

4/27/77

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder: 4/27/77
Container 18

To See Complete Finding Aid:

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

2:00 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: STUART EIZENSTAT *Stu*
SUBJECT: Briefing for Meeting with National
Education Association Officers

National Education Association has more than 1.8 million members and gave its first endorsement of a presidential candidate to you in the past election.

Items on the NEA Legislative Agenda are not new; they include the following:

- Creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education (This is opposed by American Federation of Teachers and most higher education associations);
- Extension/expansion of elementary and secondary education programs;
- Increased federal financing of public education;
- Collective bargaining for public employees and improved retirement programs; and
- National health security (insurance).

On Friday, April 1, 1977, James Green from NEA, along with representatives of allied educational organizations met with Domestic Policy Staff to discuss creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education. The group had two requests:

- (a) Expression of support for creation of a Department of Education from the President, and possible endorsement of Ribicoff Bill now in Congress creating such a Department, or
- (b) Creation of a working advisory group to assist in planning creation of a Department of Education.

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

The major concern of NEA and its allied organizations is that a Department of Education will not be created by the Administration. Thus, they have worked closely with Senator Ribicoff's staff to get endorsements for the Ribicoff Bill. To date, this bill has been endorsed by a Republican and 32 Democratic senators. Bill co-sponsors include Cranston, Magnuson, Humphrey, Pell and Williams. No hearings have been scheduled. Senator Ribicoff is awaiting signal from the White House, according to Ribicoff's staff and NEA officials.

Recommendation

As you know both you and the Vice President made strong personal commitments to the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education during the campaign. I would recommend that at this meeting you state that this subject will receive your immediate personal attention. A working group might then be formed, consisting of the Vice President, Secretary Califano, Bert Lance and myself to report to you within 10 days with recommendations.

NOTE: The FY 1978 Budget which you submitted contains a \$350 million increase in funding for the education of disadvantaged children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other small increases, balanced by a \$360 million reduction in the Impact Aid Program. This shift is designed to target the funds on areas of real need.

Participants

Mr. John Ryor, President, National Education Association
Terry Herndon, Executive Director
Stanley McFarland, Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs
The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Elizabeth Abramowitz, Domestic Council Staff
Joseph Califano, Secretary of HEW



THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20201

APR 25 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOE CALIFANO *Joe Califano*

On Wednesday, April 27th, you will be meeting with leaders of the National Education Association. They are likely to raise your campaign statement in support of a separate Department of Education.

I am well aware of that campaign commitment and prepared to work for its implementation, if that is your final decision.

However, I would like to have the opportunity to discuss the desirability of a separate Education Department before you firmly commit to such a proposal as President. Long before I ever thought I would be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I had written extensively about government reorganization, including arguments against the creation of such a Department.

The principal reasons for opposing a new Department of Education are:

- . The President should have fewer, rather than more people reporting directly to him.
- . The NEA will, in short order, exercise control over a Department of Education and will seek to pump extra dollars into teachers' salaries, to the detriment of other legitimate education expenditures.
- . As a corollary of the last point, a special interest Department, like Education, will be less responsive to Presidential leadership. The need for responsiveness to the President is especially great in an area like Education because the Federal government acts as a virtual trustee for the interests of millions of children (and these interests are not, of course, always congruent with the interests of teachers).

APR. 27
XC: CARP ✓
ABRAMOWITZ ✓

. As your childhood immunization initiative illustrates, there are close interconnections between health, education, and welfare interests that should be explored and implemented further to achieve efficient, effective program results. A separate Department would make such synergism much more difficult to achieve. We need less, not more fragmentation of related programs.

. Higher education, rather than elementary and secondary, is the area where federal financial involvement is proportionately heaviest (50¢ of each public higher education dollar is Federal); organizational arrangements are most fractured, and the need for more visible policy leadership most urgent. But an Education Department dominated by the elementary and secondary teachers' interests will not address these problems.

If you find these arguments persuasive, or if you desire to obtain more time in which we can discuss the issue, you can tell the NEA officials that you have asked OMB and HEW to examine all options in a reorganization in the education area, including the possibility of a new department or a department within a department. The latter alternative would be analagous to the Defense model, with a Department of Human Resources including Departments of Education, Health, and Income Security.

cc: The Vice President
Hamilton Jordan
Stuart Eizenstat

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: THE VICE PRESIDENT 
SUBJECT: Cabinet Level Department of Education

I understand Joe Califano's position with respect to a separate cabinet-level Department of Education.

However, I would make the following points:

- Both you and I strongly committed ourselves to a separate cabinet-level Department of Education during the campaign.
- The National Education Association based its strong support for us in part on that commitment.
- Given the tight budget constraints which we face, creation of the cabinet-level Department is of important symbolic value. It should be combined with a high priority commitment to making the most effective use of available resources if we are to retain the friendship of the education community.

I recognize -- as Joe Califano observes -- that the education community tends to be inbred, defensive, and resistant to change. Every effort should be made to assure that a new Department resists those tendencies.

RECOMMENDATION

I would recommend formation of a working group including myself, Joe Califano, Bert Lance, and Stuart Eizenstat which would make prompt recommendations to you on ways to resolve the Department of Education issue.

While I do not recommend that you announce this group or make a further commitment at your meeting with the NEA this afternoon, I do recommend that you stress at the meeting your personal concern for seeing that this is resolved promptly.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: FRANK MOORE

I talked with Senators Byrd and McClellan today. On Monday, they are going to take up the \$23 billion appropriations bill which has all the stimulus program in it. They hope to get it out of Senate Appropriations by next week. The form of it is contingent upon authorizations.

This is a result of breaking the bottleneck on public works jobs.

9

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Stu Eizenstat
Jody Powell
Jack Watson
Frank Press
Jim Schlesinger

The attached was returned in the
President's outbox and is forwarded
to you for your information and
appropriate action.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Energy

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
April 26, 1977

*cc Stee, Tedy
This shows that in
spite of increase in
drilling effort, oil
production has continued
to drop - "Crack"
program is ill-advised.*

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Frank Press *FP*

During the Cabinet meeting on April 25, the question came up as to whether the domestic oil industry will respond to the stimulus of the price increases included in your energy message and accelerate their exploration programs. From 1973 to 1975, stimulated by price incentives following the embargo:

1. Geological and geophysical exploration expenditures increased 33%
2. New field wildcatting increased 42%
3. Total drilling increased 42%
4. Estimated BTU's discovered in new fields increased 55% (despite the fact that there was essentially no activity in the high potential frontier areas!)

From 1975 to 1976, total wells drilled are up 6%, new field wildcats were 18% successful, a high rate. Wells are now being completed at the increased price which would have been plugged and abandoned at the pre-1973 prices.

From these data, the answer to the question seems to be yes, as you and Dr. Schlesinger have surmised.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

filed
4/27/77

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

C
/

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JIM SCHLESINGER

RE: MEETING WITH SENATOR RIBICOFF
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORGANIZATION BILL

The Committee on Governmental Affairs will begin formal markup of the Department of Energy Organization bill tomorrow. This morning, a draft bill was circulated which contains numerous problems. This will be the basis for markup. The most important problems are discussed below.

