

RICH ARENBERG

Lunch, March 10, 1980

We talked some about the Presidential campaign and then some about Paul.

About Paul, his first comment was that "Paul has had a good first year. He is as happy as I've ever seen him--ever since Christmas. It takes quite a while to get over the campaign."

And later he came back to this. "I said earlier that Paul has had a very good first year. What do I mean by that? I mean he's had a good year inside the institution. He has won the respect of his colleagues. They know that he works hard and know his stuff. He's credible. Some of it is invisible, like his work on the Conservation Bank and the Solar Bank in Energy in committee. While the other parts of the bill, the Energy Board, Synthetic fuels, the windfall profits tax were getting the headlines, Paul was working quietly to build up the conservation component of the bill. His colleagues on the committee learned that he would do the work on complicated matters. That got him inside the process. Junior members can still get frozen out in the Senate. But he hasn't been. And there have been times when he has brought some votes with him in the well of the Senate--on the world development bank, for example. You win victories like that in the Senate through personal respect--much more even, than in the House. You win votes on the floor of the House. But there, it's more like guerilla warfare. You organize squads of people to go around the floor and badger people especially when they come in the door. That's accepted practice on every vote in the House. In the Senate; it's much more one person to another. You have to get to know all the people you are dealing with. Paul has done that and he's comfortable in the institution. All of Paul's strengths as legislator we recognized have been recognized by his colleagues."

We talked about what I wanted to do, and he said it would be easy to find Paul doing something. On this side there's always something. In the House you might pick Mr. X and watch him for six months while all he did was answer constituency mail. In the House, action tends to be episodic (he made waves

with his hand). When you are busy, you go all out for a few weeks and then there's nothing. That's the biggest difference between the House and Senate. Over here, the intensity level is always high, always up there. (He made a straight line with his hand, up around his eyes.) There's always something. And there's always a lot of other 'somethings' percolating just below the surface. As soon as there's an opportunity, these other 'somethings' burst through the cracks."

The legislative battles he mentioned were Alaska Lands, Chrysler, African, Energy. "If you were here this year, you could have watched Paul on the Alaska Lands issue, which is a continuation of what he did in the House, or you could take the Chrysler issue, which was very intense for about 5 weeks, or you could watch him try to develop his position as the leading Senator on African issues to see how successful he has been at that or you could watch him on energy, the issue he thinks is the single most important one of all. He always comes back to that. None of these has much to do with Massachusetts. So while Paul has been developing a base in the Senate, we haven't done as much with our home base as I'd like. But that's one of the benefits of the 6 year term. Paul takes a long run view of these things, though. He doesn't grab a headline every time a grant comes through. But the people back home who are actually working on these things know Paul is interested. And when we need the political support, they will know he has helped. That was Brooke's trouble as we saw it. He had things he could point to as accomplishments but the infra-structure back home knew he hadn't been around."

Seems as though Paul has entered a new stage - campaign is really over, he's busy on legislative matters, and he feels comfortable.

Re Chrysler. "Originally, Paul was strongly opposed to helping Chrysler. We had had a couple of bouts with them in Massachusetts and his attitude was that

they were getting what they deserved. He went to Detroit to make a speech-- I think Detroit reminded him of Lowell and of the industrial cities of Mass.-- and for the first time he began to see the issue in terms of the regional economy and jobs. He came in to me the next day and said "I'm the swing man on the committee and I want to draft a compromise bill that will get out of committee." It caught me completely by surprise. So we took every available person in the office, divided up the work, read the documents and put together a compromise bill--eventually, it went through 5 different versions. The bill that could get out of committee wouldn't carry on the floor. We had to find a path between Proxmire who was against it and Riegle who was pushing it. We found out that Lugar was working along the same line, so we worked with his staff to produce what became the Tsongas-Lugar compromise. It was a case where the extreme left and the extreme right had a common interest. Proxmire called Paul and Lugar his two wide receivers."

Rich said again, in connection with Paul's success that he's interested in legislation and in pushing it through and in compromise and that he's flexible. He said ideologues don't get anywhere in the Senate. But when I asked him if there were any ideologues, he couldn't think of any. He opined that the opening up of the Senate had smoothed off any potential ideologues because they all got access and had to play. Maybe there just aren't any mavericks anymore--since everyone plays.

He said of Paul's approach to legislation. "He's interested in legislation and in pushing it through. That's just the way he was in the House. He went inside the process, even though there is more payoff to going outside when you are in the House. Over there, the temptation is to go outside and put pressure on the institution rather than to sit there and be one of the crowd."

He also is not unhappy working with conservatives, Don Young in the House, Lugar and Roth in Senate. His substitute on Alaska Lands is the Tsongas-Roth substitute.

Idea - maybe all staffers and Senators see themselves as working within the institution and that the outside is the insider today. There are really no outsiders now.

Paul comes through (in Rich's eyes) as a legislator-negotiator.