and it hasn't been a bad couple of days for the struggling Republican candidate. Thursday, Dole looked for additional traction in the international arena.

Sen. ROBERT DOLE: And I believe that President Clinton's foreign policy, track record of weakness, and indecision and double talk and incoherence has diminished American credibility, and undermined American interests.

CANDY CROWLEY: And he was just getting started. In the first major, international speech of his candidacy, Dole dissected U.S. policy in Asia, and took apart Bill Clinton. He accused the president of coddling in North Korea, ambiguity in Taiwan, and amateur posturing in Japan. Also, endangering China's special trade status by lack of leadership inside the beltway.

Sen. ROBERT DOLE: Idly allowing MFN to be rejected in Congress would be an abdication of presidential leadership. And I would hope that President Clinton would have already taken a great leap forward on this issue by now. And I hope he will end his conspicuous silence on the issue and explain what is at stake in our relationship with China to the Congress and, yes, to the American people.

CANDY CROWLEY: Though Dole has supported Most Favored Nation trading status for China in the past, this time around Dole delayed being definitive until now. During the primary season, Dole was pressed very hard by Pat Buchanan, who wants to deny MFN status to China on the basis of trade and human rights issues.

CROWLEY: Candy Crowley, CNN, Capitol Hill.



Inside Politics

Dole Attacks Housing in Contrasting Himself to Clinton

Aired April 29, 1996 4:03 pm

GENE RANDALL, Anchor: Although Bob Dole's strategy in his battle to trade up his address on Pennsylvania Avenue is viewed by some as uncertain, one part of it seems solid. The Senate majority leader is stressing his differences with President Clinton. Bruce Morton has the latest on that Dole effort.

BRUCE MORTON, Correspondent: Bob Dole in another of a series of speeches designed to contrast his views with President Clinton's today called for the abolition of public housing, which should be replaced, he said, by vouchers so poor people could choose where to live.

Sen. ROBERT DOLE (R-as), Presidential Candidate: Public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism in the world. Imagine, the United States government owns the housing where an entire class of citizens permanently live. We are the landlords of misery. Let me be clear. I believe the government has an obligation to maintain a safety net, but these programs have failed in that mission. They have not alleviated poverty. They have not- In fact, they've deepened it, rather than alleviated it. Housing vouchers, in my view, would enable poor Americans to choose where they'd like to live, just like we do.

BRUCE MORTON: In response, Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros issued a statement saying the administration wanted vouchers, too. 'I don't know where Senator Dole was,' he said, 'while members of his own party gutted the administration's voucher proposal and were undermining what he called for today.'

BRUCE MORTON: The rest of Dole's day reflected his double job these days - Senate leader and presidential candidate. He met with Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres - something a candidate or a Senate leader might do - and, on the Senate floor, attacked the administration over the trade deficit with Japan and crime. But it's in these issue speeches that Dole seems to want to highlight his differences with the president. Today's on housing was the second; the first step was crime and permissive judges. More are on the way.

Bruce Morton, CNN, Washington.

Copyright 1996 The Denver Post Corporation
The Denver Post

May 3, 1996 Friday 2D EDITION

SECTION: DENVER & THE WEST; Pg. B-11

LENGTH: 738 words

HEADLINE: I'll see your veto and raise you a tax repeal

BYLINE: Walter Mears

BODY:

But for the certainty that President Clinton was going to veto the bill, Republicans wouldn't have staged their sendoff show for a legal overhaul measure. They did it to get the first word on the issue.

That's typical of the rival efforts at one-upmanship by Clinton and Sen. Bob Dole, the GOP challenger to his bid for a second term. Each side is trying to rebut the other in advance, on issues like that one, judicial appointments and the high price of gasoline.

Dole got in first on gas prices, challenging Clinton to join in seeking to repeal a 1993 tax increase as a way to offset rising costs.

But in an earlier round - the day before Dole delivered what his campaign billed as a major address assailing Clinton's judicial appointments for "liberal leniency" toward criminals - Vice President Al Gore went before the same Washington convention with an advance rebuttal written into his remarks.

And the White House followed that with a simultaneous written comeback to Dole, pointing out that he had voted for all but three of the 185 judges the president has appointed and the Senate has confirmed, and reciting Clinton's record and recommendations for strengthened law enforcement.

In a presidential campaign now being waged largely as an in-town contest, Republican Capitol vs. Democratic White House, each side is out to preempt the other.

That was on display when Dole and House Speaker Newt Gingrich presided at a speechmaking and signing ceremony Tuesday on the product liability bill that was bound for a certain presidential veto. That normally happens when a bill becomes law, not when the leaders of Congress attest that it has been passed and is being sent to the White House.

This time, though, the Republicans were dramatizing an issue they see as a difficult one for Clinton. There has been acid criticism from Democrats who favor the measure. Clinton's

political people know that the case for the veto won't be as easily made as the Republican accusation that it is a payback to trial lawyers and their lobbyists who have been major donors to his campaigns.

Dole said a veto would show that Clinton sides "with the smooth-talking, get-rich-quick trial lawyers who have turned the pursuit of justice into a big dollar game of search and destroy."

The bill would limit punitive damages in product liability lawsuits to \$ 250,000 or twice the amount of actual damages, raise the evidence standard required for punitive damage claims, and tighten other rules on lawsuits. Clinton contends the bill would not adequately protect consumers against damage and harm from faulty products. He also has said he would sign a bill with relatively modest revisions, something that could be done in a new version after the veto.

"It's no question that he will veto it," said spokesman Mike McCurry.

Nor is there any question that Republicans will stay on his case about it; they don't have the votes to override a veto, but they do have the argument that Clinton is caving in to the unpopular lot Dole described as "his trial lawyer friends in their Gucci loafers."

On gasoline prices, Dole got the opening lines by urging repeal of the 4.3 cent-a-gallon tax that was part of Clinton's 1993 economic program passed, as he noted, over unanimous Republican opposition.

The White House had a ready response, pointing to two 5-cent increases passed under Dole's leadership when Republicans held the White House. "The Dole dime," they called it.

When Dole went to Indianapolis to campaign the day after he'd called for the gas tax reduction, Clinton aide George Stephanopoulos got there ahead of him to hold a news conference challenging his record on gas taxes. Clinton ordered oil sales from the strategic reserve, authority he got in the compromise budget as a revenue-raising step and is using, to Republican annoyance, as part of his answer to higher prices at the gas pump. There are two administration investigations of the price rises. For all the maneuvering on both sides, oil analysts see the increase as temporary and due to assorted market pressures that all hit at once.

"This issue is not a market force question," Sen. Tom Daschle, the Democratic leader, said Wednesday. "This issue is presidential politics. That's what it's all about."

Walter R. Mears, vice president and columnist for The Associated Press, has reported on Washington and national politics for more than 30 years.

TYPE: COLUMN

LOAD-DATE: May 03, 1996

RNC TALKING POINTS

Budget issues

President Clinton: "Spender-in-Chief"

March 14, 1996

"A billion here and a billion there and pretty soon you're talking big money."

--former Sen. Everett Dirksen (R-Ill.)

Whenever Republicans have tried to bring Washington spending under control and balance the federal budget, Bill Clinton has sidestepped, stalled, stonewalled and vetoed his way out of it.

- **Bill Clinton worked to defeat the Penny-Kasich deficit reduction bill**, which would have cut just one cent on every dollar of federal spending.
- **Bill Clinton brought about the defeat of the Balanced Budget Amendment**, which passed in the House (1/26/95) but was defeated in the Senate (3/2/95) by just one vote when Clinton pressured six Democrat Senators, who previously voted for it, to switch their votes.
- **Bill Clinton vetoed the Republican Rescissions Bill** in May 1995, which would have cut 1995 spending by \$16.4 billion--only 1 percent of the entire federal budget for that year.
- **Bill Clinton vetoed numerous appropriations measures, causing the federal government to shut down not once, but twice.** Two days after the second shut down began in December 1995, Bill Clinton single-handedly vetoed legislation that would have re-opened the government and federal parks and funded six departments for the rest of FY 1996. Clinton is the only president to veto a string of spending bills because they did not spend enough of the taxpayers' money. Bill Clinton always wants to spend more.
- **Bill Clinton vetoed the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995**, which would have balanced the federal budget for the first time in 26 years.

Now, Bill Clinton is at it again, threatening to veto a funding measure and shut down government if he is not given \$8 billion more to spend in just six months time. That's right--Bill Clinton will hold the government hostage if he is not given more than \$1 billion a month to spend on his liberal agenda and pet programs.

Clinton is demanding billions more of the taxpayers' money for wasteful pork-barrel spending:

- **\$470 million for Clinton's pet Americorps program**, which uses taxpayer money to pay "volunteers" nearly \$27,000 every year. Even more ridiculous, the General Accounting Office recently exposed an Americorps program in Baltimore that had a cost per "volunteer" of \$50,000. In 1994, Americorps paid a public relations firm \$1.7 million to publicize the creation of the program.
- **\$266 million more for the Safe and Drug Free Schools program**, which has paid for \$175,000 "retreats" to posh waterfront resorts, disk jockeys at dances and lumber for the construction of steps for aerobics classes. Meanwhile, under Clinton, marijuana use among teenagers has jumped 50 percent (*National Household Survey of Drug Abuse*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 9/95).
- **\$8 million more for the Global Learning and Observation to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) program**, which pays for children in foreign countries to collect rainwater--a noble goal, perhaps, but not when our growing national debt will cost children in this country \$187,000 in taxes throughout their working lives.
- **\$2 million for the Ounce of Prevention Council**, which was created in 1994 to coordinate

crime fighting efforts but has yet to administer a single grant. The council produces a glossy magazine at a cost of \$1.5 million to the taxpayer and employs the wife of Clinton's chief of staff Leon Panetta, for \$300 per day--earning the council a reputation as the "Clinton Staff Family F Employment Program."

- **\$10 million more in spending for the National Endowment for the Arts** to sponsor controversial and sacrilegious art projects such as Andres Serrano's "Piss Christ" and Robert Maplethorpe's infamous exhibits.
- **Allowing 481 more programs to qualify for the Direct Lending Program**, meaning taxpayers will be supporting schools such as the Ph.D. Hair Academy, the California Medical School of Shiatsu, the Desert Institute for the Healing Arts and three schools of massage therapy.

(Source: House Appropriations Committee)

Bill Clinton told us that "the era of big government is over" (State of the Union address, 1/23/96). But we see time and time again, **what Bill Clinton says and what Bill Clinton does have nothing in common.** As his latest demands indicate, **Bill Clinton is not interested in reducing government spending or balancing the federal budget--he only wants to spend more of the taxpayers' hard-earned money on his liberal agenda and pet programs.**

Republicans have kept their promise to the American people and turned back 40 years of wasteful government spending by passing a balanced budget. Bill Clinton vetoed it. That is why we need to increase the Republican majorities in Congress and elect a Republican president who will sign a balanced budget into law. Because as long as Bill Clinton remains the "Spender-in-Chief," America will never have a balanced budget.

TAB	BILL	DATE VETOED
1	H.R. 1158 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Recissions Act	06-07-95
2	S. 21 Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995	08-11-95
3	H.R. 1854 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, FY 1996	10-03-95
4	H.R. 2586 Temporary Increase in Statutory Limit on the Public Debt <i>CSO #3, Death Penalty Appeal,</i>	11-13-95
5	H.J. 115 Second Continuing Resolution, FY 1996	12-18-95
6	H.R. 2491 Balanced Budget Act of 1995	12-06-95
7	H.R. 1977 Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, FY 1996	12-18-95
8	H.R. 2099 Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Act, 1996	12-18-95
9	H.R. 2076 Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, FY 1996	12-19-95
10	H.R. 1058 Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 <i>trial lawyers</i>	12-19-95
11	H.R. 1530 National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1996	12-28-95
12	H.R. 4 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995	01-09-96
13	H.R. 1833 Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995 <i>"health" exception</i>	04-10-96
14	H.R. 1561 Foreign Relations Reform Bill <i>Taiwan, UN peace keepers</i>	04-11-96
15	H.R. 956 Product Liability	05-02-96

Vetoed -- Potential attack notes

S. 21

2

- The President is a weak leader. His policy in Bosnia was a study in vacillation, which involved occasional tough talk, but no tough action to back it up.
- A pinprick bombing attack here or there -- prompted by occasional CNN footage of brutal Serb attacks -- only served to undermine respect for U.S. strength and leadership.
- UNPROFOR was a demonstrated failure, and rather than taking firm action to lift the unfair arms embargo and let the Bosnians fight for themselves the President allowed himself to be hamstrung by a bunch of pusillanimous U.N. bureaucrats.
- The chief culprit was the arms embargo, which left the Bosnian Serbs fully armed, via Serbia, while the Bosnian Muslims had only small arms fire.
- Rather than letting arms be provided forthrightly to the Bosnians, we now know that the President sanctioned a secret, back channel flow of arms from Iran, awarding Iranian radicals a foothold in Europe.

H.R. 2586 (Debt limit)

Despite giving lip service to stopping this country's constant build-up of federal debt, the President pulled out his veto pen every time a serious effort was made to put controls on this nation's spending. The real reason he vetoed this bill is because it required him to accept a genuine 7-year balanced budget -- based on the no-nonsense assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office, rather than on rosy Administration scenarios. All through 1995 -- starting with the original budget he offered, with its \$200 million deficits, the President had to be pulled kicking and screaming toward real budget cuts.

