

11/8/79 [2]

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 11/8/79
[2]; Container 138

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff_Secretary.pdf

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

11/8/79

Richard Harden

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox today
and is forwarded to you for
appropriate handling.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Phil Wise

FOR STAFFING
FOR INFORMATION
FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
NO DEADLINE
FOR APPROPRIATE HANDLING
LAST DAY FOR ACTION

ADMIN CONFID
CONFIDENTIAL
SECRET
EYES ONLY

ACTION
FYI

	VICE PRESIDENT
	JORDAN
	CUTLER
	DONOVAN
	EIZENSTAT
	MCDONALD
	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEDDINGTON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE
	ANDRUS
	ASKEW
	BERGLAND
	BROWN
	CIVILETTI
	DUNCAN
	GOLDSCHMIDT
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	LANDRIEU
	MARSHALL

	MILLER
	VANCE
	BUTLER
	CAMPBELL
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	CRUIKSHANK
	FIRST LADY
	FRANCIS
X	HARDEN
	HERTZBERG
	HUTCHESON
	KAHN
	LINDER
	MARTIN
	MILLER
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PRESS
	SANDERS
	SPETH
	STRAUSS
	TORRES
	VOORDE
X	WISE

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

①

November 5, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM RICHARD HARDEN

Richard

Attached is a memorandum from Judy Harrison outlining Miss Lillian's political activities during the month of October. Judy will be preparing these periodically in the future and unless you advise me otherwise, I will forward them to you for your review.

One matter requiring your attention is mentioned in the final paragraph regarding Miss Lillian's presence in Washington on December 4. Let me know your decision and I will work with Judy on the details.

From all indications, the arrangement with Judy being with the Campaign is working out quite well. Please advise if you have any suggestions.

*With me
JC*

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

CARTER/MONDALE PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE, INC.
1413 K STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

November 3, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: RICHARD HARDEN
FROM: JUDY HARRISON
SUBJECT: Miss Lillian's Recent Activities

Knowing that you would be interested, this memo is to give you a re-cap of Miss Lillian's travel during the month of October. From now on I will give you an update on a bi-weekly basis, or at a minimum at the end of each month.

FLORIDA (October 11 - 13, 1979)

Purpose of Trip: The purpose was two-fold: to be the featured speaker at the Orange County Democratic Fund-raising Luncheon in Orlando and to work the Pinellas County caucus site in St. Petersburg.

Activities:

- Orlando fundraising luncheon
- 4 media interviews in Orlando (CBS, NBC, BBC, and Orlando Sentinel)
- 3 media interviews in Tampa (NBC, ABC, Tampa Tribune)
- coffee reception with Tampa caucus delegates (300 people)

Results: She raised \$4,000 for the Party at the luncheon and received coverage on all three nets in early and late news. They want her again before the primary and expect with more advanced notice to raise considerably more money. She shook upwards of 3,000 hands in St. Pete, and the overall success of Florida is well known.

IOWA (October 19 - 20, 1979)

Purpose of Trip: Purpose was to be the featured speaker at the annual Polk County Democratic Party Barbeque. (Polk is the largest county in Iowa.)

Activities:

- visited Prescribed Activity Center (for developmentally handicapped children)
- press conference
- radio talk show (WHO-largest clear channel in country)
- visited Carter/Mondale Headquarters
- Polk County fundraising event

Results: She raised \$13,000 for the Party -- this is the largest amount ever raised at this annual event. She has already been invited back and will be going in mid-November.

ARIZONA/CALIFORNIA (October 23 - 27, 1979)

Purpose of Trip: Purpose of trip was to be the featured speaker at the Phoenix Democratic Party Fundraising Gala.

Activities:

- press conference on arrival with Governor Babbitt
- coffee with community leaders (with Babbitt)
- groundbreaking ceremony for Chicano elderly home (with Babbitt)
- two elementary school events (one in Phoenix; one in L.A.)
- Jewish nursing home tour
- job training facility tour (with Babbitt)
- Phoenix fundraising gala (with Babbitt)
- Black community center tour
- Displaced Homemakers Center tour
- Michael Jackson Radio Talk Show
- AM San Francisco
- Over Easy with Hugh Downs
- black tie fundraising roast benefitting Gay community
- reception in her honor hosted by Mayor Dianne Feinstein
- 8 miscellaneous radio and TV one-on-one interviews

Results: The entire trip was a huge success. She got incredibly good press in Phoenix (some coverage attached) and absolutely charmed Governor Babbitt. She also raised \$18,000 for the Party at the Gala. A couple of interesting items: at the dinner in Los Angeles she was quite perturbed that the press thought she had come not knowing who was hosting the event. She knew full-well that it was a Gay function, but just didn't realize that it was a fundraiser for their community. She sat with the Mayor of Beverly Hills and many of those in attendance filed by her table to express their support for the President. The best thing of all was that Governor Brown sat at the next table and worked the entire ballroom of 850 people, but neglected to come to her table. At every opportunity the following day she mentioned the snub and the fact that she thought it was rather rude! She received a standing ovation when she went to the dias to make her brief remarks.

One final point - where do you think Miss Lillian ought to be on Announcement Nigh, December 4th. I personally feel she would like to be at the dinner in Washington, but know that she will not come unless she thinks the President and First Lady want her to.

9:15 A.M.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 7, 1979

MEETING WITH SELECTED MEMBERS ON HOSPITAL COST CONTAINMENT BILL

Thursday, November 8, 1979
9:15 a.m. (15 minutes)
The Cabinet Room

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

FROM: Frank Moore *F.M.*
Stu Eizenstat *Stu*

I. PURPOSE

To motivate the members who are for this legislation and to convert those who are questionable.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

Background: The majority of these members are undecided with few leaning in either direction.

The preliminary count from the whip call is not good. Our count is a little more optimistic. The results of your last briefing were positive, with a few members agreeing to support the bill who had tentatively been opposed. The bill should come up on the Floor next week. If word gets out that we are not making progress, there is a greater chance that the leadership may want to postpone it further.

Stu will brief the members from 8:45 to your arrival at 9:15. He will provide the general background and discuss some of the controversial aspects of the legislation.

