

sent to HET 6/22/82

DAN QUAYLE

May 12, 1982

I go in and he asks me how long I'm going to stay around. "You may never get to see the jobs bill pass." I said I wanted to talk about that and the budget markup and I asked him about his maneuvering in the budget committee last week. "I've been watching the jobs thing closely all along and the figure I've been talking about is 3.9, but I'm not going to start at the bottom. Already the administration has come up from 1.8 to 3.2, so that's real progress!"

I asked him how the amendment came about and he asked if I had read yesterday's WSJ. He said Merry's article was pretty accurate. "I assume Steve Bell gave it all to him. I don't know who else was in Baker's office."

"How did it come about? "I had been working with the private colleges and universities in Indiana on the GSL. I didn't realize they had such a problem. At my school, Depauw, 50% of the students are on loans. So I talked with the educating (sic) community and they said they could live with 243(?)million. And of course, I was interested in the jobs bill. I offered to join Hollings if he changed his amendment. He almost bit. If he had, we would have passed it right there. He probably thought he could get Andrews on the handicapped part. Anyway, he lost. Hart put up his mark and I put up mine. Domenici was over on the floor when he heard about it. So he got Baker involved, and we had a crisis meeting in Baker's office. He said that he had to get the budget out and he didn't want any amendments. I said that on the jobs bill the only way I could deal with those guys downtown was to force them to pay attention to me by moving the program along. I told them the only way a Senator provided his effectiveness to the people of his state was by things like GSL. Baker said he just had to have the budget. I told him that's your problem not mine.' But I agreed not to push it. I had the votes to win. Mark Andrews would have supported me, and Hatch. Hatch

told me not to propose the amendment at first. Then some people pressured him to support it. He responds to pressure. He told me he would vote with me. So we had the votes. Domenici knew that. I could have won. But like a gracious, loyal, obedient stupid Republican I went along for the sake of a budget resolution. Baker and Domenici both agreed to support it on the floor. I think we can win there. Maybe we'll even get more publicity for our cause on the floor."

I asked him if he thought PD did a better job this year than last year. "He was in a very different situation this year. He had to have something. My objection last year was that he didn't need it. That's part of the reason why I support a 2 year budget cycle. I don't want a budget coming up every 2 months. My relationship with him was different this year. I told him I knew we had to get a budget resolution to the floor. I said I expected to offer some amendments, but that if I lost I would still vote out the budget. I said 'You don't have to worry about me.' I think by pushing it the way he did last year, he contributed to some of the psychological and other difficulties we've had this year. But he thought he had to have it and he got 10 votes."

He did not give PD much credit. He also said, earlier in the interview, that "I don't agree with them on social security. I think that was a mistake. I think you should put a cap on entitlements. That makes people seem greedy when you say they can have 3 or 4 percent and they ask for 7 or 8 percent. But this idea of 40 Billions in savings is wrong. I wouldn't sign their letter on that. They sent a letter around asking for an endorsement of the social security section. I refused."

He said all the Repubs. except maybe Armstrong were at the meeting in Baker's office. He said Tower protested defense cuts and that "Mark Andrews

wanted something. I don't know what it was." I asked him if MA worked with him at all and he said that he would have supported him.

Keep this

I asked him about the jobs bill. "I don't know where we are on the jobs bill. I don't know whether Hatch will call a markup. So far as I know, it's on for tomorrow. Bob Guttman told me that as of 6:00 last night it was on. But my guess is that Hatch will cancel it three or four times. I talked with him last night. He said, we've got to have the administration. I said you'll never get the administration--not until you actually have a bill."

I interrupted to say that that was the exact same situation as the budget and he said yes it was.

He talked in number at ACP

"I've given up dealing with the Department of Labor. I will only deal with the White House. The Department of Labor is impossible to deal with. They have to check everything with the White House anyway. Donovan is spending all his time defending himself. Now he's up testifying before the grand jury. It's a disgrace. But I can't tell where I am with the White House. It's not a high priority with them. Stockman and Baker and Harper and Rubenstein are supposed to have a meeting today to decide what to do about it. That's what I've heard. But I don't know whether they will or not!"

"I talked with the President about it yesterday(?). He called me to talk about my MX amendment. He asked me not to push it, that it would harm his negotiations. I told him I thought we were spending too much money on things like MX, but that I wouldn't do anything to harm his negotiations. Then I said, while I've got you here there's something coming up I want to alert you to--and I told him about the jobs bill. I told him it had passed the committee 7-0. I told him all the money went to the PIC councils with 51% business. I told him the governors would have more say than before. I told

him we had an absolute prohibition against public service jobs. I told him that 90% of the money went for training. He said of what you say is true that sounds like something we should support. I told him that if we didn't get a jobs bill we'd get CETA. He said he didn't want that and that he'd speak to some people about it. I didn't push him. I just wanted to tell him about it. We'll see if anything happens.... Later in the interview he said "That's the only way I can get their attention--when they call me about something else, like the President's call yesterday."

Presidents pay a lot more attention to senators because they can create more mischief.

