

Jim Greenwood, Washington, DC, March 17, 1995 (430 Cannon 225-4276)

- Judy Bonger, Mary _____.
- I found JG in the aftermath of his most important legislative fight yet.
- When I went in (for my 15 minutes--after an hour wait!), I said, "I just wanted to see what you were doing, what you were thinking and whether you had been able to get your oar in."
- "This past week has been the most historic time for me in terms of getting my oar in," he began. And he proceeded to tell me the story of his leadership role in a "revolt of the moderates" against an anti-abortion (Istook) amendment which was slated to be attached to the 17b. recissions bill.
- The details of the bill and the overall picture can be gleaned from the various reports he gave me and I have accumulated since then. (Check March 13, 14, 15 Congressional Record.)
- CQ's "Congressional Monitor" March 15th called him "the leader of the moderates on this issue." And I think he also spoke of himself as "the leader," but I don't have any direct quote to that effect in my notes.
- "I don't think I've mentioned this before, but I'm a member of the 'lunch bunch,' a group of 40 or 50 Republican moderates who get together once a week for lunch to discuss issues. Sometimes, in the last Congress, we took a position on an issue. But we never drew a line in the sand. When you are in the minority, after all, it doesn't much matter. But this week, for the first time, we drew a line in the sand. We said to the leadership, 'If you don't remove this anti-abortion amendment, we are going to kill the bill.'"
- "The Istook amendment came from the far right wing of the party. As soon as it appeared, I argued in the 'lunch bunch' that if we were ever going to have any influence in the party, we had to take a stand against it. I got 20 signatures on a letter to the leadership stating flatly that we could not support the recission bill, with the amendment in it. (Among their arguments was that abortion was not mentioned in the Contract.) I called Gingrich over the weekend to tell him about the letter. And I told him there were at least a dozen more members who would vote to kill the bill, but did not want to sign the letter. He said that was interesting and thanked me for calling."
- During the weekend, he also talked with Armey, who presented Jim with a procedural problem I did not understand. But JG said he went home and worked out some solution "merging the

JIM GREENWOOD, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 17, 1995-1

- two bills" (?) that helped procedurally. But he believed, at the time, that Armey thought he didn't need the moderates.
- The amendment was legislation on an appropriations bill and as such, needed a waiver from the Rules Committee. Jim and three others went to the Rules Committee to argue against it. One of the others was Connie Morella, "our most liberal member." I think the others were Democrats--E. Holmes Norton was one.
 - "It was the first time I had ever set foot in that room... Solomon (Chairman of Rules) called me a hypocrite. I said to him, 'How can you say that after all the times you pleaded with me in the last Congress to vote against legislation on appropriations bills?'"
 - The Rules Committee delayed their vote on the rule while negotiations went forward and Istook was convinced to "take down" his amendment in exchange for a promise that it would be brought up later. When (on Monday, I think) Jim went before Rules, the Istook amendment was in the bill. They held up the meeting to check and found that they didn't have the votes, came back and rewrote the rule without Istook.
 - For awhile, the leadership did not take the Republican moderates seriously, because they thought the conservative Democrats would bail them out--that they did not need their own moderates.
 - So Jim went into some detail on the relationship between the "lunch bunch" and "the coalition" of conservative Democrats. The coalition had asked to come to a lunch bunch meeting to talk about mutual interests, which they did. "They said that we could take over the Congress if the two groups could cooperate with one another." The leadership made a bid to get the deficit-hawk Democrats on the recission vote by offering a "lock box" provision that all the savings would be devoted to deficit reductions.
 - It is not clear why the Dems did not bite. But Jim says, "I went to Tauzin and I said, 'the Republican leadership is counting on you guys to fill their tent. If you meant what you said about cooperating with us, you should not help them...'. Tom Delay told us 'we are going to run over you;' and he had his many minions out working the Democrats. But he found they were not there."
 - "If we had lost this fight, we would have been out of business for the rest of this Congress. We would not have been consulted. We would have been on the sidelines, without influence. Now that we have won, we have served notice that we must be consulted. We are 20% of the Republican membership and we want 20% of the legislative business."

JIM GREENWOOD, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 17, 1995-2

- Has there been any reaction from the district? "None of the local papers have picked it up. It's still too much inside baseball for them to notice. But Newsweek is coming in to talk to me tomorrow."
- On district sentiment: "Tonight, I'm going to hold my first town meeting on the Contract. I've invited all the people who have written me about the Contract--pro or con. So we'll see what happens."
- "I'm also starting to work on the reauthorization of the family planning legislation. It has been funded for years, but never reauthorized. With all the emphasis on family problems, it's time we took a look at the basic legislation."

JIM GREENWOOD, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 17, 1995-3