Participants: The President, Frank Moore, Stu Eizenstat, Bob Maher, Bob Berenson (of Stu's staff), Members of Congress (see attached list).

Press Plan: None

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

III. TALKING POINTS

- o You know that Stu has provided a complete review of this issue, but you want to emphasize a few points.
- o You need their help on this issue. It is a vote that they can go home and run on. With five years of savings under the program, the Consumer Price Index would be reduced a half a point in 1984. No other single action by the Congress would reduce the rate of inflation that much.

- o You are aware of the arguments made by the hospital representatives. You were once a member of a hospital board and know that those people are well-meaning. But this bill has been modified to respond to every legitimate concern raised. The bill they will vote on is simply not the same bill to which the industry's criticisms were directed. Yet, the hospital lobby has continued their unremitting and well-financed opposition.
- o We know that cost containment works. Eight (8) states have saved their tax payers millions of dollars, with absolutely no lessening in the quality of care provided. The Federal legislation builds directly on the experience of these state programs and encourages the development of similar programs in other states.
- o You know that the bill is complex and that hospital representatives are criticizing, usually inaccurately, specific provisions. However, the basic approach is simple. For the first time, hospitals are simply being asked to meet a performance standard. Hospitals that perform efficiently will do very well under this legislation, as can be demonstrated by the hospitals in the eight (8) states with cost containment programs.
- o You would like to know now if there is any reason why any of the Members cannot support the bill.

Members Invited to the Meeting with the President

Jamie Whitten: He has been feeling a little bit left out and doesn't feel that you have consulted with him to the same degree as you did with his predecessor or his counterpart in the Senate.

He was invited to the Leadership Breakfast on Tuesday, Nov. 6 but he wasn't able to attend. You might want to say that you were sorry that he wasn't able to be at the Breakfast.

Regarding Hospital Cost Containment, appeal to him on the basis of the money that will be saved. Tell him that he must know what this means on the rest of the Budget.

Bill Nichols: Tell him that you understand that he has a copy of a hospital bill that points up the need to control cost. Tell him that you want his help in Alabama with other Members (Buchanan and Beville will probably come with us on the bill if Nichols votes with us).

Martin Frost: Tell him that you need him on the Rule. Texas is not doing well. Tell him that you need him and that it is his obligation to his President.

Thomas Foley: Tell him that this is the last big bill we have this year. You know that he is not in favor of regulation. You are not in favor of it either, but this is the only way to control the hospitals. If there were any other way to slow these hospitals down you would do it.

Harley Staggers: Tell him that he has helped us greatly in Committee. We need your help now on the Floor, and your help can mean a great deal. You know that if someone had had the same medical expenses that he experienced recently without good coverage they would have mortgaged their home by now.

Jack Brooks: Tell him that Texas is not doing that well despite a voluntary plan. The increase in total hospital expenses in 1978 over 1977 in the U.S. was 12.6% and in Texas it was 15.4%

Tony Coelho: Tell him that you need him on this. Make a personal appeal to him.

Harold Johnson
Lee Hamilton
John Seiberling
Pete McCloskey
Gunn McKay
Dawson Mathis
Morgan Murphy

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

11/8/79

Frank Moore

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox today
and is forwarded to you for
appropriate handling.

Rick Hutcheson

No Nuke
No Coal
No synfuels

Frank - done -
See notes J

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Frank's

*one-time veto of project
R & D only. No prod
5-7 year delay
Promote competition
(Exxon monopoly)
National security*

November 6, 1979

CONGRESSIONAL TELEPHONE CALL

TO: Senators Muskie, Glenn, Ribicoff, ~~Baucus~~ Sarbanes and Javits

DATE: As soon as Possible

RECOMMENDED BY: Frank Moore/Bob Thomson *(Bob)*

BACKGROUND: The vote on the Proxmire amendment to the Energy Committee's synfuels bill will now occur late in the afternoon Wednesday. Republican L+ votes have softened today and we have failed to move some key Democrats. We are still ahead, but the count is much closer than we would like. This could be the key vote on your entire energy program so far.

The following are the six calls we would like you to make by noon Wednesday. Cabinet officers are calling 25 other Senators.

TALKING POINTS: Senator Muskie - Muskie is almost certainly against us. Eliot Cutler has sent him a memo explaining why he should support the Energy Committee bill. You should make the following points:

*Hart stands
re synfuels
compromise*

1. Our dependence on foreign oil poses an extreme threat to our national security. A defeat of this bill at the very time I am negotiating for the release of U.S. citizens in Iran, would provide an important psychological edge to the Iranians who provide a substantial portion of our imported oil.
2. Conservation and domestic production cannot do the whole job. I have proposed a \$6 billion loan program for residential conservation improvements and \$16 billion for mass transit. However, conservation can only carry us so far. We need to maintain production and cut our imports.

?

- 3. We must produce new forms of energy, including synthetic fuels. The Energy Committee bill would authorize the first phase of a synfuels program - about 10 synfuels plants that eventually could produce 500,000 barrels a day. We must have this oil to preserve our national defense and the soundness of our economy.

*Coal states
75% = coal Synfuels*

Senator Glenn - He is now leaning against us. His major concern is the corporation itself. He complains that the Government Operations Committee created the Department of Energy to do this job. You should explain to him, as we have done, why DOE cannot administer this program as efficiently as the Energy Security Corporation. More importantly, you should stress the national defense implications of this vote and its impact on our current relations with Iran and other producing nations.

*No = Dissatisfied re EMB
(Will help on WPT)
Energy Committee arrogant
Ignoring CO₂*

Senator Ribicoff - He is almost certainly against us for the same reasons as Glenn. He contends the Committee spent much time creating the Department of Energy and now much of its job will be done by still another bureaucracy. He also has environmental concerns.

~~Senator Baucus - Baucus has appeared at a press conference in opposition to the bill. However, his position has apparently softened in the last two days. He will have environmental concerns about plants located in his state.~~

*Will look at it -
On Banking Committee.
Can't vote against own
work-product - will try
to help
Sympathetic re ESC
Concerned big globe
of #*

Senator Sarbanes - Sarbanes--a member of Proxmire's Committee--has said he is undecided, but most likely is leaning against us. You should use arguments similar to those for Muskie. He has been called by Sawhill and touched repeatedly by our outside allies.