The President also refused to endorse tough new provisions to end the outrageous delays in death penalty appeals that allow murderers to postpone their punishment for years and years.

H.R. 2491

Habemus corpus

- Congressional Republicans, keeping the promise of their Contract with America, passed historic legislation to balance the budget by the year 2002. It took on runaway entitlement spending, cut taxes for working families and to spur economic growth, and cut the government down to size. It was balanced, it was fair, and it was real. But the President -- showing his true colors -- vetoed it.

- Bill Clinton is and always will be a tax and spend Democrat in love with big Government. He has never shown more than lip service toward balancing the budget. He began the year introducing a budget with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye could see and ended it by vetoing an historic bill that would have shrunk government, strengthened our economy and given more hard earned income back to our citizens.

H.R. 2099

- When it comes to regulation, Bill Clinton, once again, is more talk than action. Given a chance to rein in the EPA bureaucracy, he said no.
- The President even refused to go along with a responsible cuts in government spending on bloated, inefficient public housing.

H.R. 2076

- Once again, when it comes to balancing the budget and cutting big government, Bill Clinton talks the talk but doesn't walk the walk. Time after time when Congress presented Bill Clinton with a bill that really cut spending, he vetoed it.
- The Commerce/Justice/State appropriations bill was a moderate bill that actually increased spending by \$900 million compared to the 1995 fiscal year. It "cut" spending only when compared to Bill Clinton's exorbitant spending request. But he still vetoed the bill.

H.R. 1058

- The President's veto of this common-sense legal reform bill demonstrates that he is in the pocket of trial lawyers -- in this case, the special branch of trial lawyers who make big money by filing frivolous class-action cases, especially against high-tech companies, and then demand a settlement.
- This was a reasonable, measured bill supported by businesses all around the country -- and especially the high-tech companies most vulnerable to this kind of legal blackmail. The President sacrificed good public policy to a special interest that fills his campaign coffers year after year.

H.R. 1833

- [President Clinton's insistence on a "health" exception shows that he has no interest in curbing the use of partial birth abortion, since that exception is a huge loophole that can be manipulated by any woman and her doctor who want to use the procedure.]

Pl-4

H.R. 1561

- This bill would have bolstered our relationship with democratic Taiwan rather than kowtowing to China. But President Clinton refused.
 - This bill tried to put reasonable limits on the use of U.S. forces for U.N. peacekeeping operations. President Clinton vetoed it.
-

→ B. Budget
Dec 6, 7, 8

→ Private Securities

More quotes:

S 21

Dole on foreign policy during the Clinton Administration: "...short, sad interlude of American waffling and weakness in world affairs. ...From the halls of Port-au-Prince to the shores of Somalia, to Bosnia, where **President Clinton allowed Iran, of all nations, to conduct American foreign policy**, Mr. Clinton's conduct of foreign policy has telegraphed indecision and weakness to the world." ["Dole Steps up Attack on Clinton; U.S. on 'Dangerous Road of Weakness,' GOP Leader Says" by Blaine Harden, Washington Post, May 4, 1996, p. A1]

"And I believe that President Clinton's foreign policy, track record of weakness, and indecision and double talk and incoherence has diminished American credibility, and undermined American interests." [CNN Transcript, "Dole Attacks President on International Issues." Inside Politics, Aired May 9, 1996, 4:04 pm]

HR 2586

QUOTES REGARDING HABEAS CORPUS REFORMS

"Three times (Clinton) has had the opportunity and vetoed the needed [habeas corpus] reforms..." [Gov. Pete Wilson, criticizing the President on habeas corpus reform at a campaign event for Bob Dole, *Sacramento Bee*, March 24, 1996, p. A1]

"Dole suggested Clinton was the 'obstacle to enacting legislation that would limit the appeals of death row inmates.'" ["Summary - Weekend Events: Dole Targets Clinton on Four key issues." The Hotline, March 25, 1996]

HR 2099

Nothing specifically was found. you had asked for something regarding "bloated, inefficient public housing" This quote seems good, but was not in direct reference to the veto of HR 2099.

"Public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism in the world. Imagine, the United States government owns the housing where an entire class of citizens permanently live. We are the landlords of misery. Let me be clear. I believe the government has an obligation to maintain a safety net, but these programs have failed in that mission. They have not alleviated poverty. They have not - In fact they've deepened it, rather than alleviated it." [Senator Dole, CNN Transcript, "Dole Attacks Housing in Contrasting himself to Clinton", Inside Politics, Aired April 29, 1996, 4:03 pm]

HR 1530

"The fact is we can't destroy even a single missile. That's not because America is lacking the technical know-how....It's because America is lacking the presidential leadership to get it done." [Dole on Clinton veto of Defense Authorization Bill, "Dole hammers Clinton on Missile System Veto in Indiana Speech," By Karl Vick, *The Washington Post*, p. A14]

"Clinton objects to immediately deploying an effective ballistic missile defense... Clinton objects to my limitations on placing U.S. troops under foreign and U.N. command, even though this is precisely the reason why he cost 19 Americans their lives in somalia. ...It's obvious 'Peacenik Clinton' is more interested in supporting Third World dictators with missiles, the United Nations, and communists in Russia than supporting the United States military and the United States taxpayer!" [Bob Dornan on Clinton Veto of Defense Bill, House of Representatives January 3, 1996, H.Doc. No. 104-155]

HR 1833

He's trying to satisfy both sides, as he always does, and as a result he's not going to satisfy anyone. But he made a mistake. He's out on the extreme fringe. There are a lot of pro-choice, bipartisan support for this bill, and I think he made a big mistake." [Dole on veto of 'Partial Birth Abortion Ban', CNN Transcript, "Dole Attempts to Contrast himself to President," Inside Politics, Aired April 11, 1996, 4:04 pm]

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 8, 1996

96 MAY 8 P 5:30

Todo: FYI:
These are the
only copies of
these articles:

MEMORANDUM TO TODD STERN

FROM: ANDREW TANNENBAUM
CC: ANN WALKER
RE: Requested Articles

Attached are the articles you requested concerning the President's vetoes. We found several articles dating back to March 1995 that compare the number of bills vetoed by President Clinton with the number of bills vetoed by past Presidents. Each article demonstrates that recent Presidents have used the veto considerably more than President Clinton. There is a chart in the June 8, 1995 *Washington Times* article that outlines the number of bills vetoed by each President since FDR and how many of those bills were overridden. All relevant information is highlighted.

Also included are articles from *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* the day after each veto and articles concerning the signing of H.R. 1944. Most of the articles are lead stories about the particular veto, but in a few cases, as with the budget debates last December, the vetoes are included as part of a bigger story. No article comes up in *The Washington Post* on April 13, 1996 concerning the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, but the story is carried by *The New York Times*.

Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Budget ger.

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	THIS CR ISSUE	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	Senate Contents	CR Issues by Date

Congressional Record entry 22 of 104

BALANCING THE BUDGET (Senate - October 19, 1995)

[Page: S15322]

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, before we recess, I would like to take a moment to discuss President Clinton's appearance before reporters at the White House this morning.

Republicans have been willing to work with the President in our efforts to finally balance the budget. Regrettably, the President's veto threat today makes us wonder whether he is serious about working with the congressional majority to fulfill the mandate the American people gave us. If anyone needs to think again, in my view it is President Clinton. Rather than continuing his cynical reelection campaign designed to scare the American people, particularly senior citizens, he should show some leadership and work with us to balance the budget, cut taxes for American families, protect Medicare from bankruptcy, and overhaul welfare.

If any plan puts America's elderly at risk, it is the President's plan, which fails to offer any long-term reforms, any choices for seniors, and any real solutions, just sort of a Band-Aid to get us beyond the next election in 1996.

I think it is interesting that the President confessed this week he raised taxes too much in 1993. I think a \$265 billion tax increase is a bit too much. It affected senior citizens, people who drive automobiles, subchapter S corporations, a lot of Americans who did not consider themselves rich until the President announced that only the rich pay taxes. But he has learned since 1993 that other people pay these increased taxes, too, who are not rich, when he increased taxes on Social Security, when he increased taxes on gasoline, when he increased taxes on subchapter S corporations, and a number of other people who were not rich.

So I think now that he has confessed he made a mistake on raising taxes, he ought to confess he has made a mistake on not wanting to adopt a balanced budget. He fought us in an effort to pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. He convinced six Democrats who voted for a balanced budget last year to vote no this year. We lost by one vote. We had 66. We needed 67.

So it seems to me the President is now saying, well, I raised taxes too much but it was not my fault; Republicans are responsible. Not a single Republican in the House or the Senate voted for the tax increase. I do not understand how he can blame us for that. It was the biggest tax increase in American history. In fact, I think the Senator from New York [Mr. Moynihan] said, no, it was the biggest tax increase in world history, and it probably was.

So I would ask the President today, now that he is feeling in a mood to say he has made mistakes--and we all make mistakes from time to time--we would be happy to have him join us in this budget debate

in balancing the budget by the year 2002 and protecting, preserving, strengthening Medicare and overhauling welfare and providing tax cuts for families with children, the very thing that the President proposed, I might add.

About 70 percent of our total tax credit goes to families. They are not rich. On the Senate side we have capped what your total income could be if you are going to be eligible for the tax credit for your children.

So, Mr. President, we agree you raised taxes too much. We agree it hurt the economy. We agree it probably cost a lot of jobs in America. We agree it cost a lot of dislocation, a lot of pain, a lot of suffering. But now that you have confessed to making that mistake, let us not make another mistake. Let us work together. Let us try to balance the budget, Mr. President. Let us

try to save Medicare, Mr. President, and try to have a good tax cut for families with children and stimulate the economy with the capital gains rate reduction, and then reform welfare, which the President indicates he supports.

We are prepared. I know the Speaker is prepared. I hope that we might have some cooperation.

I yield the floor. And I think it is 12 o'clock.

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
	Doc Contents	Senate Contents	CR Issues by Date

H.R. 1944 -- Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Recissions

The Bill. This bill proposed to provide supplemental funding of \$7.1 billion for FEMA disaster relief, for the Federal response to the Oklahoma City bombing, for increased anti-terrorism efforts, and to provide debt relief to Jordan in order to pursue a Middle East peace settlement. It also rescinds \$16 billion in FY 1995. *This bill was approved after President Clinton had vetoed an earlier version, H.R. 1158.*

Date signed. July 27, 1995

Summary. The veto of H.R. 1158 allowed Republicans to attack President Clinton on the following front: "The President was ... prepared to pass up needed supplemental funding for disaster relief; for federal assistance to Oklahoma City in the wake of the bombing; and to beef up our anti-terrorism efforts." All of these factors are accounted for in H.R. 1944.

The President stood his ground. The original bill would have cut spending in the wrong way, by targeting education and training, environmental protection, and other key national priorities. The new bill "restored \$733 million in spending on education and training (*The Washington Post*, July 28, 1994, A16)" and restored funding to program which invest in people:

- National Service -- H.R. 1158 rescinded \$210 million; H.R. 1944 rescinds \$105 million
- Safe and Drug-Free Schools -- H.R. 1158 rescinds \$236 million; H.R. 1944 rescinds \$16 million
- Goals 2000 -- H.R. 1158 rescinds \$92 million; H.R. 1944 rescinds \$32 million
- Safe Drinking Water grants -- H.R. 1158 rescinds \$1.3 billion; H.R. 1944 rescinds \$1.1 billion

Other rescissions that were either dropped or reduced include Adult Job Training, School-to-Work, Drug courts, Community schools, TRIO, the Child Care Block Grant, Housing for People with AIDS, and Community Development Financial Institutions.

FYI

—

John

H.R. 1158 -- Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions

The Bill. This bill proposed to provide supplemental funding of \$7.3 billion for FEMA disaster relief, for the Federal response to the Oklahoma City bombing, for an increase in our anti-terrorism efforts, and for provide debt relief to Jordan. It also rescinded \$16 billion of funds appropriated for fiscal year 1995, across a wide range of programs, including many of the President's top priorities.

Date vetoed. June 7, 1995.

Potential attack. The President is just another tax and spend Democrat. At a time when the Republican Congress was trying to take bold steps to start getting our deficit under control -- after the President had proposed a budget with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see -- the President was unwilling to let his pet spending projects be trimmed. [The President was even prepared to pass up needed supplemental funding for disaster relief; for federal assistance to Oklahoma City in the wake of the bombing; and to beef up our anti-terrorism efforts.]

{Question -- see rescission bill that did get done and whether this stuff was picked up in it.}

July 23

Response. The President vetoed this bill because it was a partisan attack on key investments in education, national service, the environment, and community development. In this bill, Congress chose to fund old-fashioned pork like highway demonstration projects, courthouses and federal buildings rather than investments in our people. The bill would have cut:

- National Service -- by \$210 million, depriving 15,000 young people of the opportunity to serve in AmeriCorps;
- Goals 2000 -- by \$92 million, depriving 2,000 schools in 47 states of funds to help boost academic standards;
- Safe and Drug Free Schools -- by \$236 million, slashing anti-violence and drug prevention programs serving nearly 20 million students in 90% of our schools;
- School-to-Work -- by \$25 million, cutting state and local grants to help prepare young people to compete in the global economy;
- One-Stop Career Shopping -- by \$20 million, cutting funds to help workers find new jobs;
- WIC -- by \$20 million, preventing the distribution of 480,000 food packages to nutritionally at-risk women, infants and children;

- Safe drinking water -- by \$1.3 billion, hampering ability of States to comply with regulations and threatening the health of residents;
- Adult Job Training -- by \$98 million, eliminating over 28,000 job training opportunities for adults in need;
- Community Development Financial Institutions -- by \$124 million, eliminating funding for CDFIs and the hope of economic development they could bring to needy communities;
- Assisted Housing -- by \$5 billion, including a \$30 million cut for housing opportunities for People With Aids.

