

[11/8/79-Not Submitted-DF]

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: [11/8/79-Not Submitted-DF]; Container 138

To See Complete Finding Aid:

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
memo	From Brzezinski to The President (one page) re: State Visit by President Pertini of Italy	11/8/79	A

FILE LOCATION

Carter Presidential Papers- Staff Offices, Office of the Staff Sec.-Pres. Hand-writing File [11/8/79-Not Submitted-DF] BOX 155

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

11/8

Received too late;
does not add anything
new to HJ/MCD/HK
memo sent out by The
President on 11/7.

TSEP

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

November 8, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Jim McIntyre *Jim*
SUBJECT: White House Staff Increase

You asked me several weeks ago for my candid assessment of the White House staff increase under consideration at the time. Although the issue has been decided, and we will not seek an appropriation for the positions, I wanted you to know my thoughts.

It was clear to me that many of your advisers do, in fact, need additional staff support. However, the political cost of getting a supplemental appropriation through the Congress seemed prohibitive. Such a move would have appeared inconsistent with your 1977 EOP Reorganization. Worse, the additional positions, coupled with the positions transferred to the Office of Administration, would have expanded the White House staff to a level exceeded only by Richard Nixon in 1970.

I made all these points to Hamilton, Hugh and Al McDonald during our senior staff discussions of the proposal. (The attached memorandum I drafted to you expressed my thoughts in detail). Ultimately, all agreed the political cost was too high.

Hugh and I are now making every attempt to find room for additional positions within the current budget. I have assured him that OMB will be as helpful as possible in stretching its own resources to meet your staff needs.

Attachment

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL



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

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: James T. McIntyre, Jr.

SUBJECT: Request for White House Staff Increase

I have reviewed the request that you seek an immediate emergency supplemental appropriation of \$5.9 million to enlarge the White House staff by 103 full-time permanent (FTP) and 37 other positions (temporaries, detailees, consultants) above budget. Based upon that review, I cannot recommend approval. The request is inconsistent with the major reorganization you implemented only two years ago, and seems certain to produce charges that you have broken your promise and expanded the White House staff size to a level exceeded only by Richard Nixon in the one year of 1970. I recommend instead that you approve a compromise, increasing the ceiling by no more than 40 non-FTP positions. This would accommodate the hiring above ceiling which has already taken place, and would not require a supplemental appropriation.

Background on Current Budget Employment Ceilings

You will recall that in 1977 you approved a major reorganization to limit both the size and functions of the White House staff. This reorganization reduced FTP positions from 485 to 351, through elimination of 62 positions and the transfer of 72 others to the new Office of Administration. However, authorization legislation encountered serious opposition from the Congress. The major argument was that the authorization permitted up to 600 FTP positions and set no limit on other positions. Opponents claimed it was clear that you intended to renege on your promise to reduce the size of the White House staff.

We countered that the authorization was intended to provide future presidents with the flexibility to design a White House staff appropriate to their particular needs and management style, but that the Carter Administration was determined to reduce the overall staff size and to limit FTP positions to no more than the 351 promised. The bill was enacted only after running into such stiff opposition in the House that it was defeated in its first attempt at passage. Ultimately, success was due to the strong support of a number of key Democrats who in 1975 had vigorously opposed similar Ford Administration legislation on the grounds that it would permit excessive growth of the White House staff. We won their support by promising to reduce the staff size.

Requested Increase

The request proposes immediate submission of a \$5.9 million emergency supplemental budget amendment to finance an increase in the White House staff to 454 FTPs and 520 total positions. This is 103 FTPs and 37 non-FTP positions above the current employment ceilings of 351 FTPs and 29 other positions. However, because the White House is already operating above those ceilings, the request would add only 96 FTPs and 14 other positions above current actual staffing levels.

OMB is of necessity significantly constrained in the evaluation it can provide of this request. Historically OMB has not provided the formal review of White House budgets it provides for the agencies, and therefore has no detailed information on current or proposed position-by-position duty assignments and workloads. However, based upon a review of the limited documentation available, OMB agrees that the currently budgeted staff size is inadequate to perform in a superior fashion all of the activities proposed to be undertaken. The exact number of staff required cannot be determined from available data. The new request may not be unreasonable.