Senator Javits - We carry Javits L+, but are not comfortable about that designation. No one has succeeded in talking to him yet about the issue. We think he would respond to an argument stressing the need for energy independence so that you and future Presidents can deal effectively with threats to Israel in the Middle-East. He may be responsive to your full range of national defense arguments.

Mr. President.

Read only if you need additional information on the bills or our position.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

File Bob
ESC

November 5, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE
FROM: ELIOT R. CUTLER
SUBJECT: Upcoming Senate vote on Synfuels

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

Both the Energy Committee and the Banking Committee bills provide for a synfuels development program, additional incentives for energy conservation, and stimulation of solar and other renewable energy technologies. The key differences between the bills pertain to synfuels:

- The Energy Committee bill establishes a synfuels production goal of 1.5 million barrels per day by 1995. An independent Energy Security Corporation would be established to provide financing to the private sector. In a 3-year first phase, the Corporation will be authorized to work within a program activity level of \$20 billion (total value of loans, loans guaranteed, procurement contracts signed, etc.). This will provide financial assistance for about 10 commercial scale synfuels plants and several smaller biomass projects. Production from these plants will eventually be about 500,000 barrels per day. Following the three-year period, the Corporation would be required to submit to the Congress a strategy to meet the 1995 goal, and the Congress would have to authorize and appropriate additional funds for the Corporation's next phase activities. Projects receiving financial assistance from the Corporation are not exempted from any applicable environmental laws. No financial assistance may be provided without a plan for monitoring environmental and health related emissions developed by the projectsponsors and approved by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. The Corporation must also report annually on the environmental impacts of its generic programs and decisions.
- The Banking Committee bill provides for a synfuels demonstration program only, without a production phase or a date certain for its completion. The demonstration program would be administered by a Federal agency, presumably DOE. Three billion dollars would be authorized to support the development of a minimum of 12 technologies. Because capital costs for synfuel plants are so high, the combination of the low authorization figure with the necessity for at least 12 plants will not permit even the demonstration of commercial scale plants unless private projects come forward which can provide their own capital needs.

R & D =
No production
5-7 year
delay

Basically, in our judgment, the Banking Committee bill maintains a low price tag by taking a cautious approach to synfuels and avoiding commercial scale production. The Energy Committee bill, on the other hand, embarks immediately on government-supported commercial synfuels production, albeit at a higher

price tag. The Energy Committee bill will probably generate commercial production of synfuels about 5-7 years earlier than could occur under the Banking bill.

The Administration, as you know, strongly supports the Energy Committee bill. We believe that the Nation's need for increased energy security is so pressing that synfuels must be developed carefully, but immediately. Here is our position, step-by-step:

1. Our dependence on foreign oil poses an extreme threat to our national security and our economy. It makes us vulnerable to pricing and other demands made by the producers of that oil. In 1971, the United States imported 3.9 million barrels of oil per day, about 30% of our needs, at a cost of \$4 billion. In 1980, the United States will import over 8 million barrels of oil per day, about 50% of our needs, at a cost of more than \$70 billion. Besides the trade deficit, and inflationary problems which such massive imports entail, our economy, our quality of life and our national security have become perilously subject to any foreign disruptions or upheavals which produce even small changes in world oil supplies.

2. The only way to protect our national security is to reduce this vulnerability--to reduce oil imports--through increased domestic conservation and production. Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to enter the 1990's in as vulnerable a position as we are in now upon entering the 1980's. Come 1990, we cannot turn a spigot and expect that oil import substitutes will come tumbling forth. We must begin making investments now. Each year is critical.

3. Conservation and domestic oil and gas production cannot do the whole job. Under current law and policy, we project 1990 oil imports at about 9 million barrels per day--slightly above our current levels. This estimate takes into account projected savings (conservation and increased domestic production) from the 1978 National Energy Act and from phased oil price decontrol. To actually reduce our oil imports, to cut in half our dependence on foreign oil as the President has proposed, we will have to do much more.

Increased domestic oil and gas production is not the single answer. Proven oil and gas reserves have been declining since 1971, which was also when domestic production peaked. Today, many geologists believe that most large domestic oil and gas fields have been found. We must accelerate our oil exploration and development efforts, but even with the impetus of decontrol the best we can hope for will be to maintain our current levels of domestic oil production.

Increased conservation is part of the answer. But it is not the sole answer, either. Most of the obvious conservation measures have already been taken or are underway: for example, mandatory fuel efficiency standards, standards for buildings and appliances,

and incentives for residential, commercial and industrial retrofits. We do propose additional measures now, and they are expensive--\$6 billion for a program mostly of subsidized loans for conservation improvements to homes, and \$16 billion to make public transportation more attractive and automobiles more efficient. Conservation can help hold down or eliminate growth in energy consumption, and can even help reduce imports--but not enough.

4. We must produce new forms of domestic energy, including synthetic fuels. Solar energy and other renewable resource energy technologies will not be ready to make a major contribution to our needs until early in the next century. During the bridge period between the 1980's and then, synfuels offer the best potential for providing significant amounts of new domestic energy supplies.

Anyone who suggests that there is one single answer to the overall problem of imports dependence--whether conservation, solar, or anything else--views the world with a degree of certainty that we find extremely worrisome.

To establish synfuels production capacity sufficient to begin to reduce oil imports in the late 1980's, and to contribute a significant portion of our energy needs in the 1990's, the financing and development of synfuels production capacity must begin now. Large synfuel plants can require up to 7 years to complete and can cost as much as \$3 billion. We cannot wait for the private sector to move ahead on its own--synfuel plant risks and costs are far greater than any company now or in the next few years is likely to assume without governmental assistance--a public pooling of the risk. Nor can we afford, as the Banking Committee's bill would do, to double the period prior to synfuels production by building a demonstration plant for each technology, evaluating the result, and then embarking upon a production phase. There is no need to have a separate demonstration phase. The House, the Energy Committee, the Department of Energy and others have concluded that the technologies exist now. If the urgency for the fuel were not as great as it is, and if the danger of delay were not as foreseeable as it is, it might well be prudent to demonstrate with more certainty the viability of the technologies. But the urgency is present and the consequences of delay--the continuing high level of dependence on imported oil--are extremely serious.

