

JM - Before you call McCurdy - call Jack - and we'll do a conference call.

Moakley notes for McCurdy

- 1) McCurdy was at yesterday's meeting -- and suggested that his alternative plan be considered as a compromise...no one listened. I think he's extremely frustrated.
- 2) McCurdy is key -- because he's talked to a lot of moderates already. He wants to be a player.
- 3) McCurdy's proposal deals with FY 91 funds -- and would only cut 50% if the President would certify, on October 1, that the Salvadoran Government hasn't satisfied the conditions.
- 4) Though you and McCurdy differ on when to cut the money...you should tell him that the conditions in his proposal are basically sound.
- 5) The problem we now face is that we must act within a week if we are to be relevant on this issue. If we wait too long, the Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report will be back before the House and at that time the Republicans can accuse us of holding up money for Panama and Nicaragua -- which we don't want to do.
- 6) The other problem is that you do not want to do anything that is an affront to Studds -- who is from Massachusetts -- or to the Foreign Affairs Committee. So you are hesitant about changing everything that's already in the bill.
- 7) The point of passing the Foreign Affairs Committee language at this time is twofold: 1) it strengthens our position at a bargaining table with the Administration and 2) it makes the Democratic Party look like we're pushing for peace.
- \* 8) We are currently having a difficult time holding liberals on the Foreign Affairs language. Miller is pushing hard for an amendment to cut everything.
- 9) I do not expect that the language currently passed by the Foreign Affairs Committee will be law. I would expect in conference that the House would concede withholding FY 90 monies for FY 91 monies; that the conditions would change; and perhaps the amount withheld could be less than 50 percent (perhaps 30 or 25%). **But these things will be worked out in conference.**
- 10) I have a proposition. Moakley-McCurdy would offer a substitute that would basically be the Studds bill with the following additions: 1) a condition barring political assassinations by both the FMLN and military; 2) a provision requiring that all military aid be sent through Cristiani (strengthening his hand); 3) a provision allowing for monies to be given to a number of election monitoring organizations in preparation for the 91 Salvadoran elections and 3) additional language to the reporting requirement in the Studds bill which would incorporate many of the concerns you raise in your bill.

11) Again, I think almost everything I've mentioned is in the McCurdy bill.

12) As I've said, I think most of your proposal can be worked out in conference...and I think I can assure that you get a seat on the conference committee.

13) I think it's important that we're unified. I recognize your concerns -- and I think they will prevail in conference. But we also can't have a bill that we lose because the liberals take a walk. And, guys like George Miller are raising hell that we're compromising too much.

14) I'm sure that even with the suggestions I've added, you're still not totally pleased with it. But, I don't know what else I can do. If we lose -- we send a signal to the military that it's business as usual.

15) But, again I promise to work with you on the conference committee towards something more to what you have suggested.

Dave McCurdy

home

703 - 356 - 8284