[Timber salvage -- probably not use given where we ended up.]

23RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

July 28, 1995, Friday, Final Edition

Articles
concerning
H. R. 1944

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A16

LENGTH: 886 words

HEADLINE: President Approves Rescissions Measure; Process May Offer Glimpse of Future Showdowns

BYLINE: Ann Devroy, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

President Clinton yesterday signed into law the first and smallest piece of the promised Republican fiscal revolution, a revised \$ 16.4 billion package of spending cuts that had drawn Clinton's first presidential veto but ends up allowing the GOP to continue its course nearly unimpeded.

Some administration officials suggest Clinton's decision to accept the revised bill, which offers only minor concessions to his views, could offer a glimpse of the future as the White House enters a series of showdowns with the Republican Congress over the budget. Clinton will stake out his position as protector of "good programs" such as education, training and Medicare from "extreme" GOP assaults and try to reap political benefit from that, they say. But in the end, the president may have little leverage to do more than slow down and temper the Republican direction.

"We are dealing with a work product that is written from their perspective, not ours," said White House press secretary Michael McCurry. He said Clinton cannot change the Republican direction -- and in some cases, agrees with it -- but he can sand off the rough edges and preserve and protect some pieces of his agenda.

Clinton cast the veto seven weeks ago in a politically charged Rose Garden ceremony awash in complaints of Republican pork-barrel spending and GOP tax breaks for expatriate billionaires. After the storm of rhetoric, the pork and tax breaks are unchanged. Negotiations restored \$ 733 million in spending on education and training, but still left those presidential priority areas with less than the president wanted.

The new package of spending cuts is a piece of the foundation on which the GOP has pledged to construct a balanced budget in seven years. But it will be a protracted and bitter political battle between Republicans and Democrats over the government's spending priorities; Clinton or his senior aides already have threatened vetoes on six of the 13 bills that fund the government. He and his aides have warned repeatedly of a fiscal "train wreck," and that the federal government might be shut down because of the impasse.

Clinton has been alternately confrontational and conciliatory about Republican plans. "The budget-cutting in this bill is exactly the kind of thing

we should be doing," he said yesterday. "This is how we should work together. We agree we should balance the budget. We disagree on how. But this shows that we can work through those disagreements."

The bill also includes \$ 7.2 billion in new spending for California and other disaster-stricken states, anti-terrorism efforts and aid to Jordan, limiting its net deficit reduction to about \$ 9 billion.

The measure is the first spending bill generated entirely by the new Republican Congress that makes real cuts and takes a crucial first step toward the balanced budget plan. In obtaining Clinton's approval, the GOP forced the administration to swallow cuts the president had not proposed and policy changes, particularly in the environmental area, that he opposed.

The environmental provision increases dramatically the harvest of dead and dying timber on federal lands and prevents citizens from challenging those timber sales in court. Conservationists fear the so-called timber salvage program will lead to clear-cutting in roadless areas, harm fish and wildlife, and harvest of healthy as well as damaged trees.

Clinton's signing of the legislation reneges on his pledge to fight it and seems to show the White House will go only so far in protecting environmental legislation the GOP wants to change.

"The president's flip-flop on the rescissions bill does not bode well for Americans who care about the environment," said J. Robert Cox, president of the Sierra Club. "We are outraged by this betrayal."

To highlight their disaffection with Clinton, leaders of many national environmental groups will hold a "21 chain saw salute" to the president in Lafayette Square today.

The legislation contains other policies with which Clinton is at odds. It ends, for example, the requirement that drug-ridden, dilapidated public housing projects be spared for demolition unless a new unit is available for the displaced tenant. The administration had wanted such flexibility, but wanted it with more funding to build new units or provide housing vouchers.

The 13 appropriations bills now making their way through the House are laced with GOP policy initiatives that affect abortion, organized labor, business regulation, possibly even affirmative action.

Clinton cannot veto everything, although this summer it has sounded sometimes as if he will. Officials say the White House has two or three endgame strategies and is split on whether the Republicans are, finally, bluffing over the big picture and eventually will move closer to Clinton's positions on two fundamental issues: reforming Medicare and tax breaks.

"I can't believe that Speaker [Newt] Gingrich with a new Republican House would not want to show that Republicans can govern rather than continue the gridlock, which is what killed the last [Democratic-controlled] House," said one official, reflecting a widespread, although not unanimous, White House view.

Staff writers Dan Morgan and Tom Kenworthy contributed to this report.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 28, 1995

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 News World Communications, Inc.
The Washington Times

July 28, 1995, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: Part A; NATION; AMERICAN SCENE; Pg. A15

LENGTH: 130 words

HEADLINE: Clinton signs spending-cuts bill

BYLINE: FROM WIRE DISPATCHES AND STAFF REPORTS

BODY:

In a compromise with Congress yesterday, President Clinton signed a bill that will cut \$16.3 billion in social programs as the House debated new cuts in housing and environmental efforts that will steer the two sides back to a collision course.

Seven weeks after vetoing an earlier version as too harsh, Mr. Clinton put his pen to a bill trimming scores of education, job-training and other programs. The bill also contains \$7.2 billion for states that have been hit by recent natural disasters.

Republicans launched the effort to make cuts in already-approved spending five months ago as a first step in their balanced-budget drive. But stalemate reined until lawmakers restored \$733 million for school reforms and other administration priorities.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 28, 1995

Copyright 1996 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

April 21, 1996, Sunday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A07

LENGTH: 1019 words

HEADLINE: GOP No. 1 Target: Catholic Votes / Aiming at Clinton social agenda

BYLINE: By Glenn Kessler. WASHINGTON BUREAU

DATELINE: Washington

BODY:

Washington - James Clarke worked to elect John Kennedy and then joined his administration. He voted for George McGovern in 1972 but drifted to Republicans in the 1980s, voting for Ronald Reagan and George Bush. He returned to the Democratic fold in 1992 and voted for Bill Clinton.

"In my heart, I'm still a Democrat," said the 72-year-old resident of Rockville, Md. "The Republican Party has never been the home for the Irish Catholic. If we register Republican, we'd have to go to confession."

But Clarke is leaning toward voting for Sen. Bob Dole, the Kansas Republican, this year, because he feels Clinton fails on three key points - that "he isn't pro-trade union, pro-defense or pro-life." Clinton, he concedes, has done a "marvelous job" in fostering the Irish peace process. But Clarke was dismayed by the president's veto of a bill banning a late-term abortion procedure, which he called "absolutely outrageous."

And that is music to the ears of Republican strategists. The Republican National Committee has made Catholics their No. 1 target group in the coming elections, party insiders said.

Catholics are heavily represented in the big Midwestern battleground states that are expected to decide the election. In fact, since 1976, whichever party won the Catholic vote won the presidency - and, in 1994, when Catholics for the first time supported Republican congressional candidates over Democrats, Republicans took control of Congress for the first time in 40 years.

It's no coincidence that virtually every person on Dole's short list for vice president - including the governors of Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio and Pennsylvania and the lieutenant governor of California - is Catholic. "I'm pretty certain we'll have a Catholic picked as veep," said one top adviser to Dole. "All they can talk about over at headquarters is Catholics."

Other
Dole /
Veto
articles

Thus far, however, Clinton enjoys enormous popularity among Catholics. A Los Angeles Times poll last week found Clinton leading Dole among Catholics by 58 percent to 33 percent - better than Clinton's 55 percent to 37 percent edge among all groups. Clinton has assiduously courted Catholic voters in the past year after a disastrous start of his administration that included his push for gays in the military.

Clinton's State of the Union address this year, for instance, included a call for school uniforms, warning labels for television programs and a child tax credit - all family issues designed to appeal to Catholics. He also touted an increase in the minimum wage and keeping the safety net for the poor - which would appeal to the traditional social liberalism of Catholics.

"From his days with the Jesuits, he understands the Catholic community better than most Southern Baptists we've had," Democratic strategist Tony Podesta said of Clinton's undergraduate years at Georgetown University.

To be sure, speaking of the Catholic vote is a bit of a misnomer. Catholics comprise a number of ethnic groups - Irish, Italian, Polish and Cuban, among them - and thus they do not vote as a bloc. But many were once reliable Democrats who now are independent - and Catholics vote in heavier numbers than most other groups. Thus, Republicans see an opening.

"The Republicans are absolutely trying to get our vote," said Joseph Barrett, deputy national chairman of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, who had separate meetings with Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour and the Dole campaign.

But Barrett is unconvinced the Republicans will be successful. "To get Catholics to vote against their economic well-being, Republicans have to work hard," he said. "Republicans came to us and said pro-life, and we said yes. You've sung this song so often, but what about the minimum wage? What about the poor?"

Gary Bauer, head of the Family Research Council, a conservative group, conceded: "There is a strong element of Catholic thought that is social-action oriented. There is a tension there on some elements of the Republican agenda, and Clinton will try to exploit that."

In fact, it isn't even clear that abortion is a decisive factor for many Catholics, especially younger Catholics, said Ken Kollman, a political scientist at the University of Michigan.

Still, Republicans are calling attention to Clinton's veto of a bill to outlaw a rare late-term abortion procedure, which abortion foes have labeled "partial-birth" abortion. Clinton said he vetoed the bill because it didn't make an exception for a mother's health.

The veto prompted a rare joint letter from all eight U.S. cardinals, condemning it as moving "our nation one step further toward acceptance of infanticide." The Vatican also weighed in last week with a strong statement decrying Clinton's "shameful veto."

Republican strategists said they plan to use Clinton's veto to paint him as an extremist on

abortion - a charge usually made by Democrats against Republicans. Polls show that most Americans disapprove of abortion but do not want to restrict a woman's choice; a basic tenet of the Republican Party platform for 16 years has been to outlaw abortion.

The Los Angeles Times poll found Clinton's veto made some voters slightly more likely to vote for him than for Dole, but most said it would make no difference.

Frances Kissling, president of Catholics for Free Choice, which favors abortion rights, insisted that concerns about abortion would be outweighed by traditional Catholic concerns about the poor and the social safety net.

"For the bishops, this is a terrible dilemma right now," Kissling said. "Before the Republican takeover, they could afford to make abortion the number one issue. They now have a Congress that is very much against abortion. But it's a Congress that is very much against everything else the bishops stand for."

Indeed, while the U.S. Catholic Conference issued a statement condemning the president's veto, it issued another statement calling for an increase in the minimum wage as "a matter of simple justice for a decent society."

Dole spent all last week fending off Democrats' efforts to increase the minimum wage.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 21, 1996

Copyright 1996 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

April 14, 1996, Sunday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: MONEY & CAREERS; Pg. F08

LENGTH: 1574 words

HEADLINE: COVER STORY / Madison Avenue Challenge.

BYLINE: By Harry Berkowitz. STAFF WRITER

BODY:

ANITA HERSH, who usually shapes identities for corporations like Mastercard and brands like Miller Beer, has an idea for a Bill Clinton advertising slogan: "Let's Not Repeal the New Deal."

Ron Anderson, whose big ad agency brought the world "Pork: The Other White Meat," suggests that Bob Dole go on the offensive by labeling Clinton as having "The Power to Veto" and Dole as offering "The Power to Lead."

As the campaign begins to heat up between Clinton and his Republican rival, marketing and advertising mavens are ready to lend a hand, and some are willing, or even eager, to suggest how best to market the Clinton and Dole "brands."

One corporate identity firm, Landor Associates, even surveyed 300 consumers on what brands they identify with the candidates. Clinton was especially identified with Budweiser beer, while Dole was matched with Cadillac cars.

Presidential candidates have often called upon the creative ranks of Madison Avenue to help rally voters through emotional images and memorable words.

Sometimes the ad execs have emerged as heroes or even legends, as in Ronald Reagan's 1984 re-election bid, which included such Madison Avenue spots as the feel-good "Morning in America" and the Soviet-scare "Bear in the Woods."

Other times, political strategists rebuff the outsiders as too arty, naive, slow or egotistical, as in the failed 1988 campaign of Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis against George Bush. Dukakis ads proposed by Madison Avenue contributors, including Ed McCabe, were mostly rejected, adding to an air of internal feuding and disarray in the campaign.

"People on Madison Avenue are able to take a strategy and give it an emotional life," said Linda Kaplan Thaler, executive creative director at Wells Rich Greene in New York, who was

on the Clinton campaign's ad team in 1992. "People vote with both their heads and their hearts."

Thaler is one of eight advertising and marketing executives who agreed to a Newsday request to propose campaigns for the Democratic incumbent and the presumed Republican challenger.

Kaplan said that after four years in Washington, Clinton can no longer play on his Arkansas roots, as he did in a biographical video that she helped create called "The Man From Hope." Dole, the senator from Kansas, would be better off going that route.