Finally, we are convinced that the task of financing private sector synfuel efforts should be assigned to an independent Energy Security Corporation. This task should not be assigned to a government agency as the Banking Committee would do. Their version would require Congressional approval for each loan guarantee in excess of \$500 million and each purchase agreement of more than seven years. In other words, the Banking bill establishes one-house vetoes for every major project.

This will not work. Business as usual under DOE will lead to political pressures and the usual trade-offs and concessions. The Corporation, on the other hand, would be able to act as a private corporation. It would be able to hire qualified people and exceed the Civil Service salary rates for a position with Presidential concurrence. It would be appropriately accountable through provisions for audits, Congressional approval of program activity in phases, open meetings, access to records, competitive bidding, conflict of interest requirements, etc. As you know, the Corporation concept has been used successfully before as with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, TVA, COMSAT, and many more.

5. To summarize our position, we regard the synfuels question as a national security issue. Giving an Energy Security Corporation the charter to support production of synthetic fuels now is the only way to ensure significant production of synthetic fuels by the late 1980's. A vote for the Energy Committee bill is a vote for an essential means of reducing oil imports significantly by 1990.

ESC/SYNFUELS VOTE COUNT - JACKSON VS. PROXMIRE

+
 Bentsen
 Bradley
 Bumpers
 Burdick
 Byrd, Robert
 Cannon
 Chiles
 Church
 Durkin
 Eagleton
 Exon
 Ford
 Hollings
 Huddleston
 Inouye
 Jackson
 Johnston
 Levin
 Magnuson
 Matsunaga
 Melcher
 Moynihan
 Nelson
 Nunn
 Pell
 Randolph
 Sasser
 Stone
 Talmadge

L+
 DeConcini
 Heflin
 Long
 Metzenbaum
 Morgan
 Pryor
 Stennis
 Stevenson

?
 Culver
 Gravel
 Kennedy
 McGovern
 Sarbanes
 Williams
 Zorinsky

L-
 Bayh
 Biden
 Boren
 Glenn
 Ribicoff →
 Stewart ←

-
 Baucus
 Byrd, Harry
 Cranston
 Hart
 Leahy
 Muskie
 Proxmire
 Riegle
 Tsongas

Bellmon
 Domenici
 Hatfield
 Stafford
 Stevens

Danforth
 Javits
 Mathias
 Pressler
 Roth
 Schweiker
 Warner
 Young

Durenberger
 Jepsen
 Thurmond

Boschwitz
 Chafee
 Cohen
 Hayakawa
 McClure

Armstrong
 Baker
 Cochran
 Dole
 Garn
 Goldwater
 Hatch
 Heinz
 Helms
 Humphrey
 Kassebaum
 Laxalt
 Lugar
 Packwood
 Percy
 Schmitt
 Simpson
 Tower
 Wallop
 Weicker

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

11/8/79

Frank Moore

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox today
and is forwarded to you for
appropriate handling.

Rick Hutcheson

FOR STAFFING
FOR INFORMATION
FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND
NO DEADLINE
FOR APPROPRIATE HANDLING
LAST DAY FOR ACTION

ADMIN CONFID
CONFIDENTIAL
SECRET
EYES ONLY

ACTION
FYI

	VICE PRESIDENT
	JORDAN
	CUTLER
	DONOVAN
	EIZENSTAT
	MCDONALD
X	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON
	WEDDINGTON
	WEXLER
	BRZEZINSKI
	MCINTYRE
	SCHULTZE
	ANDRUS
	ASKEW
	BERGLAND
	BROWN
	CIVILETTI
	DUNCAN
	GOLDSCHMIDT
	HARRIS
	KREPS
	LANDRIEU
	MARSHALL

	MILLER
	VANCE
	BUTLER
	CAMPBELL
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	CRUIKSHANK
	FIRST LADY
	FRANCIS
	HARDEN
	HERTZBERG
	HUTCHESON
	KAHN
	LINDER
	MARTIN
	MILLER
	MOE
	PETERSON
	PRESS
	SANDERS
	SPETH
	STRAUSS
	TORRES
	VOORDE
	WISE

NOTE: Late on Tuesday evening a friendly member of Exon's staff let us know that all of a sudden Exon seems to be less positive about SALT. His staff thinks that he is smarting from a recent Republican campaign in Nebraska to compare his voting record to McGovern's. A full page ad in the Omaha paper carried his voting record, Zorinsky's and McGovern's. Zorinsky's presumably was not a problem.

3:45 PM

MEETING WITH SENATOR JAMES EXON

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

Wednesday, November 7, 1979
3:45 p.m. (20 minutes)
The Oval Office

From: Frank Moore *FM*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss SALT

II. PERSONAL INFORMATION, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS ARRANGEMENTS

A. Personal Information:

Wife's Name: Patricia

Children: Stephen James, Pamela Ann, Candace Lee

Home Town: Lincoln, Nebraska

Committee Assignments:

Committee on Armed Services (9)

Committee on Budget (12)

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation (9)

B. Participants: Senator James Exon (D-Nebraska)

C. Press Arrangements: White House photographer

III. BACKGROUND

A. Additional Issues and Personal Information

Senator Exon has been a very pleasant surprise to us. As you may recall during his campaign for the Senate he at times sounded an anti-Administration theme; however, since January Senator Exon has become increasingly friendly toward us. He has been more consistent in his support of us on vital issues than Senator Zorinsky has. There is considerable political and personal discord between the two Nebraska Senators. Exon views himself as a true and loyal Democrat and sees Senator Zorinsky as a maverick opportunist who has no party loyalty and no set philosophy.

As a former Governor (8 years) Senator Exon is sympathetic to the problems that any chief executive has. For this reason he has been reluctant to criticize you and your Administration even when he differed with our policies. Privately, the Senator will admit that there are frustrations in his new job. As a Governor he could make a decision and feel fairly confident that the decision would be executed. Now as a Senator, he could make a decision and more often than not just talk about it.

