

Pg. 73-1992

This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas.

<http://dolearchives.ku.edu>

Hutchinson News Saturday, Feb. 8, 1992 Page 3

THE WICHITA EAGLE Monday, February 3, 1992

Dole starts with full war chest

\$2 million available for Senate campaign

By Barry Massey
Associated Press

WASHINGTON — Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole of Kansas has slightly more than \$2 million available for his re-election campaign at the start of the year, according to new financial reports.

That is six times more than the campaign money held by Rep. Dan Glickman, the Wichita Democrat who is considering running for the Senate.

Glickman had a cash reserve of \$312,161 in his campaign treasury at the start of the year, according to a summary of his financial report provided Friday by the Glickman campaign.

Dole listed cash balances of slightly more than \$1 million in each of his two campaign accounts, according to reports filed last week with the secretary of the Senate.

Dole has been raising money with his 1992 re-election campaign committee but also has money left over in his 1986 Senate campaign account.

The Federal Election Commission said most leftover money can be used in future campaigns. But Dole has said some of the surplus would go to the FEC to settle a dispute over potential overpayment of federal matching money to Dole's 1988 presidential campaign.

During the last six months of 1991, Dole's campaign collected \$196,000 in contributions and spent about \$161,000. When the money was raised, Dole had not declared publicly whether he was going to run for another six-year term. The senator announced last week that he would seek re-election.

Political action committees, or PACs, provided 69 percent of Dole's contributions, or \$135,850.

PACs sponsored by agricultural or food industry groups contributed almost \$30,000 to Dole.

PACs are formed by corporations, labor unions and trade groups to make contributions to federal candidates using money donated by their employees or stockholders.

Among the top PAC contributors to Dole were those sponsored by the Chicago Board of Trade, \$5,000; American Bankers Association, \$5,000; and National Food Processors Association, \$5,000.

Most of Dole's individual contributions came from people living outside Kansas.

Of the contributions itemized on his report, about 10 percent, or \$6,000, came from Kansans. Among them was Morris Kay, regional director of the Environmental Protection Agency, who gave Dole \$500.

Among the out-of-state contributions were \$2,000 from Amelia Gallo, of the wine-making family in Modesto, Calif., and \$6,000 from three officials of a New York company, Fred Alger Management.

Dole's expenses included \$28,000 for opinion polling. The payments were made in July and November. Dole has said that he conducted the polling to help in deciding whether to seek re-election.

Friday was the filing deadline for candidates to report on campaign activities during the last six months of 1991. To meet the deadline, however, candidates need only have their reports postmarked by Friday.

For example, a copy of Glickman's newest campaign finance report was not available from the Federal Election Commission.

Glickman collected about \$74,000 in contributions during the last six months of 1991, according to the summary provided by his campaign. PACs provided about 40 percent of those contributions, or \$29,670. Glickman reported expenditures of about \$86,000.

Dole faces a primary challenge from Richard Rodewald, a retired automotive worker who lives near Eudora. No campaign finance report for Rodewald was available from the secretary of the Senate on Friday. Candidates are required to file the reports only after they raise or spend \$5,000.

should be delayed until 1996 because of the state's financial condition.

This would be the first presidential preference primary in Kansas since 1980.

Other bills on the Legislature's agenda:

■ Fixing the prison sentence that judges can hand down, removing much of the discretion judges have when they sentence a felon.

The bill was endorsed earlier by the Senate Judiciary Committee after more than a week of hearings.

■ Qualified admissions for the state universities. The proposal will be taken up by the Senate Education Committee on Wednesday and Thursday.

The Board of Regents has been lobbying for qualified admissions for years with no success.

The bill would establish certain requirements students must meet before they could be admitted to one of the six state universities. Right now, any Kansas resident with a diploma from a state high school

must be accepted.

Those students who do not meet the minimum requirements under the bill would be allowed to attend a two-year community college and then transfer to one of the four-year institutions if their academic record improves.

Kerr said, however, that there is a chance the bill will be endorsed by the committee and sent to the Senate for debate for the first time.

