

May 4, 1992

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: SENATOR DOLE
FROM: NINA OVIEDO *Nina*
COPY TO: KERRY TYMCHUK
SUBJECT: SPEECH TO THE WINE INSTITUTE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

You are scheduled to speak to the Wine Institute's Board of Directors on Tuesday, May 5, 1992 at 4:00 p.m. at the Washington Court Hotel, Hermitage Room (Lower Level). This is a very informal meeting with approximately 30 attendees.

They would like to hear some general comments -- they have no specific requests as to topic.

John DeLuca will meet you at the Hotel entrance and introduce you. There are 12 Congressional members scheduled to speak ahead of you on the same day. Attached is the speaking schedule, attendee roster and some suggested remarks.

SENT BY: SULLIVAN & WORCESTER ; 3-25-92 ; 3:13PM ;

2022932275→

2022248952;# 2

SPEAK

~~Tues morning/afternoon,~~
May 5

SULLIVAN & WORCESTER
1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036
(202) 775-8190
TELECOPIER NO. 202-293-2275

IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109
(617) 338-2800
TELECOPIER NO. 617-338-2880
TWX: 710-321-1976

~~or~~ Wed morning, May 6
12:30
Washington Court Hotel

IN NEW YORK CITY
767 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017
(212) 466-8200
TELECOPIER NO. 212-758-2151

March 25, 1992

\$2,000-

Og

Ms. Yvonne Hopkins
Office of Senator Robert J. Dole
141 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-1601

Dear Ms. Hopkins:

I would like to invite Senator Dole to speak before the Wine Institute's Board of Directors during their annual visit to Washington on either Tuesday morning or afternoon, May 5 or Wednesday morning, May 6. The seminars will be held at the Washington Court Hotel on New Jersey Avenue. Please let me know at your earliest convenience.

A contribution of \$2,000 is available to be paid in Senator Dole's name to a designated charity of his choice.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,


Arthur H. Silverman

628-2100 Wash Ct

SPEAKERS FOR THE WINE INSTITUTE
1992 CALIFORNIA VINTNER DELEGATION

Seminars held at: Washington Court Hotel
525 New Jersey Avenue
Hermitage Room (Lower Level)

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1992

SPEAKER

8:30 a.m.	Rep. Don Edwards (D CA-10)
9:00 a.m.	Rep. Robert J. Lagomarsino (R CA-19)
9:30 a.m.	Rep. Byron L. Dorgan (D ND-AL)
10:00 a.m.	Rep. Al Swift (D WA-2)
10:30 a.m.	Rep. Carlos J. Moorhead (R CA-22)
11:00 a.m.	Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D CA-5)
11:30 a.m.	Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman (R NY-22)
12:30 p.m.	Rep. Robert T. Matsui (D CA-3)
2:00 p.m.	Rep. Bill Archer (R TX-7)
2:30 p.m.	Senator Thomas A. Daschle (D SD)
3:00 p.m.	Rep. Robert G. Torricelli (D NJ-9)
3:30 p.m.	Senator John Seymour (R CA)
4:00 p.m.	Senator Robert J. Dole (R KS) Republican Leader of the Senate
4:30 p.m.	Rep. Richard Lehman (D CA-18)

THE 1992 WASHINGTON WEEK
VINTNER DELEGATION
(4/24/92)

Don Chase, Heublein Fine Wine Group
Frank & Ludy Damrell
John De Luca, Wine Institute
Robert & Mary Beth Farver, The Chalone Group
Jim Finkle, Canandaigua Wine Company
Fred & Lisa Franzia, Bronco Wine Company
Lorraine Gafney, Wine Institute
John & Pamela Giumarra, Giumarra Vineyards
Allan Hemphill, Gauer Estate Winery
Elisabeth Holmgren, Wine Institute
Nancy Light, Wine Institute
Jerry & Carol Lohr, J. Lohr Winery
Dick Maher, Heublein Fine Wine Group
Mike & Zary Nury, Vie-Del Company
Peter Seremet, Heublein, Inc.
John & Elizabeth Sheela, Kenwood Vineyards
Barry & Audrey Sterling, Iron Horse Vineyards
Richard Walton, Heublein, Inc.