The Senator seems to be most interested in his assignment to the Armed Services Committee. It appears to us that early in the Senator's term of office he gravitated toward Scoop Jackson. Now, however, it appears to us that he is not as greatly influenced by Jackson on military and foreign policy matters, though there are still close ties. Obviously, we hope that Senator Exon will continue to follow Chairman Stennis' lead, especially on SALT.

On Monday, Senator Exon gave a Senate floor speech in favor of the Energy Security Corporation bill which we are backing. We are hopeful that we can get his support on the windfall profits tax, but our conversations with him indicate he has not focused on the issues. You may want to explore the windfall profits tax with him at least briefly.

- B. SALT Concerns: Although he was slow in getting interested in the details of the Treaty, he has recently become more knowledgeable and has asked good questions. He has been particularly interested in TNF, non-circumvention, and what happens after the expiration of the Protocol. He has indicated that he believes that the Protocol is not really limiting to us. Recently he has been concerned about the need for Soviet assurances that they would not base Backfires in Cuba.

He voted against both parts of Hollings' amendment to increase defense spending, primarily because he is a member of the Budget Committee. He was gratified by your MX decision.

We get the sense from his staff that he wants to vote for SALT and is working out a way to do it. He is not interested in "killer amendments" but getting some Backfire/Cuba language would help.

- C. Political Concerns: He is feeling a little constituent pressure on SALT. He is watching closely what Zorinsky does, his (Zorinsky) vote on the Resolution of Ratification this week, will have a significant impact on Exon.

Very interested -

Undecided -

*I answered all his
questions -*

(3)

8:00 AM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

①

November 7, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

FROM: ALFRED E. KAHN

Fred

SUBJECT: Agenda for the Economic Advisors' Breakfast
8:00 a.m., Thursday, November 8

I do not have a new, informational memorandum for you this time, because the topics that I am going to suggest for your consideration fall into two categories: first, a number of ones that we did not get to discuss at our October 25 meeting -- I attach the relevant pages from my memo of October 24 -- and, second, a few major policy issues that you may wish to explore in a general way, for which EPG would then have to prepare more thorough analyses for your consideration.

Among the carryover topics from the October 25 agenda would be the following:

1. Whether to use discretionary grants in the same way we use or threaten to use the procurement sanction against non-compliers with the price standard.
2. How to combat the general suspicion in the business community that the accord with labor and the Pay Advisory Committee represent an abandonment of the standards, and are a prelude to mandatory controls.
3. A series of possible public actions by you in support of the anti-inflation program. (Stu and I have suggested a couple of such possible meetings that Phil Wise tells us are literally impossible to put on your schedule. I attach a copy of my memo on this subject, dated October 19, not in order to circumvent Phil, but to get a sense of the extent to which you feel it important to be involved in our efforts in this way.)
4. Ways of enlisting the Cabinet and other agencies more concertedly and overtly in the anti-inflation effort.

Among the more fundamental topics that it might be fruitful for us to discuss even in general terms, I suggest, would be the following:

1. Whether we ought to reorient our thinking about the windfall profits tax, in the direction of using the proceeds -- especially if they continue to grow -- for such non-energy purposes as reduction of social security payroll taxes and buying back various state excise taxes.

2. Whether and how we can interpret our plans for financial aid to Chrysler in such a way as to insist on genuine sacrifices from the UAW. Since our last discussion, I have discovered that under its agreement with Chrysler, the UAW will have something like 100 percent adjustment of wages for the CPI -- which, since the CPI exaggerates the increase in the cost of living, means that their real incomes will go up under the contract, while we are asking everyone else in the country to take some additional sacrifice. In addition, there will be the 3 percent annual "improvement factor," the schedule for which they have merely postponed for a maximum of six months, not surrendered.

3. What should be the nature of our reaction to an interruption of supply from Iran, if it occurs? Should we be thinking along the lines of reinstated price controls and allocations, on the one side, or freeing prices to ration scarce supplies, on the other?

4. Any other such topics that your Economic Advisors may feel might be fruitful to explore, however generally, in response to the request you directed to Bill Miller at the recent meeting on the budget outlook.

Attachments

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 18, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: PHIL WISE
FROM: STU EIZENSTAT /s/ Stu

I have read Fred's memo suggesting two anti-inflation events for the President and concur with it.

I think we need to keep the President identified with the effort to fight inflation, and these two events represent some needed progress in that direction.

Stu -

I would like to try to do these two things but there is literally no way (to) schedule before the 1st of year -

/s/ Phil

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 19, 1979

MEMORANDUM TO PHIL WISE

FROM:

ALFRED E. KAHN *A.E.K.*

SUBJECT: Presidential Anti-Inflation Events

I would appreciate your assistance in putting two events on the President's schedule in the near future.

Rental Industry Meeting

I recommend the President meet with representatives of landlord and rental management associations, especially those from regions of the country where rents have increased at a rate far in excess of the national average.

The purpose of the meeting would be for the President to remind landlords and rental management agencies that the price standards apply to rents and to urge them to use restraint in raising rents.

The Council on Wage and Price Stability has received more complaints about high rent increases than about any other type of price increase. Many of them have come from areas of the country where rent increases have exceeded the national average.

In addition, the Council's Price Monitoring Division has found that landlords, including some in the high rent increase areas, have been uncooperative with the voluntary guidelines program. Still others may simply not know that the program applies to them.

I think this meeting would be helpful both to the anti-inflation program and to the President. We will need two weeks advance notice to put it together.

Meeting Outside Washington with Business and Labor Leaders

I would particularly appreciate your help in arranging for the President to meet with a small group of business and labor leaders and, perhaps other community leaders during a trip he makes outside Washington within the very near future.

The purposes of such a meeting would be:

1. for the President to re-emphasize the importance of his wage-price guidelines program and to encourage the local leaders both to comply with the program and support it publicly.

2. to give the President an opportunity to explain to these local leaders the actions that the government is taking on its own that will help lower the inflation rate over the long term (budgetary restraint, regulatory reform).