Instead, Kaplan suggested, Clinton could present spots contrasting two possible Americas 20 years from now - a bleak Republican one or a bright Democratic one. She said the incumbent also should tout his accomplishments over the past four years and stress the theme, "We can't go back to the way things were."

Gary Stibel, founder of the New England Consulting Group in Westport, Conn., which gives advice on marketing strategies to companies such as IBM and AT&T, agreed that Clinton's team should herald changes in the economy, health care and world conflict rather than apologize for Clinton's record.

Anderson, who is executive creative director of Bozell Worldwide in Minneapolis and was on George Bush's ad team in 1992, takes the opposite view of Clinton's record.

"Attack Bill Clinton where he is most vulnerable - not his private life, not his morals, but his accomplishments, or lack thereof, in his first four years - his waffles, his reneges, his vetoes," said Anderson, adding that Republicans should not make the "mistake of four years ago" in waiting too long to attack.

As for Senate Majority Leader Dole, Anderson would portray him as a "likeable guy" and as a "tough leader that had proven himself many times over," including in war, in the primaries and in the "rough-and-tumble" Senate.

An Anderson ad would show scenes of babies, the elderly and families, with "Veto" stamped on the screen each time and a narrator talking about the bills that would have helped these people but were vetoed. "On Nov. 5, 1996, veto this Bill," the narrator would conclude over a picture of Clinton.

Hersh, who is president of Lister Butler, a brand-identity consulting firm in New York, suggested several slogans, some of them tongue-in-cheek, that each of the presidential contestants could use to set himself apart from his opponent. For Dole: "Substance, Not Slick," "He Keeps on Going" or "Still Ticking." For the president: "Clinton for the 21st Century" or "He's Finally Got It."

Several of the ad and marketing execs said Clinton should focus on his relative youth and energy, while Dole should stress the issues of trust, dependability and experience.

"Dole Will Deliver," suggested AlRies, who runs the marketing strategy firm Ries & Ries in Great Neck.

"Energy for a New America" could be a Clinton slogan, suggests Jay Schulberg, vice chairman of Bozell Worldwide in New York, the agency that put milk mustaches on Vanna White and Naomi Campbell. He said the line would imply a contrast with Dole without attacking directly on the age issue. For Dole, Schulberg suggests "You Can Trust Him."

"Clinton needs to re-establish emotional trust and voter comfort with his ideas and character," said Andy Berlin, chairman of Fallon McElligott Berlin. "For Dole, reason and calm competence are terrific assets."

Dole's admakers, meanwhile, will need to punch up his personality, the experts said.

Stibel, whose clients include IBM and AT&T, suggested "Dole, Honestly" as a slogan, and urged that Elizabeth Dole be featured prominently in her husband's campaign, since she is a better speaker and more charismatic and because Hillary Clinton's image has been damaged.

In comparing the politicians to brands, the marketing experts talked of identifying the essence of each brand's image.

Allen P. Adamson, managing director of Landor Associates in New York, identified Clinton's "core brand essence" as presidential, being a regular guy, young, charismatic, smooth and articulate on the positive side, and, on the negative side, being weak on integrity and inconsistent. That means he should appear in "energized" environments and stress issues important to families, Adamson said.

As for Dole, the pluses are that he is thought of as experienced, wise, focused, grandfatherly and as having integrity and faithfulness, while the minuses are characterizations as old, boring and cold. That means, Adamson said, that ads should show him being "warm and fuzzy" with the public.

Will Dole Hire a Team of All-Stars?

TO GO Madison Avenue or not to go?

That is one of the key questions that the two presidential campaigns are considering.

Bob Dole's advisers have already asked Phil Dusenberry, vice chairman of BBDO Worldwide, the giant ad agency known for spots for Pepsi, Visa, Federal Express and others, to form a team of Madison Avenue creative all-stars.

Dusenberry, 59, has not yet said "yes," but he is asking around at other agencies to see who is willing to join such a team, ad industry insiders said.

He would be a stellar catch for Dole's campaign.

Dusenberry, 59, was a key member of Reagan's 1984 group, dubbed the Tuesday Team, which also included such ad industry heavyweights as Hal Riney, Tom Messner, Ron Berger and Jim Travis. Their legendary spots included the feel-good "Morning in America" and the Soviet-wary "Bear in the Woods."

"Using Dusenberry for Dole is very smart because people need to see the softer side of Dole, and Dusenberry is an image-maker," said Linda Kaplan Thaler, executive creative director at ad agency Wells Rich Greene and a member of President Bill Clinton's 1992 ad team. "He did great things for Reagan."

Dusenberry, who co-wrote the screenplay for Robert Redford's "The Natural," also worked on former Rep. Jack Kemp's failed presidential campaign in 1988. In recent years, Dusenberry has also helped create anti-abortion ads sponsored by the Arthur S. DeMoss Foundation, and helped form Ads Against AIDS in New York.

A Dusenberry team would support the media strategists who have created ads for Dole during the primaries. Don Sipple, who previously worked on California Gov. Pete Wilson's presidential primary bid, is in charge of ad strategy, while Stuart Stevens, whose nonpolitical credits include writing scripts for TV's "Northern Exposure," has created the ads.

In forming a Madison Avenue group, the Dole campaign hopes, however, to avoid the kind of indecision and confusion that plagued George Bush's ad campaign in 1992. Those problems led Martin Puris, the Madison Avenue leader of Bush's team, called the November Company, to say it was an experience he would not repeat. The Bush campaign had asked Dusenberry to sign on in 1992, but he declined.

Donny Deutsch, who runs an ad agency whose clients include Ikea, has not said he won't repeat his experience as a member of Clinton's 1992 ad team. But members of that campaign have complained that Deutsch took too much credit for the team's work. And some team members have complained their work was not used enough.

This year, the Clinton campaign may not even name a Madison Avenue team, although it may call on some ad experts on occasion, party insiders said.

Instead, the Democrats have been relying on a veteran political media strategist, Robert Squier, and his Washington, D.C., firm, Squier, Knapp, Ochs, as well as Hank Sheinkopf, a New York political strategist, and Marius Penczer, a music video director. Also, White House political guidance has come from Dick Morris, a strategist who has worked for both Republicans and Democrats.

- Berkowitz

GRAPHIC: Color Cover Illustration By Martin Kozlowski - Television sets with Bill Clinton and Bob Dole campaigning for the 1996 Presidential Election. Photos - Above are slogans -

some serious, some not -1) suggested for President Bill Clinton and Sen. 2) Bob Dole by Madison Avenue.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 14, 1996

Copyright 1996 Denver Publishing Company
Rocky Mountain News

April 12, 1996, Friday

SECTION: NEWS/NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL; Ed. F; Pg. 42A

LENGTH: 614 words

HEADLINE: Abortion in election spotlight
President Clinton's veto and Dole's 'extremist' remarks push the issue into presidential battle

BYLINE: Tom Raum; Associated Press

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Sen. Bob Dole says that President Clinton's veto of an anti-abortion bill places him on the "extremist fringe" of abortion- rights supporters.

The accusation sharpens battle lines for the 1996 presidential election.

But for all the rhetoric from both sides, polls show a majority of American voters don't want a ban on abortion.

Dole's comments, made after Clinton vetoed legislation Wednesday to ban partial-birth abortions, could make it more difficult for him to win support from the political center as he moves beyond the GOP primaries into the general-election campaign.

Asked about Clinton's veto as he campaigned in Pennsylvania late Wednesday, Dole said: "Big mistake. He's out there on the extremist fringe." Dole renewed his contention during a campaign stop Thursday in Memphis, Tenn., saying, "He is out there on the extreme edge."

Dole's point was that the bill, which would ban a seldom-used late-term procedure, had considerable bipartisan support in Congress - even if not enough to override a veto.

Clinton contended the procedure was sometimes necessary to protect a woman's health or save her life.

The president's veto and the Senate majority leader's caustic response are helping propel the entire abortion debate forward as a major fall campaign issue.

The last time Dole used the tag "extremist" was against since-vanquished GOP rival Pat Buchanan, whose anti-abortion views Dole largely echoes.

But even though Dole, like Buchanan, favors a constitutional ban on abortion, exit polls show most Republican primary voters don't.

Asked, "Should the Republican platform support a constitutional amendment to ban abortion?," 54% of GOP primary voters said no and 40% said yes - even though such a plank has been in the party platform since 1980. The exit polls were conducted by Voter News Service, a partnership of The Associated Press, ABC, CBS, CNN and NBC.

Despite the poll numbers, many GOP strategists think the abortion issue will be a winning one for them in November.

In part, that's because anti-abortion organizations plan to target battleground states - mostly in the Midwest - that Clinton carried in 1992 but where anti-abortion support is strong. These include Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri and Pennsylvania.

Clinton's veto angered many Catholics, who have sizeable numbers in these states. "If we deny the humanity of a child as it is being born, whose humanity will be denied next? Thoughtful Americans should keep this in mind as they ponder their choices on Election Day," Cardinal James A. Hickey, the archbishop of Washington, said in a statement.

Democratic strategists privately concede Clinton needs to carry most of these states to be re-elected and that opposition from Catholics could be a significant problem. But publicly, they assert Clinton's veto won't cost him many votes.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: April 15, 1996

Copyright 1996 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

March 22, 1996, Friday, Final Edition
Correction Appended

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A01

LENGTH: 1100 words

HEADLINE: Assault-Gun Ban's Ricochet; Issue Entangles Dole, GOP in Election Politics

BYLINE: John F. Harris; Helen Dewar, Washington Post Staff Writers

BODY:

President Clinton accused congressional Republicans yesterday of taking "the side of the Washington gun lobby" in trying to overturn the ban on assault weapons -- a rhetorical blast that showed how he hopes one of his more controversial achievements of 1994 can be a reelection asset in 1996.

Clinton did not mention Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) by name, but Dole's vague and defensive comments later about whether and when he would schedule a vote on the bill -- he pledged last year to do so -- made it plain that he was the real target. The day's maneuvering revealed how nearly every major item of legislative business is becoming a proxy for the impending Clinton-Dole general election battle.

Now that he has the nomination assured, Dole must face the political reality that numerous surveys show 70 percent or more of the public favors keeping the ban. With the House set to pass the repeal today, will Dole keep his pledge and schedule a Senate vote? "I haven't considered it," he told reporters at a news conference. "It's not a priority."

If the assault weapons bill highlights the perils of running for president as a legislative leader, Dole has been busy trying to prove that his platform on Capitol Hill can also be put to advantage. Over the past two days, Dole has embraced subjects as diverse as missile defense systems and Everglades alligators in an effort to use pending legislative items to highlight his differences with Clinton.

Yesterday, Dole joined with House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and other Republicans to propose legislation building a missile defense system for the United States over the next seven years.

Referring to Clinton's veto last year of a similar proposal, Dole said, "Right now, the United States has no defense, and I repeat, no defense, against ballistic missiles, and if it's left up to the Clinton administration, it will stay that way."

The proposal would require the United States to deploy a missile defense system capable of defending all 50 states from limited attacks by 2003. Clinton vetoed a defense bill containing such a provision last December, arguing that it would lead to a violation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with countries of the former Soviet Union.

Dole later yesterday tried to show his support for the environment and fiscal frugality at the same time, joining other Republicans in endorsing a congressional plan for saving the Florida Everglades. He noted pointedly that the congressional plan, unlike an earlier Clinton proposal, did not rely on taxes on the sugar industry for its financing.

But it was the gun issue that showed most clearly how the normal push-and-shove of Washington lawmaking has been placed in an entirely different sphere because of the presidential campaign.

The weapons ban was part of the 1994 crime bill. It outlawed 19 types of semiautomatic guns, labeled as "assault weapons" because law enforcement authorities say they are primarily used for criminal activity.

The official White House view is that scheduling a vote on the assault weapons ban is a terrible waste of time, since Clinton would veto any attempt at repeal. "There is no point in distracting the American people or the Congress from the important work before us," the president said yesterday.

Yet this was a distraction on which Clinton and his aides seemed quite eager to devote their attention.

"The longer you want to spend on this the better," White House press secretary Michael McCurry grinningly told reporters. "I'll wail on."

The point of his wailing, he explained, was to make the case that "we've got a very extreme agenda coming from the hard right compared to the common-ground agenda that the president's tried to advance."

Dole's allies among Senate Republicans are trying to help him from this sort of rhetoric. Senator after senator agreed that they do not want to reopen the politically explosive issue.

"There's no interest in doing it. It just doesn't come up," Sen. James M. Inhofe (R-Okla.) said. "We'll just have to wait and see what the House does or doesn't do," said Sen. Larry Craig (R-Idaho), who agreed that there has been little discussion of the issue.

When he was seeking support among gun-control opponents last year, Dole wrote the National Rifle Association that "Repealing the ill-conceived gun ban passed last year as part of President Clinton's crime bill is one of my legislative priorities."

But even the gun owners lobby yesterday seemed ready to give Dole a pass. Chief NRA lobbyist Tanya Matakisa said her group hopes to get the assault gun ban repealed "somehow,

somewhere, sometime," but not necessarily this year. She said the group trusted Dole's judgment on when to schedule a vote. "He's got a lot of pressing priorities, and he's going to have to decide with his colleagues in the Senate when" to take up the issue.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) said Dole told her he did not intend to schedule any Senate vote. "He said it's not a priority and he's not going to calendar it," she said in an interview yesterday.