"I hope we have a chance to debate that," he said. "More and more people are seeing this as something positive for high schools."



Dole Seeking fourth six-year term in Senate.

Dole says U.S. requires export subsidies

By Ray Hemman
The Hutchinson News
Farm Writer

An ideal world wouldn't need export subsidies.

But this is not an ideal world for trade, said Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., during his regular weekly telephone news conference with Kansas journalists.

Dole was asked to react to comments made earlier this week by William R. Pearce, vice chairman of the board of Cargill Inc., who said the Export Enhancement Program had not resulted in increased sales of bulk grain.

The Export Enhancement Program provides export subsidies to lower the cost of U.S. commodities, making the food and feed stuffs more competitive on the world market.

"My view is, I'd like to get rid of all of them," Dole said. "I'd like to get rid of all export subsidies and play on a level playing field."

"I don't think we can do that."

We can't expect our farmers to do that. That's not going to be a global initiative, which includes the European Community and some other countries like Australia, Argentina and others."

Dole said he agreed EEP needed to be reviewed along with all government programs. The program at times has offered subsidies as large as \$1 or more per bushel.

Yet the United States must remain competitive if it is going to sell grain, he said.

"If we are going to have to remain competitive, we are going to have to have some kind of (export subsidy) program or get some kind of agreement that will terminate these kinds of subsidies, which would be the best thing that would happen," Dole said.

"Would prices have been higher (without EEP)? I doubt it."

In fact, testimony at the Agriculture subcommittee on wheat, soybeans and feed grains, sup-



Dole

Glickman

ported Dole's assumption on the impact of EEP on grain prices.

"We had testimony from Chris Goldthwait during the hearing," said Rep. Dan Glickman, D-Kan., and chairman of the subcommittee. "He said that without EEP, the price of grain would be 30 to 50 cents a bushel less."

"Cargill may have its reasons for making the statements. Perhaps they may make more money on grain that's priced more cheaply."

Glickman made his comments Friday during the 1992 Ag Cele-

bration Day at Hutchinson's Convention Hall.

About 600 farmers attended the meeting, which was sponsored by the Mid America Ag Network and several other groups.

Actually, Cargill's statements Thursday broke no new ground.

"They wrote us six years ago, and their position was consistent with that taken now," Glickman said. "... It may have to do with the fact they own facilities in the EC (European Economic Community), the Far East and elsewhere and see it as a global market."

Glickman said it was important that the United States not end EEP now, because the nation was involved in negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which are the rules that govern international trade.

Three individuals in the grain industry said EEP was a factor in the markets.

Tom Hausman, Continental COF, said the export program was an important factor in the overseas sales of wheat. Without EEP, the U.S. share of world wheat exports would have slipped.

"If we don't sell the wheat, someone else will," added Roland Hecht, individual trader on the Kansas City Board of Trade.

In the current market environment, subsidies are an unavoidable reality, said Sandra Pennington, vice president of marketing for the Kansas City Board of Trade. She, Hausman and Hecht attended Friday's 1992 Ag Celebration Days.

Although the U.S. subsidies have critics, the European Economic Community subsidizes its exports at a rate four times that of the United States.

"If you are going to retain world market share, you will have to subsidize," Ms. Pennington said.

-The Russell Daily News, Thursday, Feb. 27, 1992

Kansas Restaurateurs Ask Dole To Help Save Hundreds of Jobs

WICHITA — A group of Kansas restaurant owners is out to convince Sen. Bob Dole that Congress can save hundreds of state jobs in the near future — and that he can have considerable influence on that process.

Dole will have a key vote on the powerful Senate Finance Committee when the Senate considers repealing a 1987 law that requires employers to pay FICA taxes on all tips earned by their employees.

This burden, unique to the restaurant industry, has already cost Kansas restaurateurs millions of dollars. And that's not all. These small business owners have recently learned that in some parts of the country the IRS has begun assessing back taxes on tipped income it feels may have been under-reported in previous years.