(1) Federal Power Commission--The draft incorporates the FPC in the Department, but requires that all FPC matters be considered by an Energy Regulatory Board, which is not under the control of the Secretary. Rulemakings by this Board would be initiated by the Secretary, carried out by the Board, and could be vetoed by the Secretary. The net effect of this relationship is likely to be stalemate, with the result that the regulatory proceedings of the FPC may be substantially impaired.

My strong belief is that the rulemaking activities of the FPC should be carried out by the Secretary. Senator Ribicoff's principal concern seems to be that natural gas pricing decisions should not be left totally in the control of the Secretary. However, the FPC now exercises a variety of other rulemaking functions which impact, for example, on allocation of natural gas and electricity. You might suggest that if there is concern about the wellhead pricing of natural gas, this rulemaking function could be carried out in the manner which the bill now describes for all FPC rulemakings, but the remainder of that rulemaking power should be exclusively lodged in the Secretary.

In addition, there is a need to retain for the Secretary other important functions, such as those relating to emergency transfers of electricity, import and export of natural gas and curtailment authority. These are all executive type powers, and should remain with the Secretary.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

(2) Federal Energy Administration--The bill also requires that all rulemaking decisions on oil pricing and allocation made by FEA be reviewed by a "substantial evidence" test in the courts. This may have the effect of tying up FEA administrative procedures to the detriment of consumers and small independents in the oil industry, and to the benefit of those with sufficient resources to delay. In addition, that provision would seem to present a change in the underlying law of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. The nature of the petroleum and natural gas industries is sufficiently different that the substantial evidence test used under the Natural Gas Act may not be applicable for petroleum regulation.

(3) Energy Planning Board--The draft would establish an Energy Planning Board, separate and apart from the Department, with the Secretary as a member but not the chairman. This Board would take over virtually all of the long-range planning functions relating to energy, thereby taking these functions away from the Department of Energy. If the purpose of the reorganization bill is to enable a coherent planning structure, establishment of this type of Board would undermine a significant portion of the benefits of such a reorganization.

These are three of the most important issues. However, because of the fact that this draft was circulated this morning, just one day in advance of markup, there are dozens of other issues which in the aggregate may be quite significant. I believe that an adequate opportunity should be given the Administration to present our views on the other problem areas, many of which could likely be resolved if the markup were postponed for a day or two.

You might suggest to Senator Ribicoff the need for such consultation and our willingness to work at the staff level with them to find a mutually satisfactory solution to both the regulatory and other problems contained in the bill.

WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

To Sharon and Steven Lasley

Thank you for your kind words. I
appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

Mr. and Mrs. Steven G. Lasley
3622 Almar Road
Lake Worth, Florida 33461

*p.s. Your letter means a
lot to me J*

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

To Holly Sullivan

It was a pleasure for me to receive your poster. I know that you put much time and effort into this special project and you can be proud of the fine results.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

Miss Holly Sullivan
Taylor County Junior High School
318 Clark Street
Perry, Florida 32347

*ps You make my Cabinet
look even better than it is!*
J

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 14, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: FRANK MOORE
FROM: DAN TATE *DT*
SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON SECRETARY KREPS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary Kreps wants to write Senator Byrd and Speaker O'Neill for the purpose of establishing a fairly formal system under which Commerce would seek the views of and coordinate the Department's testimony with appropriate Congressional members and committees.

Surely, this is already done informally. If Commerce is preparing testimony on a bill, the Department ought to be aware of the views of important Members and committees through routine staff checks.

If consultation and coordination is not already being done informally, Commerce should start this practice. However, I have some reservations about formalizing the procedure. Congress should not ever feel it has a hand in writing the testimony of the Department. Commerce shouldn't have to consult and coordinate on every issue, because it sometimes involves tipping their hand in advance and sometimes merely emphasizes the Department's and Congress' differences. More importantly, Secretary Kreps' suggestion would bypass the Administration's testimony clearance procedure of which the Domestic Council and OMB are integral parts. Many times as a result of our testimony clearance procedure, Commerce's initial position has to be changed because OMB feels it is inconsistent with the President's policy. If Congress had helped develop that initial Department position, the change could be embarrassing to Commerce and also give Congress the feeling it has been betrayed.

I thoroughly endorse informal coordination, but do not believe that consultation and coordination should be a hard and fast procedure.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

27 April 1977

TO: FRANK MOORE
FROM: RICK HUTCHESON 
SUBJECT: Hand-Carrying Memos In to the President

Memos such as the attached, which are routine, should always go to the President through me.

I have never objected to your sending the President emergency information memos, as you do frequently, relating to fast-breaking congressional events. I don't ever want to get in the way of your being able to respond to things quickly.

However, I would appreciate it if things not of an emergency nature are funneled through me (as you usually do). In this case, the Kreps/Tate memos could have been substantially abridged for presentation to the President. Thanks.



THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington, D.C. 20230

ACTION

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

April 8, 1977

*Frank Moore -
Why the delay??
Let me know
J.
p.s. She won't send
letters.*

Dear Mr. President:

Pending your approval, I would like to send the attached letters to the Majority Leader of the Senate, Robert Byrd, and Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill.

The letter and procedure it recommends should reassure the Congress that this Administration and Department are sincere in our desire to cooperate. It would also communicate to all levels within this Department my intention to optimize consultation with Congress. There may be some residue within this Department of an exaggerated adversary attitude toward Congress after nearly a decade of living with that relationship.

If you and Frank Moore think it is worth pursuing with the Majority Leader and the Speaker, I will send the letters.

Sincerely,

Juanita M. Kreps

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 14, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: FRANK MOORE
FROM: DAN TATE *DT*
SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON SECRETARY KREPS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary Kreps wants to write Senator Byrd and Speaker O'Neill for the purpose of establishing a fairly formal system under which Commerce would seek the views of and coordinate the Department's testimony with appropriate Congressional members and committees.

Surely, this is already done informally. If Commerce is preparing testimony on a bill, the Department ought to be aware of the views of important Members and committees through routine staff checks.

If consultation and coordination is not already being done informally, Commerce should start this practice. However, I have some reservations about formalizing the procedure. Congress should not ever feel it has a hand in writing the testimony of the Department. Commerce shouldn't have to consult and coordinate on every issue, because it sometimes involves tipping their hand in advance and sometimes merely emphasizes the Department's and Congress' differences. More importantly, Secretary Kreps' suggestion would bypass the Administration's testimony clearance procedure of which the Domestic Council and OMB are integral parts. Many times as a result of our testimony clearance procedure, Commerce's initial position has to be changed because OMB feels it is inconsistent with the President's policy. If Congress had helped develop that initial Department position, the change could be embarrassing to Commerce and also give Congress the feeling it has been betrayed.

I thoroughly endorse informal coordination, but do not believe that consultation and coordination should be a hard and fast procedure.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

27 April 1977

TO: FRANK MOORE
FROM: RICK HUTCHESON 
SUBJECT: Hand-Carrying Memos In to the President

Memos such as the attached, which are routine, should always go to the President through me.

