

MARK ANDREWS

May 7, 1982

I wanted to talk to Mark about Budget and Transportation matters. I'm transcribing this 3 days later and so I fear I'll miss a lot. But my view of Mark as "hardball farmer" was immeasurably strengthened.

Bill had told me that a federal appeals court had overturned Judge Ritchie on the Garrison Dam today. When I went in Mark was on the last third of a cigar, with feet up on the desk. I mentioned Garrison. "It just vindicates the provision Quent and I put in the Senate bill last year. Of course, Byron Dougan called it a horse shit provision--after he lost it 4-1 in the House. We're mightly pleased."

"Did you see that' show last night?" "Yes, I tayed till the end." "Jim Sasser saved the day for me. I wanted to go out to dinner with some North Dakota folks and Mary was reading. I was squirming around, when Jim Sasser said he had to leave and asked unanimous consent to be recorded against the resolution. So I jumped right in and asked unanimous consent to be recorded in favor of the resolution. Besides, I had already voted twice with the Democrats. And I probably would have voted with them several more times. That would have displeased my Republican colleagues, so Sasser gave me a graceful way out." *Doesn't want to shut out*

"Howard Baker came up to me today, and said 'We've got to get the budget resolution through without any amendments.' I said I agreed that we had to get a budget resolution passed. He said "You've been voting with the Democrats". I told him 'I've been voting for those programs since before you came to Congress, Howard.' He said 'I know; but we've got to get this budget resolution through. I said I didn't know whether I'd vote for amendments or not. Then he said 'What do you want?' I said 'I want this REA deal and a couple of other things.' He said 'You've got 'em.' He chuckled.

"I guess I'm a marked man around here I was the only Republican to vote

to resind the third year of the tax cut. I was the only Republican to vote for the Hollings motion on education."

I asked him why he had done that. "If you're going to be in this business, you've got to be serious about it. There isn't anything more basic to what this country is all about than the opportunity for people to obtain long term credit--to build a small house, start a small business, or buy a small farm. Interest rates are so gol darned high--16 1/2%--that long term borrowing is impossible. People can stand it for one year, maybe two. But if we don't bring interest rates down, and make long term borrowing possible again, there will be a wrenching in this country worse than anything except an invasion by the Russians. And, frankly, I don't know which would be worse. One problem is that we gave too big tax cut last year. At the White House the other day I told the President that and he nearly flipped. I told him people thought he started on the right track and had things going well until the big tax bill, that people feel he went off the track there and has had his head in the sand ever since. I said people felt he had to do something--and getting rid of the 3rd year tax cut would be a start. I said we should deal in large numbers and not worry about this and that. The others were saying 'we can't cut social security, we can't cut defense, we can't increase taxes. No one else was as blunt as I was. I feel you've got to be honest with yourself. If I'm honest with myself, it's easy for me to explain to the folks back homewhat I did and why I did it. On the Hollings motion, I just believe in those programs. As I say, I probably would have voted for more if I had stayed.

I asked him about the deferral problems and the transportation bill. He explained the problem and the amounts involved--the freeze was done on the basis of last year's budget outlays and not last year's program levels. He had 800 million(?) that was deferred from 81 and spent in 82 but not

*I think Mark
Andrew understands
interest rates in his
gut better than
anyone else in
my group.*

appropriated in 82 and so the amount that was frozen was 800 below 82 spending levels. He wanted it put back. "I went out into the corridor with Domenici, Steve Bell and Keith Kennedy from the Appropriations Committee. We reached an understanding that 800 million dollars in the appropriations bill would be earmarked for my bill. That took care of me. It also took care of a little for Kasten. When we got back in the meeting I said, for the record, that I appreciated the accommodation the chairman had made. And I asked Kasten. to say he appreciated it, too. We did it publicly. That's the way I do things. I don't go off in the corner and make a deal. The staff people may forget it--on purpose or not. If it's in publi everyone understands what has been done. Domenici knew what I was doing. The Democrats knew what I was doing. Most of the people around the table had a bridge or a highway or the coast guard or something they wanted in that bill. And the bottom line was that Steve Bell could count. He runs that committee with a heavy hand, and he's close to Stockman. He knew he had two potential votes against him--and Dan Quayle would probably come along as the third. Dan didn't do so well, though. He came up to me on the floor and said 'We've got an agreement with the Appropriations Committee.' I played honest injun with him. I told him, 'I'm taken care of but you are not.' Mark Hatfield came by and I said to him 'That's a good deal we made.' 'He said yes, we agreed on all but the CETA money.' Dan jumped up. I believe in being honest with a colleague. He went back to the committee and offered an amendment. But he was talked into withdrawing it. I don't know what he'll do. But that's his problem. That's the way it goes. I never thought much of the CETA program anyway. "