3. to give them an opportunity to describe for the President regulatory problems they are having, which my staff could then follow up on.

4. to talk about local productivity efforts.

I would, of course, be pleased to accompany the President to such a meeting.

I think meetings such as this one could be very helpful in promoting the anti-inflation program, and if this one turns out well, we should consider scheduling them on a regular basis.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 24, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ALFRED E. KAHN

SUBJECT: The Wage and Price Standards, First and
Second Years

Presidential Involvement in the Context of Our Strategy for
the Second Year

During the first year of the wage-price program we necessarily devoted a large part of our efforts to getting the standards out and informing business and labor about them. Our emphasis was on trying to get cooperation from major labor unions and big business.

As I see it, our major tasks in the months ahead all have to do with improving the credibility of the program in the face of eight months of a CPI rising at a 13% annual rate, a general public view that the anti-inflation program is in disarray, and, specifically, deep suspicion on the part of much of the business community about the accord with labor.

The press reports about a secret deal with labor on sanctions, and the accord itself, have been perceived by many business people as a sign that the Administration is backing away from the program. Others profess to see in the constitution of the Pay Advisory Committee and the accord the first steps toward

mandatory controls. I believe we must all devote a good deal of personal attention to combatting these attitudes, by intensifying our efforts to secure voluntary compliance with the standards, while emphasizing our continued determination to practice monetary and fiscal restraint, to carry out our promises of regulatory reform, and as promptly as possible to mount a concerted attack on the productivity problem.

Bob Russell and I agree, second, that we must concentrate our limited price monitoring resources more -- and more visibly -- on problem sectors -- most obviously, energy, housing, medical care, and food. As part of this concentration, I intend to devote more of my time to meeting with representatives of these industries; and to arranging occasional meetings for you to attend.

The specific suggestions that I am developing for your personal involvement are guided by the conception of our most pressing needs. I am actively discussing with other people in the White House the following possibilities:

1. Periodic meetings with business leaders at the White House to reassure them about the program and your commitment to it, and to receive their advice.

2. Meetings on some of your scheduled trips outside of Washington with local business and labor leaders and other prominent citizens. It seems to me very important that you get your anti-inflation message conveyed to people at the local level, to use these occasions, among other things, to urge compliance with your wage and price standards; to counsel patience; to explain your regulatory reform efforts and accomplishments; to encourage local cooperative efforts to attack the problem of productivity; and also to hear from these people about the problems that they have. Specifically, I have found it fruitful to give business people an opportunity to complain about the burden of specific regulations that they consider unreasonable, and then to look into specific cases. Where you think it would be helpful, I would be glad to accompany you at some of these meetings.

3. A meeting with landlords and rental management associations. By far the largest number of complaints that CWPS receives are about rents; and while the rent component of the CPI has not risen anywhere nearly as much as the 13 percent average, there have been very large increases in some areas, and the complaints seem to come disproportionately from there. Moreover, many landlords are simply refusing to respond to

CWPS' inquiries or to cooperate in any way. While it is difficult to argue that such a meeting would produce concrete results, rent is so large an element in the cost of living that it seems to me highly desirable for you to express your concern and to do what you can by way of applying pressure.

4. A similar meeting with operators of hotels and motels. Prices in this sector have increased far more rapidly than seems consistent with compliance with the standards, and there is at least a possibility that some major chains may be out of compliance. This is one the Vice President might handle.

5. As soon as we have completed our analysis of oil refinery margins, it may be highly desirable for us (in collaboration with Secretary Duncan) to call together people from the industry. Using information from the Department of Energy, we are intensively attempting to reconcile the apparent sharp increases in refinery and marketing margins that we see in the published statistics of the industry as a whole with the claims of the major companies, supported by their data submission to us, that they are complying with our gross margin and profit margin standards. We will try to produce some results just as soon as possible and see what should be done next.

6. In cooperation with Al McDonald, we are trying to develop some means of enlisting the various Cabinet departments and other agencies of the Administration more directly, actively and overtly in the fight against inflation. It has seemed to me that the several departments are not giving sufficient prominence to the efforts needed to put us in the position to present an integrated picture of an entire Administration devoting its major energies to combatting inflation in all the sectors of the economy to which the several agencies reach. We will try to present you with specific suggestions to accomplish this.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

08 Nov 79

Alfred Kahn

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox today
and is forwarded to you for
appropriate handling.

Rick Hutcheson

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 5, 1979

EYES ONLY

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ALFRED E. KAHN *Fred*

SUBJECT: Taking Stock on Anti-inflationary Policy

During our lengthy conversation several weeks ago, I tried to describe and explain the way in which the advice we provide you on economic policy tends to be sanitized and purged of any boldness or unorthodoxy before it ever reaches you, and why this had contributed to my questioning whether I was being sufficiently useful to you. Our talk got off on whether I should stay on and for that reason did not do justice to the more important substantive questions I raised: do we need new approaches to anti-inflationary policy; are there any to be found; and how do we get them explored with a degree of urgency corresponding with that of the need, which, I believe, is very great.

The following attempt to take stock of where we are probably errs on the dramatic side; but it does so for three reasons. The first is that -- for reasons I set forth below -- I no longer feel I can go around saying I see a reasonable prospect of the CPI dropping below double-digit levels in the next several months.

The second is that your advisors still seem to be operating under a general timetable that puts off the promulgation of any significant new anti-inflation initiatives until January.

And the third is my fear that we cannot afford those two more months of unabated inflationary experience unaccompanied by any visible basis for anticipating deceleration, because it could so intensify inflationary expectations as to make the tendencies even more difficult to root out than they are now. I say this purely in terms of successfully combatting inflation without bringing on a serious recession: I am not talking about the political situation.

The time has come, I think, for us to admit to ourselves that our present anti-inflation program has failed.

The program is a good one in every sense except that it has not produced the clearly visible results necessary to convince the American people that it is working. We have been doing almost all the right things; and they have had an effect. But the fact that they have not worked fast enough to convince people of their success or prospects for success, I believe, makes simple perseverance along essentially the same lines an insufficient course of action.