Margie Watkins, Wine Institute

Carolyn Wente, Wente Estate Winery

Frank Woods, International Wine Marketing Associates



SENATOR BOB DOLE

WINE INSTITUTE

MAY 5, 1992

**•THANK YOU. IT'S A
PLEASURE TO BE HERE TODAY.**

LOS ANGELES

**•I WANT TO TAKE A MINUTE
TO SPEAK TO AN AREA OF**

**CONCERN TO MANY AMERICANS
ESPECIALLY MANY OF YOU WHO
MUST HAVE COME TO TOWN
FROM CALIFORNIA.**

**•OF COURSE, THE NUMBER
ONE ISSUE ON CAPITOL HILL
LAST WEEK--AND THE NUMBER
ONE ISSUE IN AMERICA--WAS
THE RIOTS AND VIOLENCE IN
LOS ANGELES.**

**•I DON'T WANT TO GET IN
TO THE BUSINESS OF SECOND-
GUESSING JURIES, BUT AFTER
SEEING THE VIDEOS OF THE
INCIDENT, I WAS SURPRISED BY
THE VERDICT.**

**•I SPOKE WITH ATTORNEY
GENERAL BARR THE DAY AFTER
THE VERDICT, AND HE ASSURED
ME THAT THE JUSTICE**

**DEPARTMENT WAS MAKING ITS
INVESTIGATION INTO THE
BEATING A TOP PRIORITY.**

**•I ALSO HOPE THE
CALIFORNIA COURT SYSTEM
WILL MAKE A TOP PRIORITY OF
PROSECUTING ALL THOSE WHO
USED THE VERDICT AS AN
EXCUSE TO BREAK THE LAW.**

•PRESIDENT BUSH WAS IN MY

**OFFICE THIS MORNING TO MEET
WITH REPUBLICAN SENATORS,
AND WE DISCUSSED THE LOS
ANGELES SITUATION....**

**•I EXPECT THAT, SINCE THIS
IS AN ELECTION YEAR, THERE
WILL BE THOSE ATTEMPTING TO
PUT A POLITICAL SPIN ON THE
SITUATION--CRITICIZING
PRESIDENT BUSH FOR NOT**

**DOING ENOUGH, AND
ADVOCATING THE SPENDING OF
MORE MONEY.**

**•THE PROBLEM ISN'T HOW
MUCH MONEY WE'RE SPENDING
FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS--WE'RE
SPENDING A LOT--THE PROBLEM
IS HOW THAT MONEY IS SPENT.**

**•WE NEED TO FOCUS OUR
EFFORTS ON PROGRAMS THAT**

**WORK---THAT PROVIDE JOB
TRAINING...THAT PROMOTE
STRONG VALUES...THAT KEEP
THE AMERICAN FAMILY
TOGETHER.**

POLITICS

**•AND WHEN THINGS CALM
DOWN A BIT, I SUSPECT THAT
THE NUMBER ONE ISSUE OF**

**DISCUSSION IN WASHINGTON
WILL RETURN -- THE
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.**

**•THINGS WERE A BIT QUIET
FOR A WHILE. GOVERNOR
CLINTON WAS ORDERED BY HIS
DOCTORS TO STOP SPEAKING
FOR TWO WEEKS -- AND DURING
THOSE TWO WEEKS HIS POLL
NUMBERS WENT UP.**

**•AND THE NOISE OUT IN
TEXAS CONTINUES WHERE ROSS
PEROT KEEPS RISING IN THE
POLLS.**

**•THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT
THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT
CHANGE AND I THINK PEROT IS
SUCCEEDING RIGHT NOW
BECAUSE HE'S FOR CHANGE.**

•THE PROBLEM IS THAT NO

**ONE KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT HE
WOULD CHANGE. HE WON'T
DETAIL HIS POLICIES OR TAKE A
STAND ON ISSUES -- I THINK HE
EVEN REFUSED TO SAY
WHETHER HE VOTED FOR THE
"YOUNG ELVIS STAMP" OR THE
"FAT ELVIS STAMP."**

ECONOMY

**•WE HAVE SEEN SOME
RECENT ENCOURAGING SIGNS
THAT WE ARE EMERGING FROM
THE RECESSION. HOUSING AND
MANUFACTURING ARE UP ...
UNEMPLOYMENT SEEMS TO BE
STABILIZING ... WHAT
GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO DO IS
EXTEND A HELPING HAND TO**

**BUSINESS -- OR AT THE VERY
LEAST, JUST GET OUT OF YOUR
WAY.**

**•WITH ALL THE CRITICISM
THE DEMOCRATS HAVE LOBBED
AGAINST PRESIDENT BUSH ON
THE ECONOMY, IT AMAZES ME
THAT PART OF THEIR
LEGISLATIVE AGENDA AMOUNTS
TO NOTHING MORE THAN A**

PRESCRIPTION OF CYANIDE.

**•THEY SEEM INTENT ON
FINDING THOSE BUSINESSES
THAT ARE TURNING A PROFIT
OR KEEPING THEIR HEAD ABOVE
WATER, AND KNOCKING THEM
BACK UNDER WATER.**

**•WITH ALL THE POLITICS, IT
WILL BE QUITE DIFFICULT TO
GET ANYTHING DONE IN**

CONGRESS -- PARTICULARLY A TAX BILL.