"Make no mistake, unless this law is repealed, a lot of full-service restaurants in this area are going to close," predicts Mark Martin, owner of the Brookville Hotel in Brookville and chairman of a group called Kansas Restaurateurs for Fair Tip Taxes. "The effect of this unfair tax has been devastating."

Bills to repeal the law have been introduced in both houses of Congress with widespread bipartisan support. Restaurateurs nationwide are pushing to include them as part of a larger tax-relief

package considered by Congress early this year.

Eating and drinking establishments in Kansas employ approximately 67,000 people, nearly half of whom earn tips. Prior to the law's enactment in 1988, restaurateurs paid FICA taxes on only a portion of the tips — specifically, any tip income used as a "tip credit" to satisfy an employer's minimum wage obligations.

"It's a clear double standard," argued Martin. "The federal government gets to count 100 percent of my employee's tips as wages for tax purposes, yet won't allow me to count more than 50 percent of them toward meeting the minimum wage."

Martin said some of his fellow restaurateurs estimate that the 1987 FICA tax-on-tips law has nearly tripled the FICA taxes they pay for their tipped employees, no laughing matter in an industry that already exists on razor-thin profit margins. As a result, many local restaurants have been forced to reduce the hours of their waitstaff or, far worse, fire employees in order to avoid raising menu prices.

Loren Unruh, owner and operator of the Black Angus Steak Ranch in Great Bend, commented on the law's impact on his business. "This law is making it really tough for full-service restaurants in rural areas to remain

competitive. I have really had to limit the number of people I employ; I make up for it by working more myself. The effect on employment levels in rural areas where restaurants are critical to the economy has got to be devastating."

The fears of restaurateurs were recently exacerbated, Martin said, when IRS regional offices began billing individual restaurants for back taxes based on the IRS's estimate of how much an employee should have earned in a given year.

The increased vulnerability to tip audits infuriates restaurant owners because they never even see tip money in the first place. Strictly speaking, tips are a transaction between the customer and the server, which by law the employer cannot control.

The Salina Journal

10 Saturday February 8, 1992

Health care may hinge on election

Vote seen as clue to changing system

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON — This year's election will serve as a referendum on health care and help determine what legislation Congress will approve, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole said Friday.

Dole, R-Kan., expressed doubts lawmakers would agree this year on any package of reforms to control rising medical costs and expand the availability of health insurance coverage.

"It's fair to say that maybe not this year, but in 1993 this will probably be on the first orders of business," Dole said.

There are dozens of health care overhaul proposals pending in Congress, and President Bush unveiled his plan Thursday.

With both Congress and the White House advocating reforms, Dole said, "something will be done."

"It will probably be after this year's election because I think the election is going to be sort of a referendum on which way we should go," he said.

Democrats and Republicans, including Bush, have disagreed on the basic approach to health care reform, particularly on how government will get involved.

The most far-reaching proposals would implement national health insurance or a system of universal health care administered and paid for by the federal government.

Republicans have objected to a proposal by Senate Democratic leaders, which would extend health insurance coverage to all Americans through a "play or pay" system of government mandates.

Employers, for instance, would be required to provide health insurance to workers and their families or pay into a public program offering coverage for the uninsured.

Democrats have criticized Bush's proposal — and a similar Senate GOP package that Dole supports — because they rely on tax incentives to help make health care more accessible.

For example, the president has proposed tax credits and deductions for individuals to pay for medical insurance.

Critics say it doesn't do anything to resolve major health-care problems, such as escalating costs of medical care and refusals by insurers to sell coverage to some people.



Dole

SUNDAY ■ FEBRUARY 9, 1992 ■ THE HAYS DAILY NEWS ■ 26

Dole: US can't do without farm export subsidies

By HARRIS NEWS SERVICE

An ideal world wouldn't need export subsidies.

But this is not an ideal world for trade, said Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., during his regular weekly telephone news conference with Kansas journalists.

Dole was asked to react to comments made last week by William R. Pearce, vice chairman of the board of Cargill Inc., who said the Export Enhancement Program had not resulted in increased sales of bulk grain.

The Export Enhancement Program provides export subsidies to lower the cost of U.S. commodities, making the food and feed stuffs more competitive on the world market.