7/13
TK
I asked him if he ever regretted taking Kennedy on, with him and making it Quayle-Kennedy. "If I had gone it alone, it would have been treated as just another bill--by Hatch and by the administration. They would have had their bills and sometime or other mine would have been considered. But in order to elevate it the way I wanted to, I needed a bipartisan bill. And in order to avoid bitterness and tancor and name calling in getting the bill out it had to be a bipartisan bill. In order to be able to deal with the House effectively, it had to be bipartisan. So I think it was the right

By 6/6(?)
Indur
But I've gotten into a lot of trouble over it. It's a jungle out there. Back home, my Republican friends don't like the Kennedy name on the bill. For one thing, they don't realize it's my bill. They think it's his bill. When I explain that to them, it's OK. But still, people in Indiana don't like Kennedys. Bobby Kennedy did not do well in Indiana; Ted Kennedy did not do well in Indiana. The Reagan Administration, of course, doesn't like Kennedy. They know he's running against them. You saw how long it took them to settle the Voting Rights bill, didn't you? That's because Kennedy was involved. And here he is, involved in the training

bill. Well, he's been around here a long time and he occupies some very important positions. In my case, he is the ranking member of the committee. If someone else had been the senior Democrat, it might have been easier to get the bill. After all, Donovan thinks Kennedy is trying to put him in jail. Hypothetically, if Eagleton had been the ranking member, I would have had all the benefits of bipartisanship and none of the drawbacks. Kennedy has made it more difficult. There's no doubt about that. But I've enjoyed working with him. He's a lot better than his image. And he's given up a lot. You heard him say the other day in markup that the bill isn't what he would want. It isn't. It's a real compromise.

open to people
He said again "The Labor department ruined things with their press release just before markup saying what they would and would not accept. That was stupid. They took everything off the table. The people down there aren't very smart about dealing with the bill. They are smart about some things, but not about Congress. Why, they could get this bill of ours passed in the House if they would introduce it and push it over there. But they haven't."

House
Have you been in touch with the House? 'I'm going to have to sit down with Michel and Lott. But I decided I ought to get the bill out of the Senate committee before I do that."

I got up to leave and said that I would think his bill would be the only chance to protect their social flank in the election. He agreed. "It would give people something to run on. It would help with the rich-poor thing--the bill takes care of the poor. It would help with unemployment--the bill helps people without jobs. It will help with the whole compassion thing. It's natural. You'd think the people down there would see it. But they don't--the bastards."

Again "I've stopped dealing with the Labor Department. I haven't had any communication with them since the markup. I'm only going to deal with the White House. But they aren't paying attention. The only way I can get their attention is when they call me for something--as the President did yesterday. I've supported Reagan. I suppose this happens with all administrations--at least the last two. Carter wasn't from here' Reagan isn't from here."

I asked if he'd win in committee. "Oh, there's no problem at all in committee. I may lose East and Humphrey. But all the others are for it. We'll get the bill out of the committee. No doubt about that... It's been a long process, but we'll get it. I had no idea it would take so long and be so tedious and so petty when I started. But we'll get a jobs bill. I can't imagine that they'd veto..."

I asked him about his time allocation on Budget, Labor and AS. His point was that it was hard to tell. "In terms of hours spent and getting an intimate knowledge of the legislation, I've spent more time on the Jobs Bill. This year, with the hearings, I've certainly spent more time on the jobs bill. But when the Budget is up that takes a lot of time. I spent the first six months on budget last year. Armed Services is sporadic. When the bill is up, it takes a lot of time. AWACS, that took an awful lot of time. That's here. When I speak back home, I'd say one-third of the groups want to hear about the jobs bill. The other two-thirds want something more general."

I asked if his age affected his relationships. "I'm sure with Tower it does. He's of the old school that young people should sit and keep quiet. With others, too, there's bound to be some resentment--people joke about my looking like a page. Of course I look young--though I've got a few gray hairs. But I don't feel it. Talking on the telephone or talking in person to other Senators, I don't feel it. And if it was there, I'd feel it."

For 10 minutes, I listened to him on the telephone with Dan Glickman
Tidbits:
on the Peace Academy. /"To tell you the truth, I don't know anything at
all about it. I haven't paid any attention to it. It was marked up in sub-
committee the other day and I didn't even go. I didn't even send over my proxy.
I thought it was just some foolish idea. But I just got a letter on it from
Father Hesburgh on it, so I suppose I'll have to see what it's all about.
Frankly, I haven't taken it seriously up to now. Thanks for jogging me on
it." Puts phone down and asked me what I knew about it. I said I knew it was
Sparky's dream. He said of Glickman - "He's a pretty steady guy. I think he
has a large mennonite community in his district and that's where the pressure
is coming from. I'm afraid it will become a haven for radicals...for the
nuclear freeze nuclear war group."

He asked me if I wasn't following Tsongas and I said yes. He said he
was dealing with Tsongas on sugar imports. "W're going to try to get rid
of the quota all together. You can't do it in the farm bill. Every member
has some program they are interested in. But if you come at it from the
outside, you may be able to do it. We want to get 15 co-sponosrs and that will
help get it (scheduled)". He said "I think Paul comes at it from the consumer
angle. You'll have to ask him. I'm interested in the consumer, \$oo, but I
don't have much contact with consumer groups. He does. I come at it because
it creates a privileged class of citizens. The farm program is so schizophrenic.
Farmers want you to cut the budget, but they want their programs, too.

He talked about tax simplification act that he's interested in. Went
into some enthusiastic detail. It's like his desire for 2 year budget cycle.
He's an institutional tinkerer. Can be moved by talk that makes something
work better.

His wife cut his hair this morning!