I talked to him about the subcommittee and its progress. He said "We've finished our hearings and we're waiting for the House to pass its bill first. I wouldn't be surprised if we didn't get a bill from them till July."

He talked about last year's Continuing Resolution and how he had an FY82 bill all passed. But, he said (and I've got to check with Chip on this) Reagan signed the continuing resolution 4 days after (or before) his Transportation bill went through. That meant that he didn't get the difference between his bill and the continuing resolution. But if RR had signed the continuing resolution before he signed the Transportation Bill, Mark would have gotten more money.

He said that when you operate under a continuing resolution, you get a lump sum and it is much more difficult to earmark special projects. That hurt him in the last year, too. He thinks Congress is "the people's House" and that members do a lot better job than the executive of allocating money to various projects.

The result is that (and I think the problem is that Transportation got folded into the cont. res. last year somehow). Mark is going to have to use the supplemental which is coming up soon (it's on its way through the House) to get some of the projects through that he couldn't earmark last year.

Bob Byrd has one,
"I've got 15m for a little bridge in North Dakota, /Pete Domenici has something in New Mexico, John Glenn has something he wants; we've got all these special deals. When you operate under continuing resolution, it's a lot more difficult to earmark those little deals. You have to be pretty nimble. I am. But I didn't get them all. Under a continuing resolution, the executive branch has a lot more discretion to do what they want. But Congress is the people's house, and I think it does a better job of earmarking these projects. We know who has gotten what, who has been waiting in line and we follow cost benefit formulas. When the supplemental comes up, we'll try to do some earmarking for a few of the special deals we didn't get last year."

I asked him about the subcommittee - "I've got a very interesting subcommittee. On the Republican side, I don't have a single person who ever served

an appropriations committee before. And on the Democratic side I have a bunch of rookies like Lawton Chiles, Bob Byrd and Bennett Johnstone. They came to the first few meetings and they have not been back since. They came to see whether I could do the job, and I guess they decided I could. In my bill, everybody was accommodated within the realm of possibility and we still came in below the House bill. That's an accomplishment. When the bill came to the floor, it sipped through in a few minutes. I'm grateful for that. It's the kind of recognition you cherish around here.

"The other members of the subcommittee don't come to the hearings. They can't. They are spread too thin. But their presence is felt--always. Senatorial courtesy works. And they expect me to watch out for them--just as I expect them to look out for me. The people sitting in back of me (at the hearings) aren't my staff. They are the staffs of the other members... It's a lot easier to chair a Senate subcommittee than it is a House subcommittee. In the House, they all come, they all want to ask questions, and you have to sit through a lot of repetition. Here you get to ask all the questions you want to ask."

"The buddy system is very important when you go to conference with the House. The House members are there and they are all experts. Your members haven't any idea what it's all about. So they have to be willing to give you their proxies. If they decide to go it alone, it would be a disaster. Last year on one matter I didn't have one proxy I thought I had. One of my members voted against me on the 406 subsidy issue I couldn't do all I wanted to do in getting rid of that program. I made sure he'll never do that again. We talked; and you can be sure that won't happen again. This year we'll get rid of the 406 program. And I'll make darn sure that I've got all my proxies."

He said again "I'm not so sure we need a budget process." and told the story again of how he told PD that "I'm not sure I believe in the budget process. I've been fighting alongside Jamie Whitten for years telling the budget committee to keep its hands off appropriations. But he said he wanted someone on the committee who understood the Appropriations process. So I said just so as you understand." "I asked him if Kasten's support wasn't due to his sophistication re approp. (as compared, say, to Quayle) and he said Kasten had interest in FAA and something else.