After his morning news conference left such confusion about when he might schedule a vote, Dole issued a statement in the afternoon that cleared the matter up not at all. He said he opposes the weapons ban as "simply a public relations exercise" and that after the House vote he would "confer with my colleagues on the best course of action to ensure that the Senate advances my goal of keeping all guns out of the hands of criminals."

Many House Republicans acknowledged feeling the same discomfort Dole was experiencing.

Rep. Mark Foley (R-Fla.), a moderate freshman who said he would vote for repeal, calls it "stupid" to call the vote when the measure is not going anywhere. "Why go through all this kind of anguish and debate if it doesn't produce a conclusion?" Even after the Friday vote was scheduled and announced Wednesday, House Republicans sought another delay. At a meeting of the House Republican Conference Wednesday evening, members on both sides of the issue called for a delay in the vote, according to those present.

But Gingrich, who like Dole had committed to the NRA in a 1995 letter that he would work to repeal the assault weapons ban, argued that they would have to face the vote eventually, so they might as well do it now and get it out of the way. "Later is now," he said, recalled one member who had been present. Gingrich stressed that he had given his word that the vote would take place.

Staff writer John E. Yang contributed to this report.

CORRECTION-DATE: March 26, 1996

CORRECTION:

In stories Friday and Saturday about the House bill to repeal the assault-weapons ban, the name of National Rifle Association chief lobbyist Tanya Metaksa was misspelled.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 22, 1996

Copyright 1996 Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

March 20, 1996, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 11; National Desk

LENGTH: 1110 words

HEADLINE: POPULAR REFRAIN ON WELFARE MAY BE TRICKY TUNE FOR DOLE;
POLITICS: GOP HOPEFUL SOUNDS THE REFORM THEME IN THE MIDWEST, AS
CLINTON DID IN 1992. BUT HIS ROLE AS SENATE LEADER COMPLICATES THE
CAMPAIGN ISSUE.

BYLINE: MARIA L. La GANGA and ELIZABETH SHOGREN, TIMES STAFF WRITERS

DATELINE: SPRINGFIELD, Ill.

BODY:

As he stumped through the Midwest, in states that are likely to be central battlegrounds for the presidency, Sen. Bob Dole beat one of the same drums that helped rouse the region to Bill Clinton in 1992: welfare reform.

"When Bill Clinton came to Illinois in 1992, he went all over this state, talking like a Republican," Dole told a cheering crowd in the Capitol rotunda here Monday. "Clinton said at the time that we're going to end welfare as we know it. We sent him a welfare bill . . . , but then he vetoed it."

But while Dole the candidate plays the issue boldly on the trail, Republicans back in Washington express growing concern about how Dole the Senate leader will handle the matter in Congress.

How, they ask, will Dole manage to pass some form of welfare reform legislation this year without giving the issue to Clinton?

The question goes to the heart of Dole's unique position as he nears the Republican nomination. Never before has a sitting Senate majority leader squared off against an incumbent president in an election.

Welfare reform, more than any other issue, shows the dilemma in that confrontation. Producing a welfare reform bill the president would sign could demonstrate Dole's leadership ability. Yet Clinton clearly would share the credit for pushing through a solution to one of the nation's most intractable problems.

Failure to assemble a welfare plan Clinton would sign would allow Dole to continue hammering the president for standing in the way of reform. Yet part of the blame would be laid on Dole as well.

Nevertheless, at least some analysts believe that a strategy of provoking vetoes is the best approach for Dole. "Politically, it makes much more sense for the Republicans to pass a bill that is much, much tougher, forcing Clinton to veto it," said Larry Sabato, a professor of government at the University of Virginia.

Passing a bill that Clinton would sign would be "wonderful for Clinton," Sabato predicted. "It would be a wonderful endorsement of his view that a Republican Congress and a Democratic president is the best situation."

There is no question that the issue is important to voters here, where Clinton's pledge to "end welfare as we know it" helped establish him as a "new Democrat" in the eyes of the voters in 1992.

Studying the keys to Clinton's victory, Republican analysts and pollsters found that each time Clinton sank in the polls in Midwestern swing states, his campaign played the same television ad: the welfare reform spot.

"Every time Bill Clinton went down in the polls, he trotted out his views on welfare," Wisconsin Gov. Tommy G. Thompson, one of several Midwestern governors vying for the vice presidency, said in an interview. "But he never got around to signing any legislation."

This time, welfare "is the Achilles' heel of the Clinton administration," he said.

Anger over welfare continues to be heard among voters here. "Welfare reform, that's the No. 1 priority," said Halina Bielowicz, 48, as children in bright costumes danced to Eastern European music at an ethnic rally for Dole last weekend in River Grove, Ill. "The breeding of third- and fourth-generations of welfare women is a disgrace."

Focusing on the welfare issue here was part of Dole's overall effort to shift focus away from his primary opponents and toward the general-election matchup with Clinton. The Midwest is "probably where the battle's going to be in November," Dole told supporters at a St. Patrick's Day party and rally in Madison, Wis. Tuesday's primaries were "sort of a preliminary bout. . . . Clinton carried this state in 1992. He's not going to carry this state in 1996."

To make good on that bet, Dole is "going to need some way to show the sharp differences in approach" between himself and Clinton, said Douglas Besharov, a policy analyst at the conservative American Enterprise Institute.

Welfare is one of the major issues on which Dole and his advisors hope to do that. Clinton's welfare proposal, which Congress received too late to act on at the end of his

second year, would have retained federal control of the safety net for poor families.

Dole and the governors who introduced him, all of whom have signed into law welfare reform in their states, told voters that Clinton vetoed welfare bills after promising reform.

"Welfare is important to a lot of people," Dole said over and over. "There will always be people--the very old, the disabled, the very young--who will need help. But we believe able-bodied people ought to work if they can work, that you shouldn't have to work 16 hours a day so somebody else doesn't work at all."

Yet in trying to draw out his differences with Clinton on the issue, Dole faces several problems. One is Dole's oft-noted difficulty in articulating his positions in language that voters find compelling.

Another problem is that even if Dole would prefer to push ahead with legislation that draws the sharpest possible contrasts with the White House, doing so would run the risk of infuriating his Republican colleagues in Congress who desperately want to tout welfare-reform accomplishments in their reelection campaigns.

Many of those members of Congress are backing a bipartisan measure conceived by the National Governors' Assn. A group of Republican and Democratic governors, together with members of Congress, are scheduled to unveil the completed welfare overhaul next week.

Whether he likes it or not, it is too late, congressional insiders say, for Dole to stall that plan.

"I was in the Congress for 10 years, and I can't imagine a Democrat or a Republican representative who would want to go home and face the voters having not passed welfare reform this year when everyone knows it needs to be fixed," Delaware Gov. Thomas R. Carper, one of the Democratic governors working on the welfare initiative, said in an interview. "I believe welfare reform is alive and well. I expect the Congress to pass and the president to sign welfare reform this year."

Clinton vetoed the welfare reform bill that Congress sent him late last year, saying it would be too harsh to children, because, among other things, it cut deeply into funds for disabled children and failed to provide adequate money to pay for child care for working welfare recipients. The current version is more moderate on most of the points Clinton criticized.

But given the popularity of the issue, the president would be hard-pressed to veto a welfare reform measure that comes with the support of the Democratic governors.

"Whether there will be a welfare reform bill this year is entirely political," said Besharov.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 28, 1996

Copyright 1996 The Dallas Morning News
THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS

March 17, 1996, Sunday, HOME FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 11A

LENGTH: 475 words

HEADLINE: Dole possibly' will consider flat income tax GOP candidate also sounds some of Buchanan's themes

DATELINE: DE PERE, Wis.

BODY:

DE PERE, Wis. - Sen. Bob Dole, in a bow to a vanquished rival, said Saturday that he's "possibly" looking at proposing a single, flat income tax system similar to that championed by failed presidential candidate Steve Forbes.

In a Reagan-Lincoln Day luncheon in northeast Wisconsin, Mr. Dole also sounded some of the same themes of his remaining major GOP opponent, Pat Buchanan, saying America should worry about competition from foreign trade.

But with an eye on the White House, Mr. Dole saved his attacks for President Clinton, calling him the biggest taxer "in the history of the world" and saying the president thinks he has a blank check on government spending.

"He wants more money, more money all the time," Mr. Dole said after noting Mr. Clinton has vetoed Congress' balanced-budget plan and has yet to agree on a spending plan.

Mr. Clinton previously has fended off such criticism, saying that the economy rebounded during his first term and that government reforms by his administration have helped cut the deficit.

The president, Mr. Dole and other GOP leaders are hoping to meet soon to come up with a balanced-budget plan for 1996.

Saturday night in Milwaukee, he questioned Mr. Clinton's resolve.

"I'm prepared to sit down with the president if he wants a real budget agreement. And we'll get credit and he'll get credit. And it will help the American people," Mr. Dole said. But, he added, "I really don't believe President Clinton wants a balanced budget."

Earlier, the Senate majority leader mocked Mr. Clinton for saying in his State of the Union address in January that "the era of big government is over." Mr. Dole said Mr. Clinton doesn't

want to give up power to the states either, a key part of the Republican agenda in Congress.

Referring to Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Dole said, "Pat Buchanan has touched a nerve when it comes to people concerned about their jobs, concerned about their future. And we will address that."

Mr. Dole also praised Mr. Forbes, saying, "Steve Forbes had a good idea" for a 17 percent flat tax rate.

"We're now looking, possibly, possibly at a single rate," said Mr. Dole, who added that Americans probably would not want a flat tax that eliminates home mortgage deductions and charitable contributions.

"I don't want to help the rich and hurt the poor," he said.

The positions Mr. Dole took Saturday were not new, but he was more explicit in crediting his rivals for their contributions than he had been before the nomination was securely in his hands.

And he said his decades of experience in Washington are an asset. As he told St. Patrick's Day celebrants in Madison, "I'm the plumber with experience. I'm the mechanic with experience. Let's fix America!"

Saturday was Mr. Dole's first 1996 campaign visit to Wisconsin, one of four Midwest states with primaries Tuesday.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO(S): (Associated Press) Republican presidential candidate Bob Dole strolls past reporters Saturday during a campaign stop in De Pere, Wis.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 27, 1996

Copyright 1996 Sentinel Communications Co.
THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

March 13, 1996 Wednesday, METRO

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 698 words

HEADLINE: KEY TO WHITE HOUSE WIN: DEFINING THE BATTLEGROUND

BYLINE: By Craig Crawford, Sentinel Washington Bureau

BODY:

You are about to witness an eight-month brawl between America's two most skilled politicians - Bob Dole and Bill Clinton.

As military schools teach future generals, victory often belongs to those who define the turf where battles are fought.

Clinton knocked George Bush out of the White House by establishing "the economy, stupid" as the battleground of 1992. Bush was slow to react, while also failing to make his foreign policy skill the defining issue.

This year's campaign landscape is only beginning to emerge. Clinton wants to stress his "feel-your-pain" empathy for middle-income voters. Dole promotes trimming government and returning power to the states.

But before Dole can fully engage the president, the likely Republican nominee faces a critical test of leadership in his own party: Pat Buchanan.

So far, only Buchanan has tapped the issue that could drive the 1996 election - job insecurity among middle-income Americans. In elevating the issue, he has unwittingly given aid to the enemy. Clinton is a pro at reaching voters on this topic.

Buchanan no longer threatens Dole for the Republican nomination. But the conservative crusader and his backers grow more shrill with each primary loss. They could deny Dole a glowing coronation at the party's San Diego convention in August.

Dole must decide whether to appease Buchanan, as Bush did four years ago, or to ignore him. So far, he's leaning toward the latter.

Former Bush aides already are telling Dole not to repeat their mistake. Some regret giving Buchanan a high profile at the 1992 Republican convention, where the angry talkmeister frightened many moderate voters watching the event on television.

But Dole can't afford to alienate Buchanan's coalition of evangelical conservatives. They wouldn't vote for Clinton, but they might stay home. Or, even worse for Dole, they could bolt to a third-party candidate such as Ross Perot.

Despite these internal threats, Dole can beat Clinton - although early polls show the president with a solid lead. Dole rose to Washington's top ranks and stayed there more than 35 years for a telling reason: He is a master politician.

Clinton also is a political gold medalist, media-savvy and supremely clever at adjusting to voter moods. The president is ready, with a strong organization and plenty of cash.

Along with all these skills and resources, both men present voters with a profound choice in November - thanks to the Republican agenda on Capitol Hill.

If the Grand Old Party wins the White House - and keeps control of Congress - the promise of its historic 1994 takeover of Capitol Hill finally could be realized.

Dole says he would sign into law what Clinton vetoed:

- Ending federal guarantees of welfare to the needy.
- Reducing or eliminating taxes on investor profits.
- Cutting Medicare growth nearly in half.

On the campaign stump, Dole more simply frames his goals as welfare reform, tax cuts and balancing the budget. Those phrases please voters, pollsters say, until they hear the details.

Voters like the idea of welfare reform, but many balked at specifics such as trimming federal support of school lunches and cutting off aid to single women with children.

Balancing the budget wins support, but not when it leads to talk of reducing aid to middle-income families with parents or grandparents in nursing homes.