"My view is, I'd like to get rid of all of them," Dole said. "I'd like to get rid of all export subsidies and play on a level playing field."

"I don't think we can do that. We

can't expect our farmers to do that. That's not going to be a global initiative, which includes the European Community and some other countries like Australia, Argentina and others."

Dole said he agreed that EEP needed to be reviewed along with all government programs. The program at times has offered subsidies as large as \$1 or more per bushel.

Yet the United States must remain competitive if it is going to sell grain, he said.

"If we are going to have to remain competitive, we are going to have to have some kind of (export-subsidy) program or get some kind of agreement that will terminate these kinds of subsidies, which would be the best thing that would happen," Dole said.

"Would prices have been higher (without EEP)? I doubt it."

In fact, testimony at the Agriculture subcommittee on wheat,

soybeans and feed grains supported Dole's assumption on the impact of EEP on grain prices.

Rep. Dan Glickman, D-Kan., chairman of the subcommittee, said testimony showed "that without EEP, the price of grain would be 30 to 50 cents a bushel less."

"Cargill may have its reasons for making the statements. Perhaps they may make more money on grain that's priced more cheaply."

Glickman made his comments Friday during the 1992 Ag Celebration Day at Hutchinson's Convention Hall.

About 600 farmers attended the meeting, which was sponsored by the Mid America Ag Network and several other groups.

Actually, Cargill's statements Thursday broke no new ground. "They wrote us six years ago, and their position was consistent with that taken now," Glickman said.

"... It may have to do with the fact

they own facilities in the EC (European Economic Community), the Far East and elsewhere and see it as a global market."

Glickman said it was important that the United States not end EEP now, because the nation was involved in negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which are the rules that govern international trade.

Three individuals in the grain industry said EEP was a factor in the markets.

Tom Hausman, Continental COF, said the export program was an important factor in the overseas sales of wheat. Without EEP, the U.S. share of world wheat exports would have slipped.

"If we don't sell the wheat, someone else will," added Roland Hecht, individual trader on the Kansas City Board of Trade.

In the current market environment, subsidies are an unavoidable

reality, said Sandra Pennington, vice president of marketing for the Kansas City Board of Trade. She, Hausman and Hecht attended Friday's 1992 Ag Celebration Days.

Although the U.S. subsidies have critics, the European Economic Community subsidizes its exports at a rate four times that of the United States.

"If you are going to retain world market share, you will have to subsidize," Pennington said.

For the traders, the issue of EEP is simply economic — staying competitive in the world trading environment. They see the current talk about EEP as political — something outside their normal realm of activity.

"Our government has definitely committed itself to maintaining market share," Hecht said. "... The politics of the situation is wildly unpredictable."

Champagne labeling gets Kansan's input

By Diana Williams
Eagle Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON — Sen. Bob Dole, never known for his champagne tastes, is helping a California winery push for a change in the way inexpensive bubbly is labeled.

Dole, whose campaign received thousands of dollars from members of the E&J Gallo Winery family, has written the U.S. Treasury to suggest that

regulations on labels for bulk-produced champagne be changed.

The winery wants to drop the required "bulk method" description from its champagne label and use the swankier "Charmat method," named for an inventor of large-scale fermenting.

The move, however, is vehemently opposed by champagne

makers who use traditional champagne methods and ferment wine in individual bottles. They say the bulk description gives consumers an easy distinction between their product and Charmat champagnes.

"I don't think he has any business being there," said Gary Heck, president of Korbel winery of Guerneville, Calif. "Kansas is not one of the top 10 markets in the country for champagne."

Dole, along with Sen. John Seymour, R-Calif., wrote the letter Feb. 7, urging officials to "modernize the regulations on champagne labeling" because "for most Americans, champagne is champagne, regardless of the production method."

During the past three years, members of the Gallo family have donated at least \$12,000 to Dole's campaign and \$85,000 to Campaign America, a group formed by Dole that gives money to other candidates.

Walt Riker, Dole's spokesman, said the Gallos' campaign contributions were not related to Dole's letter.



Dole