That is the nature of the problem with which we are dealing. For other spheres of activity, one can persevere along the right course as long as necessary to achieve the desired results. But when one is dealing with a political and psychological phenomenon like inflation, the "right course" becomes wrong if people cease to believe in it: their belief becomes self-justifying, and can render futile efforts that would otherwise have succeeded in time.

It was right to have practiced budgetary and monetary restraint; and we have practiced it.

It was right to have enunciated wage and price standards; and the standards have had some real effect.

And it was certainly right to have promised regulatory reform, and we have pursued it with unprecedented vigor.

I do not say we have done any of these things with total consistency; "total consistency" in such policies makes no sense. We have certainly done them with resolution, and as wisely as we knew how. But all these efforts have proved inadequate to the task.

We can honestly explain that the efforts have been engulfed by the revolutionary change in our energy situation, and by the unexpected depth, power, resilience and intractability of our underlying inflationary momentum; but that doesn't alter the fact of their insufficiency; or at the very least the insufficiency of our effort to explain to people what we are doing and why.

Nor does it answer the criticism that we have not practiced what we preached with sufficient single-mindedness and resolution. We did not try to postpone the scheduled increases in the minimum wage or insist on a youth differential; we did not attack Davis-Bacon; we continued to set aside acreage, to support farm prices, to protect group after group from the competition of imports; we compromised

on maritime policy. It might -- and undoubtedly will -- even be argued that we have been insufficiently resolute in pursuing a restrictive budgetary and monetary policy.

There were good reasons for all these temperings of what would have been required for an all-out, single-minded anti-inflationary effort. Many would have been politically unachievable (although, even so, it might have been salutary to have tried). The cure could well have been worse than the disease; but what people see is the disease; and they judge us as having failed to demonstrate that we are even on the way to curing it.

We could persevere in what we regarded as the proper, balanced course, so long as we could honestly say we saw a prospect of improvement not too many months ahead. I have been saying that, until recently, because I believed it, and also because I felt people would not behave in such a way as to make the program work if they did not have that assurance.

But while I still think there is a good chance that the softening of the economy and the tapering off in the rise of interest rates that it will make possible will during 1980 get us down out of double-digit rates, at least two considerations make it impossible for me to continue to make that prediction. The first is that I see no real prospect of it coming to pass in less than, say, four months. A new round of increases in OPEC prices, reinforced by whatever production cutbacks are required; our probable inability to prevent continued increases in petroleum product prices in the months ahead, so long as the OPEC countries keep a rein on available supplies; the likelihood of rising interest rates continuing to have their effects on the CPI in the months ahead, quite possibly producing an acceleration in measured home purchase costs; the continued course of past energy price increases through the economy; and the cumulative effect on expectations of each additional month's double-digit PPI and CPI -- all these make it impossible for me to predict any tapering off of the 13 percent rate in the months immediately ahead. (I hope I prove as mistaken in this pessimistic prediction as I have been in my earlier modestly optimistic ones.)

The second reason I have had to shift the tone of my predictions is the fact that we have been making them, however carefully qualifiedly ("We have a good chance -- or a reasonable prospect -- of seeing the rate fall below double-digit levels") for so long that people no longer believe us, and we will do ourselves only injury if, as appears likely, the CPI persists in rising at double-digit rates over the next several months.

I had hoped that the National Accord and labor participation in the Pay Advisory Committee might give us the necessary few months of grace. It is too early to write off that possibility; but while I hear labor uttering the rhetoric of restraint and balanced sacrifice, I see no tapering off of the other kind of rhetoric: that the working man has borne more than his fair share of the burden, that profits have increased disproportionately, that labor must be afforded an opportunity to catch up for the difference between wage increases over the past year and the 13 percent CPI, that the price standards are a sham, and so on. I don't see how anyone can predict anything but some acceleration in the rate of wage increases -- or, at least, in the conspicuous wage settlements -- in the year ahead.

Even in the Chrysler situation, the UAW is apparently unwilling to make any sacrifice. On the contrary, it will have something like 100% adjustment of wages for the CPI; and since the CPI exaggerates the increase in the cost of living, this means the real income of the Chrysler workers will go up under the contract. In addition, there will be the 3% annual "improvement factor," the schedule for which they have merely postponed for a few months, not surrendered. The union leaders themselves are prisoners of the general perception among their members that the anti-inflation program has been a failure, that workers have suffered severe declines in real income (which may not at all be the case for unionized workers, but a fantasy promoted by the CPI).

Where, then, do we go from here?

First, we have to decide that we must go somewhere -- provided, of course, there is somewhere we can responsibly go. No matter how correct in concept and in principle, our present course of action becomes wrong when it is widely perceived as a failure.

Second, however, we must remain true to our principles. That means we must pursue our present policies of restraint with even more dedication and imagination: regulatory reform, no price supports, no acreage set asides, no further capitulations to protectionism -- none. And we seize every opportunity to demonstrate that determination: it is not too late to proclaim that we will give no help to Chrysler, for example, unless we get real sacrifices from its stockholders, the UAW (and maybe its suppliers); and that 100% COLA's and mere postponement of annual improvement factors do not represent real sacrifices. Or that there will be no further Federal assistance for construction of hospitals in areas that already have excess capacity.

Δ CPI
as
index?

Third, we show greater willingness to attack the fundamental problems now. This means at least announcing plans for tackling productivity in every way we know now -- not several months from now: accelerated depreciation, additional incentives and expenditures for R&D, and tax incentives and government programs to absorb the inexperienced and structurally unemployed.

Fourth, it means considering more radical attacks on the energy problem, either now or on the occasion of the next OPEC announcement. I now incline to argue for complete decontrol, accompanied by even more drastic windfall profits taxes; or heavy additional taxes on gasoline.

And that means, fifth, breaking out of the straightjacket of acquiescing in the notion that the revenues from these taxes can be used only for energy purposes. We must insist, instead, on using the proceeds to finance the aforementioned heightened tax incentives for capital formation, intensified attacks on structural unemployment, buy-backs of state and local excise taxes and of payroll taxes, as well as lump-sum rebates to the poor. A big gasoline tax means a big one-shot increase in the CPI: well, this then requires going to Congress and insisting that that part of the CPI, along with the cost of home purchase, not go into indexation formulas -- neither those mandated for Federal expenditure programs nor in private wage contracts.