Dole, who wants to run on the promise of restraining government, will have to be careful how he defines this turf. Clinton could trap him with tales of needy children tossed to the wolves, as he did in outmaneuvering House Speaker Newt Gingrich and the now-dormant Republican "revolution" on Capitol Hill.

What would happen if Clinton wins re-election? If his victory failed to bring more Democrats to Congress, putting the Republicans back in charge, look for another four years of gridlock.

Deciding what matters in this election is what the next eight months are all about. And the voters already have defined the big issues: wage stagnation, corporate downsizing, crime and

failing schools.

The question is: Can either man convince voters that he has a realistic solution to any one of these complex problems?

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: Campaign '96

CAMPAIGN LETTER

LOAD-DATE: March 13, 1996

Copyright 1996 Globe Newspaper Company
The Boston Globe

January 15, 1996, Monday, City Edition

SECTION: NATIONAL/FOREIGN; Pg. 10

LENGTH: 515 words

HEADLINE: Dole accuses Clinton of failing California;
Chides president for spending-bill veto;
CAMPAIGN '96

BYLINE: By Jill Zuckman, Globe Staff

DATELINE: LOS ANGELES

BODY:

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole yesterday accused President Clinton of failing to do enough to help California, a state with a critical abundance of electoral college votes in the battle for the White House.

Dole, touring the Los Angeles County Jail with Gov. Pete Wilson, chastised the president for vetoing a recent spending bill that would have given California about 70 percent of \$ 500 million the government had set aside for states with large populations of illegal immigrants.

Dole's comments indicated he has begun campaigning directly against Clinton rather than duking it out with the other GOP candidates who trail him in the polls. Many political analysts believe that Clinton cannot keep his job without winning the states' 54 electoral votes.

Dole said he was trying to do everything he could to help the state pay for the cost of imprisoning illegal immigrants who have been convicted of crimes.

"I think President Clinton has turned his back on California," Dole said. "He comes out here a lot and says a lot of things, but when it comes to the crunch, he's not there."

A White House official, however, said Clinton vetoed the measure for other reasons. The aide also said California has already received federal funds to help pay for the cost of jailing illegal immigrants.

"In confronting and combating illegal immigration, the Clinton administration has accomplished more in three years than Senator Dole has in 33 years in Washington," said Rahm Emanuel, assistant to the president.

Clinton has tried to show his concern for the state by visiting it more than 20 times since his election. During recent natural disasters, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has quickly sent out relief checks to thousands of residents.

According to Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block, about 20 percent of the jail's inmates were living in the country illegally when they committed their crimes. There are more than 20,000 illegal immigrants in the state's prison and juvenile facilities, according to Wilson.

Dole promised to send a second version of the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill to the White House that would include the \$ 500 million provision. "If we can't protect our borders, we must help the states pay for some of the cost," Dole said. "It's a federal obligation to protect our borders, not California's, Texas' or Florida's responsibility."

Wilson was even harsher in his condemnation of Clinton, raising the issue of character by denouncing the president for not keeping his word to help the state. "The point is, there are obligations to the federal government for which he has frankly welched, and this is a cardinal example," said Wilson, who also complained about defense cuts, environmental overregulation and the president's veto of a recent welfare bill.

Asked whether Clinton had done anything of value for California, Wilson said: "Well, he has made much in coming out here in a period where we suffered natural disasters, and he has demonstrated sympathy. He has dispensed some of our tax dollars back to us."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, Sen. Bob Dole (left) and California Gov. Pete Wilson stand before confiscated weapons on a tour of Los Angeles County Jail. / AP PHOTO

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: January 18, 1996

Copyright 1996 The Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

January 24, 1996, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1042 words

HEADLINE: DOLE PROPOSES 'ANOTHER WAY' IN GOP RESPONSE

BYLINE: By EDWIN CHEN and GEBE MARTINEZ, TIMES STAFF WRITERS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Offering "another view, another way," Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole said Tuesday night that Democrats and Republicans have profound differences over how to solve the nation's problems, suggesting, in effect, that Americans give him a chance to lead.

Dole sought in the GOP response to portray himself as a forward-looking man with old-fashioned values shared by most Americans, while describing President Clinton as "almost the last public defender of a discredited status quo."

The front-runner for this year's GOP presidential nomination spoke from his Senate office minutes after Clinton completed his third State of the Union address before a joint session of Congress.

The two nationally televised speeches amounted to dueling campaign orations, providing a glimpse of the themes that will dominate the race for the White House this autumn. Unlike the president's 61-minute speech, Dole's lasted only about 10 minutes.

Referring to the unresolved -- and often rancorous -- budget dispute, the Kansas senator said: "What we're really arguing about are the values that will shape our nation, our government and the future of your child sleeping down the hall."

"Our battles will not be about numbers. They will be about the character of our nation," he said, adding:

"Yes, this country has problems. . . . But we can handle them."

But Dole offered scant details of his own proposals to solve America's problems. Instead, he recited the GOP mantra that was uttered by most Republicans in Congress throughout 1995:

"We must rein in our runaway government, return power to the people, reduce the tax burden, put parents back in charge of our schools, untie the hands of our police, restore justice to our courts and put our faith once again in the basic goodness, wisdom and self-reliance of our people."

Dole, 72, said younger Americans must make sacrifices that he did not specify, an apparent reference to reductions in government services already proposed in Republican plans that Clinton has vetoed.

In calling for sacrifices, Dole also evoked, however tangentially, his military service during World War II, in which he was gravely injured.

"Thanks to God and fortune and to those who went before, we don't have to conquer a dangerous frontier, we don't have to fight another great war," Dole said. "What we do have to do is face the fact that we cannot give in to all of our own desires."

But in scaling back government, Dole vowed: "We will always be mindful of the poor and disadvantaged, education and the environment."

Dole also noted that Clinton has vetoed the GOP welfare reform plan, opposed the Republican Medicare reform proposals, fought against a proposed \$245-billion tax cut and vetoed a balanced budget, and then said:

"It's as though our government, our institutions and our culture have been hijacked by liberals and are careening dangerously off course."

He added: "We know the way back."

Other Republicans responded similarly, agreeing even before the address to describe Clinton as a "say-anything, do-nothing president . . . long on promises but short on follow-through."

"Bill Clinton talks like a born-again conservative but, when the American people focus on what Bill Clinton really believes, they see a congenital liberal," said House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Texas).

Rep. Robert S. Walker (R-Pa.) said he found it "stunningly peculiar" that Clinton would hail the demise of big government, while offering what Walker characterized as "a prescription for even more big government."

"There was a series of disconnects that creates a real credibility gap," Walker added.

Other Republican lawmakers offered similar critiques.

"The president said repeatedly this is the end of big government," said Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Newport Beach). "Yet, in this speech, he proposed no fewer than 10 programs and

program expansions and not a single cut."

If Republicans shared any feelings of guilt when Clinton, by inference, blamed them for the recent federal government shutdowns and implored them to raise the federal debt ceiling to avoid a government default, they did not acknowledge them.

"I was incredulous," said Rep. David M. McIntosh (R-Ind.), a member of the House freshman class that has been criticized by Clinton and others for contributing to the current state of gridlock. He said the fault lies with Clinton, who chose not to sign GOP budget bills because proposed spending reductions were deeper than Democrats preferred.

McIntosh said Republicans plan to resubmit essentially the same bills as those vetoed by Clinton.

"Everything he asked for (Tuesday evening), let's send him those bills. If he really meant it to the American people, he'll sign it. If he didn't, he'll veto it and we'll take it to the (November) election," McIntosh said.

Other Republicans also dismissed the president's remarks.

The Republican National Committee, fearing that Clinton would use his high-profile address to bash the GOP congressional agenda, began faxing out statements challenging the president's assertions even as Clinton spoke.

"There's a big gap between his rhetoric and his actions . . . and how he represents what we Republicans are doing," said Mary Mead Crawford of the GOP committee.

Democrats, meanwhile, expressed far more satisfaction with Clinton's address.

"The agenda the president has set out provides an excellent starting point for action," said Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.). "The president calls responding to the needs of working people a 'challenge' for Congress. I call it doing our job."

Freshman Sen. Russell D. Feingold (D-Wis.) said he was elated by Clinton's advocacy of campaign finance reform, an issue on which Feingold has worked tirelessly. "It's going to help," he said.

Amid the avalanche of instant analyses, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) offered a seasoned politician's perspective.

"These addresses -- anybody can make of them what they want," Feinstein said. But in delivering a speech widely perceived as a kickoff for Clinton's reelection campaign, the president met the challenge, she said.

"It was a compendium of the best achievements and of six goals for the future," she said. "It was practical and it was proper."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: January 25, 1996

leg. Affairs

prepared this

—

only copy

MEASURE: HR1158

SPONSOR: Livingston (R-LA)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 03/08/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Appropriations

RELATED BILLS: See S617, HR1864, HR1927, HRes115, HRes151
See also HR1159

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

03/16/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 227-200. (see CR p.H3303) (House Vote 251) (CR p. H3302-H3303) (WR pp. 794, 797)

04/06/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 99-0. (Senate Vote 132) (CR p. S5380)

05/18/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 235-189. (see CR p.H5354) (House Vote 346) (CR p. H5317-H5354)

05/18/95 Conference Report on measure now cleared for Senate action. (CR p. H5354) (WR pp. 1366, 1377, 1378, 1381, 1382, 1383, 1407, 1426)

05/25/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 61-39. (see CR p.S7405) (Senate Vote 203) (CR p. S7405-S7407)

05/25/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. S7407) (WR pp. 1494, 1512, 1559)

06/06/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H5620)

06/06/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S7777)

06/06/95 Presented to the president.

06/07/95 Vetoed by president (1996 WR pp. 10, 23)

06/07/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H5682-H5683) (WR pp. 1623, 1624, 1626, 1627, 1669, 1698, 1840, 1904, 2042, 2455, 2628)

06/15/95 *** Related measure (HR1864) introduced in House. ***

06/27/95 *** Related measure (HR1927) introduced in House. ***

MEASURE: S21

SPONSOR: Dole (R-KS)

BRIEF TITLE: Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to terminate the U.S. arms embargo applicable to the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

INTRODUCED: 01/04/95

COSPONSORS: 18 (Dems: 3 Reps: 15 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Foreign Relations

RELATED BILLS: See S1157, HR1172, HRes204

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

07/26/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 69-29. (see CR p.S10696) (Text of measure, as passed, appears on pgs. S10696-S10697 of the July 26, 1995, Congressional Record) (Senate Vote 331) (CR p. S10696-S10697) (WR pp. 2282, 2284; 1996 WR p. 119)

08/01/95 Measure passed in House by yea-nay vote: 298-128. (see CR p.H8122) (House Vote 608) (CR p. H8121-H8122)

08/01/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. H8122)

08/02/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

08/02/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S11199-S11200)

08/02/95 Submitted to the president. (CR p. S11200) (WR pp. 2386, 2387)

08/10/95 *** Related measure (S1157) introduced in Senate. ***

08/11/95 Vetoed by president (1996 WR pp. 10, 49)

08/11/95 Presidential veto message received in Senate. (CR p. S12326, S12369-S12370) (WR pp. 2455, 2459, 2652, 2668, 2734, 2827; 1996 WR p. 193)

MEASURE: HR1854

SPONSOR: Packard (R-CA)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 06/15/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Appropriations
House Rules
House Appropriations

RELATED BILLS: See HR26, HR2492, HConRes99, HRes169, HRes206, HRes213

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

06/22/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 337-87. (House Vote 417) (CR p. H6232) (WR pp. 1803, 1804, 1805)

07/20/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by voice vote. (CR p. S10420)

09/06/95 House rule, HRes206, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H8572) (CR p. H8555-H8572)

09/06/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 305-101. (House Vote 638) (CR p. H8578)

09/22/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 94-4. (see CR p.S14127) (Senate Vote 461) (CR p. S14114-S14118, S14127) (WR pp. 2858, 2859)

09/22/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. S14127)

09/26/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H9590)

09/26/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S14309)

09/26/95 Presented to the president. (WR p. 2966)

10/03/95 Vetoed by president (WR p. 3054; 1996 WR pp. 10, 15)

10/06/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (Subsequently, the House agreed to a DAVIS, R-Va., unanimous consent request to postpone consideration of the president's veto message on the bill until Thursday, October 12, 1995, by unanimous consent.) (see CR p.H9742) (CR p. H9741-H9742) (WR p. 3276)

10/12/95 PACKARD, R-Calif., unanimous consent request that the veto message from the president and the accompanying bill be referred to the Appropriations Committee, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H9904) (WR pp. 3113, 3122, 3183, 3353, 3532, 3590)

10/18/95 *** Related measure (HR2492) introduced in House. ***

MEASURE: HR2586

SPONSOR: Archer (R-TX)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 11/07/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Ways and Means

RELATED BILLS: See S1546, HRes258, HRes262
See also S735, HR1756

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

11/09/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 227-194. (Habeas corpus reform provisions of S735 and provisions similar to HR1756 are included in this measure.) (House Vote 781) (CR p. H12064)

11/09/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 49-47. (Senate Vote 569) (CR p. S16913)

11/10/95 ARCHER, R-Texas, motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment, agreed to by yea-nay vote: 219-185. (see CR p.H12113) (House Vote 785) (CR p. H12106-H12113)

11/10/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. H12113) (WR pp. 3439, 3441)

11/10/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

11/10/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S17003)

11/12/95 Presented to the president.