I have never objected to your sending the President emergency information memos, as you do frequently, relating to fast-breaking congressional events. I don't ever want to get in the way of your being able to respond to things quickly.

However, I would appreciate it if things not of an emergency nature are funneled through me (as you usually do). In this case, the Kreps/Tate memos could have been substantially abridged for presentation to the President. Thanks.



THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington, D.C. 20230

ACTION

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

April 8, 1977

*F Moore -
Why the delay??
Let me know*

*J.
p.s. She won't send
letters.*

Dear Mr. President:

Pending your approval, I would like to send the attached letters to the Majority Leader of the Senate, Robert Byrd, and Speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill.

The letter and procedure it recommends should reassure the Congress that this Administration and Department are sincere in our desire to cooperate. It would also communicate to all levels within this Department my intention to optimize consultation with Congress. There may be some residue within this Department of an exaggerated adversary attitude toward Congress after nearly a decade of living with that relationship.

If you and Frank Moore think it is worth pursuing with the Majority Leader and the Speaker, I will send the letters.

Sincerely,

Juanita M. Kreps
Juanita M. Kreps

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

The Vice President

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox and
is forwarded to you for
your information.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Carter's First 100 Days
The Voters' Perspective
by Peter D. Hart

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN,
CARTER'S FIRST 100 DAYS--THE VOTERS' PERSPECTIVE

by
Peter D. Hart

D. Hart
Safe Me
VP
info
J

President Carter has been able to achieve in 100 days one thing that candidate Jimmy Carter was unable to accomplish in two years of campaigning--inspiring some broad intensity of feeling toward him. The most remarkable aspect of the polls which measure Carter's performance both personally and professionally is that there is a strong attachment to him. In the first 30 days, polls indicated that people liked him personally and thought that he was doing an acceptable job professionally. Few voters gave him an excellent mark for his job performance.

In the last 60 days, we have seen an increasing respect for the way he is handling his job. Between 15 and 20 percent of the voters rate Carter's performance as excellent, compared to less than 10 percent in the first month. This indicates that the president has begun to build up a sizable core constituency which is based on personal and professional respect, rather than on regional pride. By contrast, Presidents Ford and Nixon never really built sizable core constituencies.

In analyzing the job rating and the personal popularity of Mr. Carter, I find a number of statistics which indicate a uniqueness to his constituency. While traditional Democrats are most favorable, he scores strongly with Republicans and conservatives as well. Along socioeconomic lines, his rating differs from a traditional Democrat whose rating would sharply decrease as one went up the social class scale. For Carter, it appears to be more of a plateau, where only the most affluent and most poor show sharp differences of opinion.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

Our work in one deep South state probably best illustrates the truth that Jimmy Carter's honeymoon makes for strange bedfellows--his superlative rating among the hard core Wallace supporters is surpassed only slightly by his rating among blacks.

In accomplishing these fine ratings, Jimmy Carter has been able to portray himself as above the partisan fray. Only 30 percent say he is very partisan, compared with Vice President Mondale at 46 percent, and his predecessor, Gerald Ford, at 56 percent.

The second major surprise in the polls which has generally been overlooked is that Jimmy Carter has conveyed as much substance as style in his first 100 days. While his stylistic efforts like the walk down Pennsylvania Avenue, the fireside chats, the telephone call-in, the overnight in Clinton, and his accessibility are noted, the voters have cited in equal numbers Carter's cutting back on government frills, the energy program, the tax rebate, amnesty, and government reorganization. From the voters' perspective, Carter has set more than just a tone; he has established a direction and a set of priorities.

Given all of this favorable feeling toward the president, the national mood has not exactly become euphoric. Confidence in America has returned to an even keel for the first time in over a decade (two exceptions: the fall of 1972 and the first month of Ford's tenure), but our standard question of whether the country is headed in the right direction or is seriously off on the wrong track finds equal numbers on both sides. The deep cynicism inspired originally by Vietnam and Watergate has not been dispelled by two months of good presidential performance.

If most of this is good news to the Carter administration, there are some inherent downside risks in Carter's highly personalized approach to the presidency. The most important element is that he has yet to determine what his constituency will be. While he has mounted the white horse, he has raised the level of expectation about his performance. The more that the voters expect from an elected official, the greater the disappointment if that person fails to achieve these goals. Finally, his highly responsive and personal approach has been undertaken with such intensity that there is no sense of pacing. At present, voters feel that Carter cares and is listening, because he has had so much direct communication with the American people in the first 100 days. If he returns to a more normal level of direct communication, the voter will worry about his becoming insulated and isolated from the average person.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Hamilton Jordan
Jody Powell

Suggest you read Stu's comments on
the Welfare alternatives.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Perspective on Welfare Reform

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

The Vice President

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox and is
forwarded to you for your
Information.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Perspective on
Welfare Reform

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

FROM: STU EIZENSTAT *Stu*
BERT CARP
BILL SPRING
FRANK RAINES

SUBJECT: Perspective on Welfare Reform

I. Overview

The major pending plans, in rough overview, are as follows:

(1) HEW's comprehensive cash assistance and job proposal. This is essentially a negative income tax closely resembling the Nixon Administration's family assistance plan, with the addition of a large number (1 - 1.5 million) of discretionary public service jobs at the minimum wage for those who can work. The advantages of this proposal are:

- o simplicity and theoretical ease of administration.
- o the fact that the commitment to minimum wage jobs for the welfare population is discretionary. Because of the nature of the population served, these jobs will require significant overhead for supervision and supplies, as much as 30%, and will be extremely difficult to implement. In addition, 1 - 1.5 million minimum wage jobs will represent a substantial impact on local public employee labor markets. At the minimum wage, we can anticipate bitter opposition from organized labor, although these jobs may be acceptable to labor at a significantly higher wage.

Among the major disadvantages of this approach are:

- o the strong and announced opposition of Russell Long, Al Ullman, -- and the coalition they can muster -- to a negative income tax. They can be expected to fight bitterly and to base their opposition on the large numbers of persons added to the welfare rolls.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

- o the size of the proposed commitment to the concept of minimum wage jobs. A smaller program, at least at the outset, would be far more practical.
- o the difficulty of providing decent benefits to those who cannot work, since each \$1 in benefits to the poorest raises the eligibility limit by \$2, escalating costs and the number on the rolls.
- o the argument by conservatives that a negative income tax -- under which people keep only 50% of their earnings, less state and local taxes and work expenses -- constitutes a disincentive to work and a disruption of local labor markets.

(2) The Labor Department Proposed Jobs/Cash Approach

Although the Labor Department proposal is complex in its present form, it essentially divides the population into 4 categories: (1) families who are not required to work, who will be served by a flat cash program; (2) families who are working, who will be served by an expanded rebatable tax credit, modeled on the existing Earned Income Credit; (3) families who are required to work (combined with those who choose to work) who will be entitled to one minimum wage job per family -- basically in the public sector; (4) singles and childless couples, who will receive a cash grant equal to the food stamp bonus value.

This proposal is overly complex in present form. However, its advantage is that it is potentially saleable to the public and to the Congress in terms of theme (it is closely related to the "Workfare" proposal which Russell Long advanced in 1972).