**•THERE HAS BEEN SOME
TALK ABOUT THE SO-CALLED
"EXTENDERS" BUT IF
EVERYONE'S GOING TO ADD HIS
OR HER FAVORITE TAX ISSUE,
EXTENDERS WON'T GET DONE.**

•WE WILL BE ADDRESSING

**UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPENSATION AGAIN -- WE
HEAR RUMORS THAT THE
DEMOCRATS ARE PLANNING AN
EIGHT BILLION DOLLAR
PACKAGE. LET'S HOPE IT WON'T
COST YOU ANYTHING. IT'S A
GREAT ISSUE FOR
DEMAGOGUERY.**

CONCLUSION

**•IT'S FASHIONABLE NOW TO
CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT, AND
TO BELIEVE THAT HE'S IN
SERIOUS TROUBLE COME
NOVEMBER.**

**•AND THE FACT IS THAT
YES, HIS APPROVAL RATINGS
ARE LOW. BUT EVERY POLL
THAT PUTS THE PRESIDENT**

**FACE TO FACE WITH A
DEMOCRAT CANDIDATE, SHOWS
THE PRESIDENT WINNING.**

**•AS SOMEONE WHO TOOK A
ROLLER COASTER RIDE FROM
IOWA TO NEW HAMPSHIRE FOUR
YEARS AGO, I KNOW POLLS AND
PERCEPTIONS CAN CHANGE
OVERNIGHT.**

•THE PRESIDENT MAY LOOK

**VULNERABLE NOW, BUT I THINK
COME NOVEMBER, THE VOTERS
WILL REALIZE THAT FOUR MORE
YEARS OF HIS LEADERSHIP ARE
FAR BETTER THAN WHAT THE
DEMOCRATS HAVE TO OFFER.**

**•I URGE TO TAKE ACTION.
WE NEED YOUR HELP. WHILE
YOU'RE HERE, TAKE A TRIP UP
THE HILL AND TALK SOME**

**SENSE TO CONGRESS. IF YOU
WAIT MUCH LONGER YOU MAY
BE FACED WITH HIGHER TAXES
AND NO GROWTH.**

**•HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY OF
YOUR QUESTIONS.**

*Shine
Institute*

BOB DOLE
KANSAS

United States Senate

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7020

April 8, 1992

The Honorable Nicholas Brady
Secretary
Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 3330
Washington, D.C. 20220

Dear Secretary Brady:

I am writing to request your personal attention to an issue now pending before Treasury concerning the labeling of champagne.

I understand from Deputy Secretary Robson that the Department will likely go forward with a proposed rule in the near future. This letter is to request that you consider including in the proposed rule use of the terms "Charmat Method" or "Charmat Technique".

I am under the impression that the term "Charmat" is viewed positively by the BATF. It is a precisely accurate designation of the inventor of the method; analogous to the term "pasteurized". Moreover, as I explained to Deputy Secretary Robson, the term has been used on champagne labels in this country for many decades.

Apparently, there has been some discussion of using some "new" term. Before doing so, I urge you to seek comment on the term "Charmat", which I believe to be the simplest and most straightforward approach.

I very much appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Signed

BOB DOLE
Republican Leader

March 30, 1992

TO: SENATOR DOLE
FROM: SHEILA BURKE
SUBJECT: CHAMPAGNE LABELLING -- CALL TO SECRETARY ROBSON

Approximately nine months ago, Mr. Gallo contacted us and asked that you support their request for a proposed rulemaking on the issue of the use of the term champagne.

Very briefly, the fight is between those who make champagne the old-fashioned way (fermented in the bottle) and those who use a more recent method (fermented in large containers) the so-called Charmat Method. Producers like Gallo must clearly indicate on their labels that they are sparkling wine or champagne but only if qualified by the words "style", "type" or "bulk process". Gallo is seeking to have the regulations, last updated in 1958, reviewed and modified so they can simply say champagne, California style: Charmat Method.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is responsible for administration of these regs and actually agree with Gallo that a review is in order. The opponents, however, have convinced some of the folks at Treasury that no change should be made.

I am told that, at a minimum, a decision has been made to publish a new rule and ask for public comment. The question now is over what the rule will say and what will be available to comment on.

Gallo has asked that you call and ask that the term "Charmat" be listed as one option in the draft rule. "Charmat" is, in fact, the actual name of the process used and is well known by at least those consumers who care enough to look at the label. And while factual, it also has the advantage of not being a negative as the term "bulk" processed.