This list is by no means exhaustive. I continue to feel, as I suggested in my memorandum to you last April, that selective credit controls would be highly salutary: I find it interesting and encouraging that the Fed accompanied its recent tightening with calls to the banks to curtail loans for speculation and corporate takeovers -- shortly after I raised the suggestion with them and received the traditional response that selective controls make no sense. Similarly I would like to see us ask Congress to put a tighter cap on the deductibility of some interest payments for income tax purposes, accompanied by corresponding limited exemptions of interest income.

I think what is least acceptable about our present situation is the impression it gives that our policy is one of drift and mere appeals for altruistic individual behavior. I sense increasingly, in the reactions to my speeches, that people are longing for the government to take charge with the degree of firmness and imagination commensurate with the problem. I get very good reactions to my recitals of all the things we are doing; but the general additional reaction is that we are not doing enough.

not
feasible in
Congress

may be
good

Since the policy suggestions I make here are obviously not formal, fully-developed recommendations for specific actions by you, I feel the need to explain why then I am giving you this memorandum:

1. To influence your decisions on specific issues as they come before you, like the Chrysler loan guarantees;
2. To urge you to consider whether waiting until January before making any major policy pronouncements would be a mistake;
3. To suggest you ask your economic advisors to speed up their flow of suggestions to you, and
4. Perhaps to give serious consideration to some of my individual suggestions, particularly comparing their defects or drawbacks with those of continuing on our present course without substantial modification; and
5. To give me some guidance about the general attitude to take in the speeches I am committed to give in the weeks ahead and in my work for you.

This work

*made out
guidance*

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

C. Matthews
Draft A-1
11/2/79

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

*Ancestral
homeland
of 20 mil
Americans*

Arrival Ceremony for Prime Minister Lynch of Ireland 11/8/79

*My Mother -
Tourist*

An Taoiseach (on tee-shock), I am happy to welcome you and

Mrs. Lynch to Washington.

I welcome you as Prime Minister of Ireland, as president of the European Council, and as a friend. You are triply welcome.

Your visit symbolizes the warm friendship and the close relations between our two countries. This friendship was dramatized in our very beginning as a nation. It was then, more than two centuries ago, that Benjamin Franklin visited Dublin and found a sympathetic hearing for the cause of the American colonists. Since that time, the Irish people and the American people have shared a sympathetic understanding of one another's problems and aspirations.

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

Millions of Irish men and women have contributed to the building of this nation. Ireland and the United States are bound together by ties of kinship, by common culture, and by shared political ideals. Our two nations are as one in our faith in democratic government, the rule of law, and the dignity of the individual.

We greet you today, not only a national leader, but an authentic voice of international responsibility. Ireland's sons serve in far-flung places as volunteers in the peacekeeping forces of the United Nations. In the Congo, in Cyprus and now in Lebanon, Ireland has shown what it really means to be a responsible ^{& courageous} member of the world community.

Ireland in recent years has taken its natural and rightful place in the councils of Europe. The economic integration of Europe is now far advanced. This year with the first direct election of members of the European Parliament marks an important

step toward political cooperation. In your role as president of the European Council, Mr. Prime Minister, you have given leadership to Europe in its constructive economic and political evolution.

We applaud Ireland's strong and active leadership in Europe. The United States is grateful for the open, friendly and cooperative spirit that Ireland has shown to us in its conduct of the European presidency.

I am confident that the talks we will have today will strengthen the good relations between our two nations and the warm friendship between our two peoples.

#

8:00 AM
10:30 AM
4:00 PM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Q

November 6, 1979

FILMING FOR NBC WHITE PAPER
DOCUMENTARY ON THE PRESIDENCY

Wednesday, November 7, 1979
Thursday, November 8, 1979
(See attached schedule for times)

FROM: Jody Powell *J.P.*

I. PURPOSE

To film various Presidential activities during two-day period to include in documentary.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background

NBC is doing a 90-minute documentary entitled "NBC White Paper: The Presidency" to be aired December 26, 1979.

We have agreed to allow them to film a few minutes of several of the President's appointments during a two-day period. A schedule is attached setting forth which appointments will be filmed, indicating when NBC will be filming with sound.

The participants of each meeting will be notified prior to the beginning of the meeting that NBC will be filming and will be aware when sound is being used.

B. Participants

The participants will be the various appointments which we have designated on the President's schedule for the two days set aside for this filming.

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

There will be two four-member crews from NBC, escorted by White House Press Office personnel.

C. Press Plan

As set out above. There will be no coverage by other members of the White House press corps, except for normal photo sessions. A White House photographer will be present as each meeting calls for them.

III. TALKING POINTS

As given to you by White House staff members responsible for each meeting.

Attachment

SCHEDULE FOR FILMING OF NBC WHITE PAPER
DOCUMENTARY ON THE PRESIDENCY

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7

8:00 am Congressional Leadership Breakfast

Film leadership arriving at White House, first 4-5 minutes while waiting for the President and first 3 minutes of breakfast -- NO AUDIBLE CONVERSATION, except 3 minutes at table.

11:30 am Conservation Community Leaders

Film participants arriving in West Lobby and follow them into the Cabinet Room while waiting the President's arrival. Film the President arriving for meeting and shaking hands with participants of meeting prior to White House press corps arriving for photo session -- WITH SOUND.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8

_____ am The President Arriving for Work

Film the President walking down the colonnade, into the Oval Office as he begins the day's work and then NBC to leave office -- NO SOUND.

8:00 am Domestic Policy Advisers Breakfast

Film first 2 minutes of breakfast -- NO SOUND.

10:30 am Arrival Ceremony for Prime Minister Lynch

NBC will be in the Diplomatic Entrance Room to film the President greeting Mrs. Carter and follow the President and Mrs. Carter out to the South Lawn -- NO SOUND.

4:00 pm The President in the Oval Office

Film 10 minutes of the President at work in the Oval Office and the study -- NO AUDIBLE CONVERSATION.