The disadvantage is the plan's very great reliance on low-paying jobs for the welfare population -- which amounts to a real policy gamble. We are concerned about the impact of a large number of minimum wage jobs on local public employee labor markets.

(3) Tom Joe's "Triple Track" Approach

In broad concept, there is one major difference between the Labor Department's approach and Tom's.

Tom would provide an escape from the total commitment to minimum wage jobs for those in the "work track" by removing the entitlement to work and providing a stipend for those in the work track for whom work is not supplied. Particularly in times of high unemployment this should substantially increase the feasibility of the plan. It still leaves us with a massive commitment to low-paying jobs for the welfare population -- the same policy gamble embodied in the Labor Department's plan.

Frankly, I think Tom has done good work, and I have strongly urged the Labor Department to get together with him. I understand he will meet with Marshall this evening.

II. Summary

In short -- as we see it -- the choice is between a negative income tax which is administrable but faces a very difficult road, at best in the Congress and a multiple track approach like Tom's or the Labor Department's, which faces costly administrative problems but is a more saleable program and would be equally effective.

You should not approve any plan with announced benefit levels and cost figures until you have seen statistical breakouts of the impact by region, family size, income level, urban-rural, age and other relevant factors.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: The President
FROM: Jack Watson and Jim Parham
SUBJECT: Welfare Reform

The present state of welfare reform discussion centers around three major issues which can be characterized as follows:

1. How heavily shall the reform plan depend on the creation of "public service jobs" to provide employment to those "expected to work?" Theoretical options range from Guaranteed Jobs for all or some families to a gradual retargeting and improvement of present programs.
2. Should the reform plan further favor work by:
(a) allowing those employed or training for employment to achieve higher total income from earnings plus assistance, and/or
(b) providing aid to the employed in a form relatively less stigmatizing (tax credit, public service employment, pre-employment or training stipend, cash welfare grant, in-kind assistance, etc.);...or should the plan simply vary the level of aid only in relation to family size and income?
3. Would it be acceptable to propose a reform plan that would continue to involve several departments in the administration and distribution of aid and services (i.e., Treasury, HEW, Labor, Agriculture, HUD); or is it mandatory to avoid this outcome?

Attention to these issues is essential to further progress in planning.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

The Vice President -

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

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Status Report on Universal
Voter Registration

2



THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

Good
C
-

April 19, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: THE VICE PRESIDENT *WJ*
SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT ON UNIVERSAL VOTER REGISTRATION

We are encouraged about the progress of this bill and the speed with which it is moving on the Hill. Dick Moe and Dave Bieging of my staff are spending most of their time on it, and they report that we could have action in both houses by the end of May.

Attorney General Bell opened testimony on the bill before the House Administration Committee shortly before the recess and was very effective, particularly with southern members. There will be several additional days of hearings during the next two weeks. So far we anticipate no serious difficulty in getting the bill out of committee.

Howard Cannon has scheduled hearings in the Senate Rules Committee beginning on May 4, and he too has requested Attorney General Bell to be the lead-off witness. We have four solid votes on the committee (Cannon, Byrd, Williams and Clark) and we believe we'll have Pell, whose vote is essential, although he is under heavy pressure from the R.I. Secretary of State who is a strong opponent.

With organized labor, the League of Women Voters, Common Cause and others, we have launched a major effort to sell the program nationwide, particularly to secretaries of state and local election officials. Reaction among these groups is already much more favorable than it was a year ago to post-card registration. There have been two regional meetings of secretaries of state at which we were represented, one in the Midwest and the other in New England, and the results of both were quite favorable to us. They are quite evenly divided on the bill, and as a result their national association will take no official position, which was our goal. Many of them intend to testify for the bill. There is less support among local officials, as we expected, but here too we have succeeded in turning some around and neutralizing others.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

The major Democratic areas of opposition to the bill are Chicago and the Deep South. In Chicago we have succeeded in uniting the Democratic regulars, the reformers and the Republicans all against the bill, but again we hope to neutralize them. And there is little or no support in Mississippi or Alabama, but Democrats in the rest of the South have been very supportive.

After their initial flurry of support, the Republicans are now coalescing strongly against the bill. Only John Rhodes, among GOP leaders, says he still supports it. They are obviously concerned that most newly registered voters will vote Democratic, and therefore opposition is becoming a litmus test for them. Nonetheless, we still have some GOP support, probably enough to offset most of the Democratic defections.

The chief argument used by opponents, of course, is that it will increase the potential for voter fraud. We are convinced that it won't and believe we can convince most others that it won't, but we are nonetheless concerned about the effect of this argument on undecided members. Therefore we are inclined to accept one or more of the following amendments which would not significantly alter the bill if doing so would neutralize the fraud issue and pick up additional support:

- Require new registrants to produce two identification cards instead of one.
- Limit the number of persons without identification for whom any one registered voter can vouch.
- Eliminate altogether the vouching procedure.

A more serious problem arises from the pleas of state and local officials, including many supporters of the bill, to delay its implementation until the 1980 elections. Many legislatures will be unable to enact the necessary state legislation without special sessions, which some governors will surely be reluctant to call, and thus these states will be forced to assume the burden of maintaining two voters list, one each for federal and state elections. We are aware of your strong belief that the new system should start in 1978 and we will do everything possible to meet that date. We simply want to flag this problem for you because it's conceivable that we'll soon face the question of moving the effective date back or jeopardizing the bill's prospects.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Stu Eizenstat -

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

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Jack Watson

Re: Tanker Safety and Oil
Spill Prevention Legislation

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE PRESIDENT

FROM

STU EIZENSTAT *Stu*

SUBJECT:

Tanker Safety and Oil Spill
Prevention Legislation

Your March 18 message on preventing oil pollution announced the Administration would use existing law to implement the program rather than seek new legislation. We did not support legislation because: (1) cargo preference would have been added to a bill; and, (2) the bills under consideration established a 200-mile marine safety zone.

Senator Magnuson has since amended his bill on tanker safety and oil spill prevention to conform to your message by deleting cargo preference, the 200-mile marine safety zone and other inconsistent provisions. The Senator, having worked for years on tanker safety, is committed to passing legislation this year. The chances of the House passing a similar bill are equally good. Since there are few substantive differences between this legislation and your program and because legislation appears inevitable, it would seem unwise to oppose legislation.

Therefore, the Department of Transportation, Council on Environmental Quality and other agencies are working to develop amendments to Senator Magnuson's legislation which would be consistent with your program. Should our amendments be accepted, we would anticipate supporting enactment of the bill.

If you have no objection, we will proceed in this manner.