Treasury is within a day or two of deciding so the timing on the call is important. Deputy Secretary Robson has gotten involved in the issue because it is sensitive and it is for that reason I suggest a call to him. There are "heavy hitters" on the other side of the issue, including Howard Baker, who are arguing for no change -- but, in fact, Gallo is right to ask for a review.

I know we've been subject to some negative stories, but you've asked for nothing more than a public review of the issue -- if the public comment goes against Gallo -- he loses fair and square.

Call to Robson
4-1-92

TALKING POINTS -- CALL TO DEPUTY SECRETARY JOHN ROBSON

1. Ask for a notice of proposed rulemaking -- not an advance notice.
 - ATF has already considered the issue in great depth for more than two years.
 - An advance notice proceeding would require at least another two years to resolve. It is unfair to put business people through such protracted discussion and the resulting costs. Lets get it resolved.
2. In drafting the rule -- make sure "Charmat" is one of the options to be considered and available for comments.
 - The term "Charmat" is one that is a precise designation of the inventor of the method and is recognized by wine experts.
 - The minute fraction of champagne consumers who care about the process used to make their champagne know just what to look for and will not be confused.
 - There is no particular need to create new terms of art to be used to describe these methods of productions -- the old ones are understandable by the consumers who care enough to look.
 - If, in fact, consumers and wine producers are uncomfortable with the labeling changes they will have a chance to comment on the rule and have their comments reviewed.

BOB DOLE
KANSAS

United States Senate

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7020

February 7, 1992

The Honorable John E. Robson
Deputy Secretary
Department of Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 3326
Washington, D.C. 20220

Dear Mr. Robson:

We are writing to request your personal attention to an issue now before the Treasury concerning the labeling of champagne.

As I am sure you are aware, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms' labeling regulations for champagne were promulgated in the 1930s and have not been updated since 1958. These regulations require disclosure of production method for Charmat Champagne, but not for Champenoise or Transfer Champagnes.

Of course, for many years this country has recognized three methods for producing champagne -- Champenoise (the method recognized by the French), Charmat, and Transfer. The Charmat method was invented in France in 1910 by Eugene Charmat. The Transfer method originated in Germany and came to use in the 1950s.

A number of U.S. wineries adopted the Charmat method before Prohibition, and such champagnes have been produced in this country since Repeal in 1933. Over the years, the Charmat method has undergone extensive technological advances, and it has become the predominant U.S. approach to champagne production. Today, over 75 percent of U.S. champagne production is Charmat. Taking into account imported products, almost 60 percent of U.S. champagne consumption is Charmat.

Charmat producers believe that the current regulations regarding these methods make no sense. In fact, today's Charmat method is vastly improved over the method employed when the original regulations were adopted and the Champenoise method has become mechanized.

They further believe that the current regulations which require the use of the phrase "bulk process," create the misimpression that the Charmat method champagnes are inferior.

The Honorable John E. Robson
February 7, 1992
Page 2

In order to address these concerns, starting almost two years ago, U.S. Charmat producers requested that ATF update the champagne labeling regulations.

This letter is to request that you take prompt action to go forward with a proposed rule that would modernize the regulations on champagne labeling. We believe the issue is straightforward and ripe for resolution.

For almost all U.S. consumers, champagne is champagne, regardless of the production method (Champenoise, Charmat, or Transfer). The minute fraction of champagne consumers who care about the Champenoise production method know exactly what to look for. Frankly, the market should be allowed to function freely in this area, without excessive governmental intervention.

One option would have the regulations make the disclosure of champagne production method optional with the producer. Alternatively, if reference to production technique is going to be required, the regulations could require that the method used by Charmat producers throughout the U.S. be referred to as "Charmat method" or "Charmat technique." We understand that the term "Charmat" is viewed positively by the BATF, the expert federal agency in the field. It is a precisely accurate designation of the inventor of the method, analogous to the term "Pasteurized". Moreover, the term "Charmat" has been used on champagne labels in this country for many decades, and it is widely recognized as appropriate in the technical literature.

We would ask that you seek a resolution of this matter as quickly as possible. If you feel you must mandate disclosure of production method then we would suggest that you consider a rulemaking on adoption of "Charmat method" or "Charmat technique" as the appropriate description, and allow the use of the terms American (or New York or California, etc.) champagne without other types of encumbrance.

Apparently, there has been some discussion of using an advance notice to cover this subject. We would hope you would reject such a protracted and costly approach. However, should you decide that further public comment is necessary we would, of course, urge you to include the use of the terms "Charmat method" as one of the options to be considered.

The Honorable John E. Robson
February 7, 1992
Page 3

We hope you would direct the staff to move ahead immediately with an appropriate proposed rule that either makes disclosure of production method optional or adopts Charmat method or technique.

We very much appreciate your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

BOB DOLE

JOHN SEYMOUR