11/13/95 Vetoed by the president. (1996 WR p. 10)

11/13/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H12150-H12151)

11/13/95 ARCHER, R-Texas, motion that further consideration of the veto message and the bill be postponed until December 12, 1995, agreed to by yea-nay vote: 223-184. (see CR p.H12155) (House Vote 788) (CR p. H12151-H12155) (WR pp. 3504, 3508, 3559, 3586)

12/07/95 ARCHER, R-Texas, unanimous consent request that the veto message on the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways & Means, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H14206)

01/30/96 *** Related measure (S1546) introduced in Senate. ***

MEASURE: HJRes115

SPONSOR: Livingston (R-LA)

OFFICIAL TITLE: Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 11/07/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Oversight
House Ways and Means
House Government Reform and Oversight
House Appropriations
House Commerce

RELATED BILLS: See S1410, S1411, HJRes108, HJRes116, HJRes119,
HJRes120, HJRes122, HJRes123, HJRes136, HJRes163,
HRes257, HRes261
See also HJRes175

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

11/09/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yeay-nay vote:
50-46. (Senate Vote 567) (CR p. S16892) (WR pp. 3439,
3442, 3443)

11/10/95 LIVINGSTON, R-La., motion that the House concur in the
Senate amendment no. 1, agreed to by a yeay-nay vote:
224-172. (see CR p.H12123) (House Vote 786) (CR p.
H12113-H12123)

11/10/95 LIVINGSTON, R-La., motion that the House concur in the
Senate amendment no. 2, agreed to by a yeay-nay vote:
224-172. (see CR p.H12123) (House Vote 786) (CR p.
H12113-H12123)

11/10/95 LIVINGSTON, R-La., motion that the House concur in the
Senate amendment no. 3 with an amendment, agreed to by a
yeay-nay vote: 224-172. (see CR p.H12123) (House Vote 786)
(CR p. H12113-H12123)

11/10/95 Measure now cleared for Senate action. (CR p. H12123)

11/13/95 DODD, D-Conn., unanimous consent request to providing for
the consideration of the continuing resolution, agreed to
by unanimous consent. (CR p. S16977)

11/13/95 HATFIELD, R-Ore., motion that the Senate concur in the
House amendment to the Senate amendment, agreed to by
voice vote. (see CR p.S16977) (CR p. S16977-S16979)

11/13/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

11/13/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's
signature. (CR p. S16977)

11/13/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S17003)

11/13/95 Presented to the president.

11/13/95 Vetoed by the president. (1996 WR p. 10)

11/13/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H12238-H12247)

11/14/95 LIVINGSTON, R-La., motion to postpone further consideration of the veto message and joint resolution until Friday, December 1, 1995, agreed to by a yeaynay vote: 229-199. (see CR p.H12247) (House Vote 790) (CR p. H12253-H12312) (WR pp. 3503, 3508, 3516, 3559)

11/30/95 LIVINGSTON, R-La., unanimous consent request that the president's veto message and joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, agreed to by unanimous consent. (see CR p.H13842) (CR p. H13841-H13842)

12/22/95 *** Related measure (HJRES136) introduced in House. ***

03/13/96 *** Related measure (HJRES163) introduced in House. ***

MEASURE: HR2491

SPONSOR: Kasich (R-OH)

BRIEF TITLE: Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

INTRODUCED: 10/17/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Budget
House Agriculture

RELATED BILLS: See S1357, HR2517, HR2530, HJRes132, HConRes122, HRes272, HRes276, HRes279
See also S12, S158, S395, S495, S506, S755, S847, S852, S888, S904, S959, S991, S992, S993, S1000, S1006, S1086, S1088, S1109, S1188, S1198, S1304, HR4, HR70, HR246, HR317, HR530, HR602, HR714, HR773, HR873, HR887, HR927, HR1122, HR1215, HR1216, HR1300, HR1469, HR1527, HR1551, HR1561, HR1654, HR1659, HR1663, HR1713, HR1744, HR1756, HR1769, HR1812, HR1823, HR1869, HR1975, HR2028, HR2145, HR2149, HR2195, HR2234, HR2363, HR2394, HR2395, HR2425, HR2459

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

10/26/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 227-203. (House Vote 743) (CR p. H11365) (1996 WR pp. 119, 202)

10/27/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 52-47. (see CR p.S16096) (Senate Vote 556) (CR p. S16095-S16099) (WR pp. 3282, 3287, 3290, 3293, 3358, 3359, 3369, 3372, 3384)

10/30/95 Text of measure, as passed by the Senate on October 28, 1995. (CR p. S16159-S16344)

11/17/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 237-189. (see CR p.H13205) (House Vote 812) (CR p. H13147-H13205)

11/17/95 Motion that the Senate recede from its amendment to the bill and concur therein with a further amendment (pursuant to the Budget Act, that amendment is the text of the conference report (HRpt 104-350), excluding the provisions stricken on the points of order listed above), agreed to by yea-nay vote: 52-47. (see CR p.S17330) (Senate Vote 584) (CR p. S17327-S17330)

11/17/95 Conference Report on measure now cleared for House action. (CR p. S17330) (WR pp. 3503, 3504, 3508, 3510, 3512, 3513, 3523, 3524, 3530, 3535, 3536, 3539, 3540, 3541, 3542, 3551; 1996 WR p. 25)

- 11/17/95 House Rules Committee granted a resolution waiving clause 4(b) of rule XI (requiring two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day as it is reported from the Committee on Rules) against the same day consideration of resolutions reported from the committee on or before the legislative day of November 23, 1995; the resolution covers special rules that provide for the consideration or disposition of the bill HR2491, any amendment, any conference report or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference report thereon; and to consideration or disposition of any measure making appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996. (CR p. D1369)
- 11/17/95 Rules Committee Resolution HRes276 reported to the House. (CR p. H13273)
- 11/17/95 Conference report filed in the House. HRpt 104-350 (CR p. H13340)
- 11/18/95 House Rules Committee granted a rule providing for taking from the speaker's table without intervening point of order the bill with the Senate amendment thereto; the rule provides for the consideration of a motion by the Budget Committee chairman to concur in the Senate amendment; the motion and the amendment are considered as read; the rule provides one hour of debate on the motion divided between the proponent and an opponent; the previous question is considered ordered to final adoption without intervening motion. (CR p. D1373)
- 11/18/95 Rules Committee Resolution HRes279 reported to the House. (CR p. H13340)
- 11/18/95 Pursuant to HRes276, clause 4(b) of rule XI (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House) was waived for consideration of the bill. (CR p. H13299-H13306)
- 11/18/95 House rule, HRes279, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H13319) (CR p. H13318-H13319)
- 11/20/95 HOBSON, R-Ohio, motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment agreed to by yea-nay vote: 235-192. (see CR p.H13629)
(House Vote 820) (CR p. H13379-H13629) (1996 WR p. 28)
- 11/20/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. H13629) (WR pp. 3591, 3597, 3598)
- 11/28/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H13730)
- 11/28/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S17665)
- 11/30/95 Presented to the president. (WR pp. 3635, 3645, 3648, 3653, 3662, 3663, 3667)
- 12/06/95 Vetoed by the president. (WR pp. 3722, 3730, 3731, 3740, 3742, 3744, 3745, 3748, 3789, 3794, 3799, 3801, 3874, 3889; 1996 WR pp. 10, 22, 23, 30, 37, 38, 39, 44, 119, 213, 217, 285, 288, 295, 297, 304, 350, 352, 355, 388, 394, 501, 539, 543, 546, 691, 706, 799, 874, 881, 1023, 1027)

- 12/06/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H14136-H14137) (1996 WR pp. 1178, 1212, 1243)
- 12/06/95 KOLBE, R-Ariz., unanimous consent request that the message of the president and the bill be referred to the Committee on the Budget, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H14137)
- 12/18/95 *** Related measure (HJRES132) introduced in House. ***
- 12/18/95 *** Related measure (HCONRES122) introduced in House. ***
- 01/23/96 Objection was heard to a CRAIG, R-Idaho, unanimous consent request that title I of the bill, as vetoed by the president, be introduced as a freestanding bill; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be advanced to the third reading and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate. (CR p. S304)
- 01/23/96 Objection was heard to a CRAIG, R-Idaho, unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill which would suspend further implementation of the Permanent Agricultural Law of 1949, that the bill be read for a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, without any intervening action or debate. (CR p. S305) (1996 WR pp. 769, 784, 799, 881, 981, 984, 1163)

MEASURE: HR1977

SPONSOR: Regula (R-OH)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.,

INTRODUCED: 06/30/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Appropriations
House Rules
House Appropriations

RELATED BILLS: See S340, S1241, HR1643, HRes185, HRes187, HRes189, HRes231, HRes253, HRes301

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

07/18/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 244-181. (House Vote 523) (CR p. H7135) (WR pp. 2163, 2164, 2165)

08/09/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 92-6. (Senate Vote 378) (CR p. S12037) (WR p. 2437)

12/13/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 244-181. (see CR p.H14816) (House Vote 854) (CR p. H14816)

12/14/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 58-40. (see CR p.S18616) (Senate Vote 604) (CR p. S18595-S18616) (WR p. 3794)

12/16/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H15086)

12/16/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S18785)

12/16/95 Presented to the president.

12/18/95 Vetoed by the president. (WR pp. 3887, 3903; 1996 WR pp. 10, 36, 214, 337, 347, 1159)

12/18/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H15057)

12/18/95 REGULA, R-Ohio, motion that the message of the president and the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H15061) (CR p. H15057-H15061)

12/29/95 Objection was heard to the DOLE, R-Kan., unanimous consent request that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of HR1643, regarding MFN status for Bulgaria, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of HR2099, HR1977, and

HR2076, as vetoed by the president, be inserted; that the bill be advanced to a third reading and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. (CR p. S19302)

- 01/04/96 REGULA, R-Ohio, motion to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto of the bill, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H111); (CR p. H98-H111)
- 01/04/96 Override of the President's veto, rejected in House by yea-nay vote: 239-177. (see CR p.H120) (two-thirds vote required) (House Vote 5) (CR p. H111-H120) (1996 WR pp. 14, 45, 59, 151, 220)
- 01/04/96 Referred to House Committee on Appropriations. (CR p. H120) (1996 WR p. 537)

MEASURE: HR2099

SPONSOR: Lewis (R-CA)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 07/21/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Appropriations
House Appropriations

RELATED BILLS: See HR1643, HRes201, HRes280, HRes291

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

07/31/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 228-193. (see CR p.H8052) (House Vote 607) (CR p. H8051-H8052) (WR pp. 2366, 2368, 2369, 2438, 2622, 2636, 2639, 2649)

09/27/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 55-45. (see CR p.S14389) (Senate Vote 470) (CR p. S14389-S14394)

12/07/95 Conference report agreed to in House by a yea-nay vote: 227-190. (see CR p.H14203) (House Vote 844) (CR p. H14202-H14203)

12/14/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 54-44. (see CR p.S18658) (Senate Vote 606) (CR p. S18639-S18658) (WR p. 3807)

12/14/95 Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate concurred in the House amendment to the Senate amendment no. 63. (CR p. S18658)

12/16/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H15086)

12/16/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S18785)

12/16/95 Presented to the president.

12/18/95 Vetoed by the president. (WR pp. 3893, 3903; 1996 WR pp. 10, 18, 34, 151, 214, 337, 340, 561, 605, 685)

12/18/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H15061)

12/18/95 LEWIS, R-Calif., motion that the veto message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H15065) (CR p. H15062-H15065)

12/29/95 Objection was heard to the DOLE, R-Kan., unanimous

consent request that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of HR1643, regarding MFN status for Bulgaria, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of HR2099, HR1977, and HR2076, as vetoed by the president, be inserted; that the bill be advanced to a third reading and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. (CR p. S19302) (1996 WR pp. 537, 762)

MEASURE: HR2076

SPONSOR: Rogers (R-KY)

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 07/19/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Appropriations
House Appropriations

RELATED BILLS: See HR1643, HRes198

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

07/26/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 272-151. (House Vote 585) (CR p. H7791) (WR pp. 2247, 2262, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2296, 2361, 2370, 2615, 2644, 2645, 2647, 2653)

09/29/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by voice vote. (CR p. S14697) (WR p. 3006)

12/06/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 256-166. (see CR p.H14112) (House Vote 841) (CR p. H14112)

12/07/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 50-48. (see CR p.S18183) (Senate Vote 591) (CR p. S18127-S18183)

12/07/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. S18183) (WR pp. 3726, 3736, 3747)

12/12/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H14310)

12/12/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S18437)

12/13/95 Presented to the president.