Approve Disapprove Other



Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Bert Lance

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

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Z. Brzezinski

Re: 1978 Budget Amendemtns
U.S. Information Agency &
Board for International
Broadcasting



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

C
/

APR 22 1977

THE PRESIDENT HAS RECEIVED

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance *Bla*
SUBJECT: 1978 Budget amendments: United States Information Agency and Board for International Broadcasting

On March 22 you transmitted a report to the Congress recommending additional shortwave broadcasting facilities for the United States Information Agency's Voice of America and for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty over the next three to five years. To begin four separate relay station expansions, USIA is seeking a 1978 budget amendment to add facilities in the United Kingdom and Liberia, and the Board for International Broadcasting is requesting an amendment for projects in Germany and Portugal. After thorough OMB/agency review and discussion, the agencies have agreed to some OMB suggested reductions and their requests now total \$16.1 million for 1978. The only outstanding issue concerns the timing of the expansions.

OMB recommends that projects rated lower priority by each agency (Liberia and Portugal) be postponed until 1979 to spread outlays more evenly over the 1978-81 period and to allow for a more orderly construction schedule. It should be noted that in this time period, USIA also will be undertaking a \$16 million expansion of its Philippine facility. The proposed delay is consistent with your recommendation to build these projects over the next three to five years.

John Reinhardt opposes the delay in expanding the USIA Liberian facility, because he believes a stronger signal in eastern and southern Africa is needed as soon as possible. The project will take three to four years to complete. The Board for International Broadcasting accepts the 1979 delay of the Portuguese station but believes that if the USIA Liberian expansion begins in 1978, their Portuguese expansion should also begin in 1978 to be consistent with your report's emphasis on Eastern Europe.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

(BA \$ in millions)

	Total Project Cost	1978	
		Modified Agency request	OMB recom.
<u>United States Information Agency</u>			
United Kingdom (4 transmitters)	6.3	6.3	6.3
Liberia (4)	11.6	4.5	-0-
	(17.9)	(10.8)	(6.3)
<u>Board for International Broadcasting</u>			
Germany (4)	5.3	5.3	5.3
Portugal (7)	9.0	-0-	-0-
	(14.3)	(5.3)	(5.3)
Total	32.2	16.1	11.6

_____ Accept OMB recommendation, beginning projects in the United Kingdom and Germany in 1978 but delaying Liberia and Portugal until 1979 (\$11.6 million).

✓ _____ Allow also USIA Liberian project in 1978 (\$16.1 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian and Board's Portugese projects in 1978 (\$25.1 million).

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: April 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Zbigniew Brzezinski *concur*
Stu Eizenstat *re*
Jack Watson *re*

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Bert Lance memo 4/22 re 1978 Budget Amendment
U.S. Information Agency and Board for International
Broadcasting.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

DAY: Monday

DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

No comment.

Please note other comments below:

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)



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

APR 22 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance *BFL*
SUBJECT: 1978 Budget amendments: United States Information Agency and Board for International Broadcasting

On March 22 you transmitted a report to the Congress recommending additional shortwave broadcasting facilities for the United States Information Agency's Voice of America and for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty over the next three to five years. To begin four separate relay station expansions, USIA is seeking a 1978 budget amendment to add facilities in the United Kingdom and Liberia, and the Board for International Broadcasting is requesting an amendment for projects in Germany and Portugal. After thorough OMB/agency review and discussion, the agencies have agreed to some OMB suggested reductions and their requests now total \$16.1 million for 1978. The only outstanding issue concerns the timing of the expansions.

OMB recommends that projects rated lower priority by each agency (Liberia and Portugal) be postponed until 1979 to spread outlays more evenly over the 1978-81 period and to allow for a more orderly construction schedule. It should be noted that in this time period, USIA also will be undertaking a \$16 million expansion of its Philippine facility. The proposed delay is consistent with your recommendation to build these projects over the next three to five years.

John Reinhardt opposes the delay in expanding the USIA Liberian facility, because he believes a stronger signal in eastern and southern Africa is needed as soon as possible. The project will take three to four years to complete. The Board for International Broadcasting accepts the 1979 delay of the Portuguese station but believes that if the USIA Liberian expansion begins in 1978, their Portuguese expansion should also begin in 1978 to be consistent with your report's emphasis on Eastern Europe.

(BA \$ in millions)

	Total Project Cost	1978	
		Modified Agency request	OMB recom.
<u>United States Information Agency</u>			
United Kingdom (4 transmitters)	6.3	6.3	6.3
Liberia (4)	11.6	4.5	-0-
	(17.9)	(10.8)	(6.3)
<u>Board for International Broadcasting</u>			
Germany (4)	5.3	5.3	5.3
Portugal (7)	9.0	-0-	-0-
	(14.3)	(5.3)	(5.3)
Total	32.2	16.1	11.6

_____ Accept OMB recommendation, beginning projects in the United Kingdom and Germany in 1978 but delaying Liberia and Portugal until 1979 (\$11.6 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian project in 1978 (\$16.1 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian and Board's Portuguese projects in 1978 (\$25.1 million).

Date: April 22, 1977

~~Gate~~
FOR INFORMATION:

MEMORANDUM

review
by
BK

FOR ACTION:
The Vice President
Zbigniew Brzezinski
Stu Eizenstat
Jack Watson ✓

1977 APR 22 PM 6 23

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Bert Lance memo 4/22 re 1978 Budget Amendment
U.S. Information Agency and Board for International
Broadcasting.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:
TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DAY: Monday
DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:
 Your comments
Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:
 I concur.
Please note other comments below:

No comment.
EW
4/23
1:30 pm

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.
If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7352)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4/27/77

To Cabinet & other Officers

Too much confusion exists concerning the one spokesman for me on major issues, particularly in dealing with Congressional leaders. Conflicting positions have hurt us on occasion.

On some matters, responsibility is clear. Broader issues, though should be decided through thorough consultation, then a single spokesman should deal with the committee members on the bill.

(e.g.) Foreign trade - Strauss

Energy - Schlesinger

Tax (including welfare, energy, etc.)

- Blumenthal

Welfare (including tax, jobs, etc.)

- Califano

Labor reform - Marshall -- etc.

cc Stu

Jimmy Carter

Sent by Messenger to those indicated:

4/27/77

4/11/77

HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, ESTABLISHMENTS
AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT (with names)

The Honorable Cyrus Vance
Secretary of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

The Honorable W. Michael Blumenthal
Secretary of the Treasury
Washington, D.C. 20220

The Honorable Harold Brown
Secretary of Defense
Washington, D.C. 20301

The Honorable Clifford L. Alexander, Jr.
Secretary of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20310

The Honorable W. Graham Claytor
Secretary of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20350

The Honorable John C. Stetson
Secretary of the Air Force
Washington, D.C. 20330

The Honorable Griffin B. Bell
The Attorney General
Washington, D.C. 20530

The Honorable Cecil D. Andrus
Secretary of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

The Honorable Bob S. Bergland
Secretary of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

The Honorable Juanita M. Kreps
Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

The Honorable Ray Marshall
Secretary of Labor
Washington, D.C. 20210

The Honorable Joseph A. Califano, Jr.
Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20201

The Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris
Secretary of Housing and
Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410

The Honorable Brockman Adams
Secretary of Transportation
Washington, D.C. 20590

The Honorable Samuel Winfred Brown, Jr.
Director of the ACTION Agency
Washington, D.C. 20525

The Honorable Robert Armstrong Anthony
Chairman
Administrative Conference of
The United States
2120 L Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20037