The request levels indicate that even if the Congress and the press fail to adjust the size of the White House staff for the 72 positions shifted to the Office of Administration, the result will still be considerably in excess of the levels you promised. It is more likely, however, that they will insist that any accounting of comparative staff sizes adjust for the positions shifted rather than eliminated in 1977. This leads to the possible conclusion that the Carter White House staff is larger than any previous President's except for Richard Nixon's in the one year of 1970 (see table).

Total White House Employment (includes full-time permanent, temporaries and detailees)

<u>Fiscal Year End</u>	<u>Unadjusted Total</u>	<u>Adjusted for Transfer to OA</u>
1965	448	448
1966	475	475
1967	497	497
1968	456	456
1969	546	546
1970	632	632
1971	572	572
1972	548	548
1973	520	520
1974	553	553
1975	560	560
1976	527	527
1977	463	463
1978	351	423
1979 (9/15/79)	410	482
1980 (request)	520	592

A further important OMB concern is that approval of this request, because of its high visibility, could seriously undermine your major objectives of promoting reorganization and efficiency in government.

Recommendation

Therefore, I recommend that you not approve the request. It is extremely probable that it would evoke a fire-storm of protest from Congressmen of both parties. Checks with key Congressmen, including the leadership of both Houses, indicate that even if we could force approval, it would not be worth the price in terms of congressional criticism and bad publicity.

The only sure way to assure there is no criticism of the White House staff size would be to reduce the current number of employees to a level at least close to that promised by the 1977 reorganization. However, this is entirely impractical, as it would require a reduction in the current staff of about 35 positions.

I have no doubt that with its new activities added since the reorganization (especially liaison with organized interest groups and policy formulation on priority issues), the White House staff is overextended and overburdened. Therefore, because shrinking the current staff is not a viable option, some risk taking is necessary. The question is - how much?

I have examined the White House budget, and I believe there is sufficient flexibility to employ up to about 40 people (of which about 35 have already been hired) above the employment ceiling without requiring a supplemental appropriation request. This could provide for a total staff of 415, and permit the number of FTPs to be held close to the politically sensitive level of 351. The total figure would still be potentially dangerous, but because we would not be drawing attention to it with an appropriation request, I believe whatever bad publicity developed would be tolerable.

I have discussed this with Hamilton, Al and Hugh, and I recognize that this would not provide the number of people they feel is desirable. However, with the discharge of some individuals whom I understand are still employed only because they have not found jobs elsewhere, and with the shifting of others to other agencies or the re-election campaign, I would hope that it could suffice. Certainly OMB is prepared to provide any assistance it can.

11/8

DF -

HS has a copy -

no need to give to

The President - per HS.

—
Sey

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
HARDEN
HERTZBERG
HUTCHESON
KAHN
LINDER
MARTIN
MILLER
MOE
PETERSON
PRESS
SANDERS
SPETH
STRAUSS
TORRES
VOORDE
WISE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 8, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Louis Martin *LM*

SUBJECT: Negotiations for the Release of American Hostages in Iran

On Tuesday morning we discussed with Hamilton Jordan the possibility of using Ambassador Andrew Young as an envoy to Ayatollah Khomeini. I understand from Hamilton that this proposal was not considered viable.

On Wednesday morning I discussed with Attorney Charles Lomax, who represents Muhammad Ali and his spiritual advisors, Hubert and Wallace Muhammad, the possibility of using their good offices on behalf of the American hostages in Iran.

Wallace Muhammad is the leader of the Islamic movement among Blacks in America. Ali and his associates are well known and greatly admired in the Islamic world. They frequently travel to Islamic countries without visas. Attorney Lomax, who is a good friend, feels that Ali may be able to make a contribution toward freeing the hostages.

I hope this suggestion will be considered among other alternatives now under study. Ali and his associates are ready to fly to Iran if we think it is advisable.