12/19/95 Vetoed by the president. (WR pp. 3876, 3893, 3904; 1996 WR pp. 10, 39, 40, 42, 43, 50, 59, 214, 337, 343, 605, 1162)

12/19/95 ROGERS, R-Ky., unanimous consent request that if the chair lays before the House a veto message from the president on the bill, HR2076, that the objections of the president be spread at large upon the journal and that the message and bill be ordered printed as a House document; and that consideration of the veto message be postponed until December 20, 1995, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H15156)

12/19/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (Pursuant to the previous order, consideration of the veto message is

postponed until December 20, 1995.) (CR p. H15166-H15167)

- 12/20/95 ROGERS, R-Ky., motion to refer the presidential veto message and the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, agreed to by voice vote. (see CR p.H15243) (CR p. H15239-H15243)
- 12/29/95 Objection was heard to the DOLE, R-Kan., unanimous, consent request that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of HR1643, regarding MFN status for Bulgaria, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of HR2099, HR1977, and HR2076, as vetoed by the president, be inserted; that the bill be advanced to a third reading and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. (CR p. S19302)
- 01/03/96 House Committee on Appropriations discharged by voice vote. (CR p. H23)
- 01/03/96 Override of the President's veto, rejected in House by yea-nay vote: 240-159. (see CR p.H33) (two-thirds vote required) (House Vote 4) (CR p. H24-H33) (1996 WR pp. 11, 550)
- 01/03/96 Referred to House Committee on Appropriations. (CR p. H33) (1996 WR pp. 537, 771)

MEASURE: HR1058

SPONSOR: Bliley (R-VA)

BRIEF TITLE: Securities Litigation Reform Act.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to reform federal securities litigation, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 02/27/95

COSPONSORS: 23 (Dems: 3 Reps: 20 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
House Judiciary
House Commerce

PUBLIC LAW: PL 104-67 (109 Stat. 737)

RELATED BILLS: See HR10, HRes103, HRes105

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

03/08/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote:
325-99. (see CR p.H2864) (House Vote 216) (CR p.
H2863-H2864) (WR pp. 733, 744)

06/28/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote:
69-30. (title amended) (Senate Vote 295) (CR p. S9219)
(WR pp. 1911, 2632, 2636)

12/05/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote:
65-30. (see CR p.S17997) (Senate Vote 589) (CR p.
S17933-S17962, S17965-S17997)

12/06/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote:
320-102. (see CR p.H14055) (House Vote 839) (CR p.
H14039-H14055)

12/06/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's
signature. (CR p. H14055) (WR p. 3729)

12/07/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H14237)

12/07/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S18232)

12/07/95 Presented to the president. (CR p. H14252)

12/19/95 THOMAS, R-Calif., unanimous consent request that if the
chair lays before the House a veto message from the
president on the bill, that the objections of the
president be spread at large upon the Journal and that
the message and bill be ordered printed as a House
document; and that consideration of the veto message be
postponed until December 20, 1995, agreed to by unanimous
consent. (see CR p.H15157) (CR p. H15156-H15157)

12/19/95 Vetoed by the president. (WR p. 3905; 1996 WR p. 10)

12/20/95 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p.

H15214-H15215)

- 12/20/95 Override of the President's veto, agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 319-100. (see CR p.H15224) (two-thirds vote required) (House Vote 870) (CR p. H15215-H15224) (1996 WR pp. 119, 202)
- 12/20/95 Measure now cleared for Senate action. (CR p. H15224)
- 12/21/95 Presidential veto message received and considered in Senate. (CR p. S19034-S19073, S19081-S19086)
- 12/21/95 DOLE, R-Kan., unanimous consent request that at 10:15 on Friday, December 22, 1995, there be 30 minutes for closing remarks on the veto message, to be equally divided in the usual form, and that at 11:15 a.m., the Senate proceed on the question of passage, the objections of the president to the contrary notwithstanding, agreed to by unanimous consent. (see CR p.S19082) (CR p. S19081-S19082)
- 12/22/95 Override of the President's veto, agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 68-30. (see CR p.S19180) (two-thirds vote required) (Senate Vote 612) (CR p. S19146-S19154, S19180) (WR pp. 3863, 3879, 3880)
- 12/22/95 PL 104-67 109 Stat. 737
- 12/22/95 Not signed by the president. (1996 WR pp. 27, 32, 119, 193)

MEASURE: HR1530

SPONSOR: Spence (R-SC)

BRIEF TITLE: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 05/02/95

COSPONSORS: 1 (Dems: 1 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Conference Committee
Senate Armed Services
House Rules
House National Security

RELATED BILLS: See S727, S1026, S1124, S1514, HR1817, HRes164, HRes307
See also S1125, HR28, HR887, HR945, HR1670, HR1795, HR2664

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

06/15/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 300-126. (House Vote 385) (CR p. H6021) (WR pp. 1737, 1755, 1756, 1758; 1996 WR p. 202)

08/11/95 DOLE, R-Kan., unanimous consent request providing for consideration of HR1530; striking the text of HR1530 and inserting in lieu the text of S1026, as passed by the Senate; and agreeing to HR1530, as amended, agreed to by unanimous consent. (see CR p.S12327) (CR p. S12326-S12328) (WR pp. 2620, 2644, 2650, 2651, 2652)

09/06/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 64-34. (Text of bill, as passed by the Senate on September 6, 1995, appears on pgs. S13211-S13306 of the September 11, 1995, Congressional Record) (Senate Vote 399) (CR p. S12675) (WR pp. 2728, 2729, 2731)

12/15/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 267-149. (see CR p.H14960) (House Vote 865) (CR p. H14946-H14960)

12/19/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 51-43. (see CR p.S18905) (Senate Vote 608) (CR p. S18835-S18902, S18904-S18905) (WR pp. 3896, 3897, 3899)

12/19/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. S18905)

12/21/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House. (CR p. H15573)

12/21/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p.

S19109-S19110)

12/22/95 Presented to the president.

12/28/95 Vetoed by president (1996 WR pp. 10, 16, 362)

12/30/95 *** Related measure (S1514) introduced in Senate. ***

01/03/96 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H12)
(1996 WR pp. 46, 47, 48, 49, 61, 68)

01/03/96 Override of the President's veto, rejected in House by
yea-nay vote: 240-156. (see CR p.H22) (two-thirds vote
required) (House Vote 3) (CR p. H12-H22) (1996 WR pp.
154, 225)

01/03/96 Referred to House Committee on National Security. (CR p.
H22)

MEASURE: HR4

SPONSOR: Shaw (R-FL)

BRIEF TITLE: Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

INTRODUCED: 01/04/95

COSPONSORS: 122 (Dems: 0 Reps: 122 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Finance
House Ways and Means
House Rules
House Judiciary
House Economic and Educational Opportunities
House Budget
House Banking and Financial Services
House Agriculture
House Commerce

RELATED BILLS: See S736, S828, S834, S840, S842, S843, S844, S845, S846, S918, S1117, S1120, HR118, HR999, HR1029, HR1135, HR1157, HR1214, HR1250, HR1267, HR1819, HR2332, HR2491, HR2915, HR3266, HRes117, HRes119, HRes319

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

03/24/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote: 234-199. (see CR p.H3790) (House Vote 269) (CR p. H3789-H3790) (WR pp. 850, 872, 873, 874, 875, 911, 994, 995; 1996 WR pp. 93, 119)

09/19/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote: 87-12. (title amended) (Senate Vote 443) (CR p. S13802) (WR pp. 2908, 2909, 2910, 2915, 2963, 2981, 3119; 1996 WR p. 304)

12/21/95 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote: 245-178. (House Vote 877) (CR p. H15533)

12/22/95 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote: 52-47. (see CR p.S19181) (Senate Vote 613) (CR p. S19154-S19181) (1996 WR pp. 37, 193)

12/22/95 Measure has now been cleared for the president's signature. (CR p. S19181) (WR pp. 3863, 3889, 3890)

12/27/95 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

12/29/95 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S19306, S19311)

12/29/95 Presented to the president.

01/09/96 Vetoed by the president. (1996 WR pp. 92, 95, 103, 119,

305, 352, 358, 389, 394, 395, 543, 558, 559, 1023, 1027,
1028, 1178)

01/22/96 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p. H342)

01/22/96 BUNNING, R-Ky., unanimous consent request that the veto message, together with the accompanying bill be referred the Committee on Ways & Means, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H342) (1996 WR pp. 768, 786)

01/31/96 *** Related measure (HR2915) introduced in House. ***

04/17/96 *** Related measure (HR3266) introduced in House. ***

MEASURE: HR1833

SPONSOR: Canady (R-FL)

BRIEF TITLE: Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to amend title 18, U.S. Code, to ban partial-birth abortions.

INTRODUCED: 06/14/95

COSPONSORS: 115 (Dems: 16 Reps: 99 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Judiciary
House Rules
House Judiciary

RELATED BILLS: See S939, HRes251, HRes289

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

11/01/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote:
288-139. (House Vote 756) (CR p. H11618) (WR p. 3375;
1996 WR p. 119)

12/07/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote:
54-44. (Senate Vote 596) (CR p. S18228) (WR p. 3738; 1996
WR p. 39)

03/27/96 CANADY, R-Fla., motion that the House concur in the
Senate amendments, agreed to by yea-nay vote: 286-129.
(see CR p.H2929) (House Vote 94) (CR p. H2905-H2929)
(1996 WR p. 885)

03/27/96 Measure has now been cleared for the president's
signature. (CR p. H2929)

04/02/96 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S3310)

04/05/96 Presented to the president.

04/10/96 Vetoed by the president. (1996 WR pp. 987, 1009, 1237)

04/15/96 Presidential veto message received in House and referred
to the Committee on the Judiciary. (CR p. H3338-H3339)

MEASURE: HR1561

SPONSOR: Gilman (R-NY)

BRIEF TITLE: American Overseas Interests Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 05/03/95

COSPONSORS: 0 (Dems: 0 Reps: 0 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: Senate Foreign Relations
House Rules
House Judiciary
House International Relations

RELATED BILLS: See S908, HR772, HR1111, HR1172, HR1564, HR2491,
HR3121, HRes155, HRes156
See also HR942, HR1243, HR1562, HR1563

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

06/08/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote:
222-192. (House Vote 366) (CR p. H5734) (WR pp. 1653,
1655, 1658, 1760; 1996 WR p. 49)

12/14/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote:
82-16. (Text of bill, as passed by the Senate, appears on
pgs. S18747-S18771 of the December 15, 1995,
Congressional Record) (Senate Vote 605) (CR p. S18637)
(WR p. 3821; 1996 WR p. 39, 49, 50)

03/12/96 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote:
226-172. (see CR p.H2095) (House Vote 59) (CR p.
H2084-H2095) (1996 WR p. 712)

03/28/96 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote:
52-44. (see CR p.S3146) (CR p. S3101-S3114, S3121-S3146)
(1996 WR p. 895)

03/28/96 Measure has now been cleared for the president's
signature. (CR p. S3146)

04/02/96 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

04/02/96 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S3310)

04/05/96 Presented to the president.

04/12/96 Vetoed by the president. (1996 WR p. 1059)

04/15/96 Presidential veto message received in House. (further
consideration of the veto message on the bill was
postponed until Tuesday, April 23, 1996) (CR p.

H3304-H3305) (1996 WR p. 1074)

- 04/23/96 GILMAN, R-N.Y., unanimous consent request that further consideration of the veto message on the bill be postponed until Tuesday, April 30, 1996, agreed to by unanimous consent. (CR p. H3666)
- 04/30/96 Override of the President's veto, rejected in House by yea-nay vote: 234-188. (see CR p.H4161) (two-thirds vote required) (House Vote 136) (CR p. H4151-H4161) (1996 WR p. 1235)

MEASURE: HR956

SPONSOR: Hyde (R-IL)

BRIEF TITLE: Common Sense Legal Standards Reform Act of 1995.

OFFICIAL TITLE: A bill to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCED: 02/15/95

COSPONSORS: 1 (Dems: 0 Reps: 1 Ind: 0)

COMMITTEES: House Rules
House Judiciary
House Commerce

RELATED BILLS: See S454, S565, HR10, HR753, HR955, HR1075,
HRes108, HRes109, HRes394
See also S303, HR917

LEGISLATIVE ACTION:

03/10/95 Measure, as amended, passed in House by yea-nay vote:
265-161. (see CR p.H3027) (House Vote 229) (CR p.
H3015-H3027) (WR pp. 733, 744, 809)

05/10/95 Measure, as amended, passed Senate by yea-nay vote:
61-37. (Text of measure, as amended and passed by the
Senate, appears on pgs. S6407-S6412) (Senate Vote 161)
(CR p. S6407) (WR pp. 1317, 1319, 1320, 1632, 1983, 2636,
3380; 1996 WR p. 119)

03/21/96 Conference report agreed to in Senate by yea-nay vote:
59-40. (see CR p.S2591) (Senate Vote 46) (CR p.
S2553-S2591) (1996 WR pp. 789, 790)

03/29/96 Conference report agreed to in House by yea-nay vote:
259-158. (see CR p.H3204) (House Vote 110) (CR p.
H3184-H3204) (1996 WR p. 878)

03/29/96 Measure has now been cleared for the president's
signature. (CR p. H3204)

04/02/96 Enrolled measure signed in the House.

04/02/96 Enrolled measure signed in the Senate. (CR p. S3310)

04/30/96 Presented to the president.

05/02/96 Vetoed by the president. (CR p. D420) (1996 WR pp. 1220,
1253)

05/06/96 Presidential veto message received in House. (CR p.
H4425-H4426)

05/06/96 HYDE, R-Ill., unanimous consent request that further
consideration of the veto message be postponed until
Thursday, May 9, 1996, and that upon further

consideration of the veto message on that day, the previous question be considered as ordered on the question of passage of the bill, to objections of the president to the contrary notwithstanding, without intervening motion or debate except one hour of debate on the question of passage, agreed to by unanimous consent. (see CR p.H4427) (CR p. H4426-H4427)