The Honorable John J. Gilligan
Administrator
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

General Mark Wayne Clark, USA, Ret.
Chairman
American Battle Monuments Commission
Washington, D.C. 20390

The Honorable Frank Stanton
Chairman of the Board of Governors
American National Red Cross
Washington, D.C. 20006

The Honorable Jean McKee
Acting Administrator
American Revolution Bicentennial
Administration
Washington, D.C. 20276

more

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The Honorable Charles L. Schultze Chairman Council of Economic Advisers Washington, D.C. 20506 ✓	The Honorable Thomas Bertram Lance Director Office of Management and Budget Washington, D.C. 20503 ✓
The Honorable Charles Hugh Warren Chairman Council on Environmental Quality Washington, D.C. 20006 ✓	Personnel Officer Office of Management and Budget Washington, D.C. 20503
Acting The Honorable GUS W. Weiss, Jr. Executive Director Council on International Economic Policy Washington, D.C. 20500	The Honorable Director Office of Science and Technology Policy Washington, D.C.
The Honorable Robert W. Crandall Acting Director Council on Wage and Price Stability Washington, D.C. 20506	The Honorable Director Office of Telecommunications Policy Washington, D.C. 20504
Executive Director Domestic Council Washington, D.C. 20500	The Honorable Robert S. Strauss Special Representative for Trade Negotiations 1800 G Street, NW. Washington, D.C. 20506 ✓
Executive Secretary National Security Council Washington, D.C. 20500	Mr. Thomas J. English White House Office Washington, D.C. 20500
The Honorable Director Office of Drug Abuse Policy Washington, D.C.	
<p>The Vice President Midge Costanza Stu Eizenstat Hamilton Jordan Bob Lipshutz Frank Moore Jody Powell Jack Watson Frank Press ✓ Z. Brzezinski Jim Schlesinger</p>	

MEMORANDUM

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

151

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: LONDON BUTLER *LB*
DATE: APRIL 26, 1977
SUBJECT: MEETING WITH ARNOLD MILLER, 9:30am, APRIL 27, 1977

Arnold Miller, President of the United Mine Workers, requested this meeting to discuss "general issues." Here are some possible talking points:

Up-coming negotiations with the coal industry.

The national coal contract expires December 4 of this year. You may want to urge Miller to have the UMW begin negotiations as soon as possible so that many of the technical and non-economic issues can be resolved. Failure to begin early may prolong what will probably be a lengthy strike.

UMW elections.

Miller is up for reelection on June 15, and the race is very divisive. You may want to express your hope that the race will be run in a way that will minimize labor disruptions which would in turn lead to a loss in the production of coal.

Energy program.

You may want to ask Miller to work closely with Dr. Schlesinger's staff as they develop further our coal policies in the energy program.

cc: Nell Yates

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: The President
FROM: Jack Watson *Jack*
SUBJECT: Lunch with Charles Schultze, Bert Lance,
Secretary Blumenthal and Arthur Burns
Wednesday, April 27, 1977
12:15-12:45 p.m., Roosevelt Room

As you requested, these four economic advisers are coming to have a working lunch with you. I solicited recommendations for the agenda from Bert, Mike and Charlie; Charlie suggested the following topics relating to the near-term economic outlook:

Real Economic Growth: A general discussion of the key elements of risk in the current economic projections.

Inflation Developments: How transitory are the recent increases in the inflation rate, and what is the near-term outlook for the underlying rate of inflation?

Budgetary Projections: A look at the revised estimates of the Federal deficit and the implied change in fiscal stimulus, and consideration of Treasury financing requirements.

Monetary Projections: The implications for monetary policy of the new forecast for real economic growth, inflation, and fiscal stimulus.

The group might also want to take up the economic impact of the President's energy proposals and the implications for fiscal and monetary policy.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEETING WITH SENATORS GLENN, METZENBAUM, FORD,
HUDDLESTON AND REP. ASHLEY

Wednesday, April 27, 1977
9:00 a.m. (15 minutes)
The Cabinet Room

From: Frank Moore *F.M.*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss the need to continue the ERDA gaseous diffusion uranium enrichment facility near Portsmouth, Ohio.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS & PRESS PLAN

A. Background: Following your energy message to Congress and the affirmation of the Administration's intention to switch from gaseous diffusion to the centrifuge process, the people of Ohio and northern Kentucky began to worry about the future of the uranium enrichment facility near Portsmouth, Ohio. There is presently an add-on construction project in progress at this facility which is projected to create in excess of 6,000 jobs by 1982. Members of Congress from Ohio and Kentucky are concerned that the location for a new centrifuge facility will not be in Portsmouth.

B. Participants: The President
Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio)
John Glenn (D-Ohio)
Wendell Ford (D-Ky.)
Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.)
Rep. Thomas Ashley (D-9th-Ohio)
Frank Moore
Dan Tate
Jim Free

C. Press Plan: White House Photo only.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: ✓ FRANK MOORE
DAN TATE

FROM: BOB THOMSON *BT*

RE: Glenn-Metzenbaum Meeting
April 27, 1977

I had a 15-minute conference with Senator Metzenbaum (5 P.M.). They will present the President with the attached figures at the meeting re Portsmouth. Metzenbaum will say the President's credibility rests upon continuation of the project at Portsmouth. He will cite factors such as deferral of welfare reform and failure to produce jobs bill as also undermining President's credibility.

Glenn believes transfer of project to Tennessee will hurt his chances of re-election in 1980.

President should not have copy of attached figures vividly in his possession at meeting, until the Senators give him a copy themselves.

Attachment

HARRY L. MC CLELLAN, ARIZ.
 EDWARD W. R. ROBERTS, WASH.
 BRUCE BAIRD, IOWA
 JOHN W. C. BRYAN, W. VA.
 JAMES H. EASTLAND, MISS.
 JAMES B. ALLEN, ALA.
 JOSEPH P. TYDIN, ILL.
 JOHN C. STENNIS, MISS.
 HOWARD M. BENTLEY, OHIO
 GEORGE D. COCHRAN, ARIZ.

STEVEN THOMPSON, D.C.
 CHARLES W. McC. MATHIAS, JR., MD.
 WILLIAM L. SCOTT, VA.
 PAUL S. SARTY, MEV.
 OWEN B. MATHON, VT.
 MALCOLM WALLACE, WYO.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

WALTER C. BATHURSTON
 CHIEF CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR

ERDA URANIUM ENRICHMENT EXPANSION PROGRAM

IMPACT AREA: Those counties contiguous with existing ERDA installations in Pike County, Ohio and Anderson County, Tennessee.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPARISON

OHIO IMPACT AREA

Pike (Piketon)	12.3%
ROSS	9.4%
Scioto	18.7%
Adams	17.3%
Jackson	12.4%

AVERAGE: 14.02%

TENNESSEE IMPACT AREA

Anderson (Oakridge)	7.2%
Roane	7.8%
Loudon	6.8%
Blount	5.6%
Union	5.6%
Grainger	10.8%
Knox	4.8%

AVERAGE: 6.94%

IMPACT AREA 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION STATISTICS

OHIO			TENNESSEE		
COUNTY	FORD	CARTER	COUNTY	FORD	CARTER
Pike	3,729	5,734	Anderson	56,013	53,034
Ross	11,477	10,743	Roane	10,494	13,455
Scioto	13,021	18,019	Loudon	7,121	9,216
Adams	4,197	4,450	Blount	4,453	4,683
Jackson	5,987	6,699	Union	13,851	12,006
			Grainger	2,805	2,018
			Knox	1,801	1,631
TOTALS	38,411	45,645	TOTALS	96,538	96,043

CARTER PLURALITY 7,234

FORD PLURALITY 495

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

~~C.F.~~ 1

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 26, 1977

MEETING WITH REP. THOMAS 'LUD' ASHLEY (D-OHIO 9)

Wednesday, April 27, 1977
8:55 a.m., (5 minutes)
The Oval Office

From: Frank Moore JM

I. PURPOSE

To discuss energy -- briefly.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS, AND PRESS PLAN

A. Background: Rep. Ashley was invited to the meeting with Senators Glenn and Metzenbaum at 9:00 a.m., on the uranium enrichment facility near Portsmouth, Ohio. He requested a few minutes to discuss several points with the President on energy.

B. Participants: Rep. Lud Ashley

C. Press Coverage: None.

III. TALKING POINTS

1. Discuss goals of energy program.

2. Discuss how Ad Hoc Select Energy Committee will, through public hearings, better inform Congress and the public on energy goals.

3. Assure Ashley of White House cooperation.

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

THOMAS 'LUD' ASHLEY (D-OHIO 9)

Rep. Ashley's 9th district (most of Lucas County including the city of Toledo) is heavily industrial and heavily ethnic (mainly Polish-Americans). It has a large concentration of automobile-related industries. In September 1976, he supported an auto-industry backed amendment to the Clean Air bill to postpone auto emissions standards until 1982. But in July 1975, he was one of only 72 representatives voting to keep in the energy tax bill provisions requiring imposition of additional federal gasoline taxes if gas consumption was rising.

Rep. Ashley, first elected in 1954, comes from a political family. His great-grandfather, a radical Republican, was Toledo's congressman during the Civil War years; and as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, he chose the names for Montana and Wyoming and possibly others as well.

In addition to chairing the Ad Hoc Select Energy Committee, Rep. Ashley serves as Chairman of the Housing & Community Development Subcommittee (Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs) and is considered a housing expert. He also chairs the Economic Policy Task Force of the Budget Committee and ranks #2 on the Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee.

In 1972, Rep. Ashley won 69% of the vote (running substantially ahead of McGovern who carried Lucas county). In 1974, he won only 53% of the vote, primarily because he was arrested for a drunk driving charge in 1973 and spent three days in jail. In 1976, he won 54.2% of the vote, and his district is thus classified as potentially marginal.

From 1943 to 1945, Rep. Ashley served in the Army and was assigned to the Pacific Theater of Operations. He received his B.A. degree from Yale in 1948 and 1948 was associated with the Toledo Publicity and Efficiency Commission. He received his LL.B. degree in 1951 from Ohio State University. In 1952, he joined the staff of Radio Free Europe, serving in Europe as codirector of the press section and later as assistant director of special projects. March 1, 1954, he resigned to run for Congress.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Jack Watson *Jack*
SUBJECT: SCHEDULING ON TAX REFORM
AND WELFARE REFORM

The following recommendations are the result of discussions we had yesterday following the welfare reform meeting. Participants in the discussions were Mike Blumenthal, Joe Califano, Bert Lance, Charlie Schultze, Ray Marshall, Hamilton Jordan, Jody Powell, Stu Eizenstat, Frank Moore and myself. We recommend the following:

(1) That we accelerate delivery of our comprehensive tax reform package to the Congress to early July (following the July 4th Congressional recess);

(2) That you announce on May 2nd, as promised, your statement on comprehensive welfare reform, outlining the basic principles and general directions of the plan; and

(3) That you also announce on Monday that you have directed Secretary Califano to continue work with members of Congress and state and local officials throughout the country to fill in the details of the plan, so that your legislative package on welfare reform can be delivered to the Congress in early September.

Everyone agrees that it is important for us not to give the indication that we are subordinating, or even deferring, our commitment to comprehensive welfare reform. Everyone also agrees that we should not give the appearance of trying to dictate the Congressional timetable for review of Administration proposals, but rather that we are simply informing them of our own timetable on these two major Administration initiatives.

Frank Moore says that it is essential for us to consult with, and even to bring into the decision-making process, not only Senator Byrd and the Speaker, but also Senators Long, Jackson, Muskie, and Al Ullman. Mike Blumenthal has already spoken to you about his suggestion that he speak directly with Russell Long and Al Ullman, prior to your conversation with Byrd and O'Neill.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

I have just spoken to Joe Califano about the foregoing recommendations. Joe asked me to make the following two points in his behalf:

(1) Joe thinks that we should deliver the legislative package on welfare reform before the Congressional recess on August 5th. He thinks we can be ready with the package by then and believes that if we wait until September to deliver the plan, it will appear that we are not really serious about welfare reform.

(2) Joe suggests that when you talk to Senator Byrd, Speaker O'Neill and the others, you should talk with them in the broader context of all the major Administration proposals which are pending or imminent (e.g., stimulus package, hospital cost containment, social security, energy, welfare reform and tax reform), reaffirming your eagerness to get Congressional action and approval on all of them.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Jack Watson *Jach*
SUBJECT: SCHEDULING ON TAX REFORM
AND WELFARE REFORM

The following recommendations are the result of discussions we had yesterday following the welfare reform meeting. Participants in the discussions were Mike Blumenthal, Joe Califano, Bert Lance, Charlie Schultze, Ray Marshall, Hamilton Jordan, Jody Powell, Stu Eizenstat, Frank Moore and myself. We recommend the following:

(1) That we accelerate delivery of our comprehensive tax reform package to the Congress to early July (following the July 4th Congressional recess);

(2) That you announce on May 2nd, as promised, your statement on comprehensive welfare reform, outlining the basic principles and general directions of the plan; and

(3) That you also announce on Monday that you have directed Secretary Califano to continue work with members of Congress and state and local officials throughout the country to fill in the details of the plan, so that your legislative package on welfare reform can be delivered to the Congress in early September.

Everyone agrees that it is important for us not to give the indication that we are subordinating, or even deferring, our commitment to comprehensive welfare reform. Everyone also agrees that we should not give the appearance of trying to dictate the Congressional timetable for review of Administration proposals, but rather that we are simply informing them of our own timetable on these two major Administration initiatives.

Frank Moore says that it is essential for us to consult with, and even to bring into the decision-making process, not only Senator Byrd and the Speaker, but also Senators Long, Jackson, Muskie, and Al Ullman. Mike Blumenthal has already spoken to you about his suggestion that he speak directly with Russell Long and Al Ullman, prior to your conversation with Byrd and O'Neill.

(2)

I have just spoken to Joe Califano about the foregoing recommendations. Joe asked me to make the following two points in his behalf:

(1) Joe thinks that we should deliver the legislative package on welfare reform before the Congressional recess on August 5th. He thinks we can be ready with the package by then and believes that if we wait until September to deliver the plan, it will appear that we are not really serious about welfare reform.

(2) Joe suggests that when you talk to Senator Byrd, Speaker O'Neill and the others, you should talk with them in the broader context of all the major Administration proposals which are pending or imminent (e.g., stimulus package, hospital cost containment, social security, energy, welfare reform and tax reform), reaffirming your eagerness to get Congressional action and approval on all of them.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Bert Lance -

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

Rick Hutcheson

cc: The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Jack Watson
Tim Kraft

Re: Spring Planning Review for
the 1979 Budget

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

ACTION	FYI		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		MONDALE	<input type="checkbox"/> ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>		COSTANZA	<input type="checkbox"/> AGENCY REPORT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		EIZENSTAT	<input type="checkbox"/> CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>		JORDAN	<input type="checkbox"/> EXECUTIVE ORDER
<input type="checkbox"/>		LIPSHUTZ	Comments due to
<input type="checkbox"/>		MOORE	Carp/Huron within
<input type="checkbox"/>		POWELL	48 hours; due to
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		WATSON	Staff Secretary
			next day

FOR STAFFING
FOR INFORMATION
FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI	<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER	<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP	<input type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH	<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS	<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL	<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON	<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA	<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE

MEMORANDUM.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

INFORMATION

27 April 1977

TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: RICK HUTCHESON *RH*
SUBJECT: Comments on Attached Lance Memo,
"Spring Planning Review for the
1979 Budget"

Watson and Eizenstat concur. Additional comments:

1. WATSON. Suggests that you pick one agency or program, and sit through a much more detailed review than is contemplated for all the other agencies, to give you a sense for what kind of decisions never really reach the top. It would also give other agencies the feeling that you really know what it's like for them to go through these annual OMB reviews. Kraft and Eizenstat agree.
2. WATSON. Suggests that OMB schedule 4-5 regional budget meetings around the country June-July, for state and local outreach, and that one of these be chaired by the President. (KRAFT advises: no trips outside of D.C. are presently contemplated for June-August.) The hearings would be a forum for citizens, state/local leaders to testify on national spending priorities. OMB would be exposed to a useful "people" experience. It would take government to the people, and engage them directly in deciding how to spend/save our money. Eizenstat agrees. *no*
3. EIZENSTAT. Stresses the importance of the May 18 "Critical Priorities Meeting" (which you approved as part of the Vice President's agenda). The purpose of this session, in advance of your budget review, would be to: *agree*
 - a. review major economic/budget goals;
 - b. determine whether they are consistent with one another;
 - c. determine the impact of major pending commitments (tax, welfare reform; energy, farm, trade, housing, urban, employment policy) on prospects for achieving these goals.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

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

1977 APR 14 4 1977
PM 6 59

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance *Bha*
SUBJECT: Spring Planning Review for the 1979 Budget

This note seeks your approval of plans for:

- the spring review of the fiscal year 1979 budget;
- your participation in that review; and
- incorporation of zero-base budgeting into the budget review process this year.

Spring Planning Review

The spring review for 1979 will deal with two different levels of activity:

1. At the aggregate level, OMB -- together with the Council of Economic Advisers and Treasury -- will make fiscal policy recommendations to you based on
 - ° probable economic trends and their likely budget impacts, *ok*
 - ° tax policy issues and their expected short-term and longer-term budget effects.
2. For major agencies, we will identify, for your consideration
 - ° policy guidance on major program issues and planning ceilings for 1979 and for 1980 consistent with plans for a balanced budget in 1981, *ok*
 - ° appropriate longer-range goals and objectives,
 - ° the longer-range impacts of policy guidance, especially for 1981.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

In addition, the review will consider:

- crosscutting program issues affecting more than one agency, and
- other issues (e.g., Federal credit programs) with significant Government-wide implications, as well as
- plans for putting zero-base budgeting into effect.

ok

At the conclusion of the review, policy guidance letters will be sent to the agencies, specifying your budget authority and outlay ceilings for the larger agencies and your policy guidance for all agencies for preparation of the 1979 budget. This year's review will also be used to come into agreement with agencies on:

Believe we need basic review - then ZBB & priorities - then budget level.

- the level of consolidation of zero-base decision packages;
- identification of key issues for zero-base papers to be submitted with the agencies' budget requests in the fall; and
- identification of longer-range zero-base evaluations.

Your participation

When OMB's Spring Planning Review sessions have been completed, we will need your decisions on the budget ceilings and policy guidance to be given the agencies, the key issues on which agencies will be asked to concentrate in preparing zero-base decision packages for their fall submissions, and on needed, longer-term, zero-base evaluations. You can expect that, despite our best efforts, the agency spending proposals, tax reform, and realistic economic assumptions will prove to be incompatible with a balanced budget in 1981, and that you will need to decide on some priorities.

Attached at Tab A is a tentative schedule for the meetings we propose with you to discuss our recommendations and to obtain your decisions. We suggest that Cabinet officers be invited to attend the meetings with you on their programs.

ok

Zero-base budgeting

Because of the critical need to minimize the flow of paper associated with zero-base budgeting, our plans contemplate three levels of detail in the ZBB system.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

- Agencies. Within a matter of days, we will issue guidance to the agencies on their internal ZBB systems. This guidance will warn against excessive detail but will require active involvement by all management levels in an agency.
- OMB. Beginning now and continuing throughout the spring, OMB will work with the agencies to reach agreement on the ZBB materials that will form the basis of budget requests to OMB in the fall.
- Presidential. Our Spring Planning Review discussions with you will include consideration of major issues on which you will want zero-base reviews conducted. Zero-base review papers on these issues will be prepared by the agencies for presentation through OMB to you in the fall.

In approving a budget calendar for Defense earlier this year, you asked for a written briefing from OMB prior to the May meeting on Defense "including a ZBB assessment of all significant expenditures." We trust that the papers we will be giving you under the plans outlined above will meet your needs.

Decision

Agree with plans outlined. _____

Disagree, see me. _____

Attachment

March 31, 1977

SPRING PLANNING REVIEW
PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW SCHEDULE

May	23	1:00 p.m.	Overview
	25	1:00 p.m.	Defense
	26	9:00 a.m.	Treasury, Justice, Commerce, GSA, SBA, Postal Service
June	1	1:00 p.m.	Transportation, CSC
	2	1:00 p.m.	Foreign economic and military aid
	3	9:00 a.m.	Agriculture, Interior, Corps of Engineers, EPA, TVA, NASA
		1:00 p.m.	HUD, Labor, Veterans Administration
	6	1:00 p.m.	HEW
	8	2:00 p.m.	FEA, ERDA

ok - check with
Tim

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: April 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat - concur, plus comments
Hamilton Jordan n/c
Tim Kraft #1 ok, but after Summit; #2 The President will not travel June - Aug

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Jack Watson memo 4/21/77 re Bert Lance's Memo on
Spring Planning Review for the 1979 Budget.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 1:00 P.M.

DAY: Monday

DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

No comment.

Please note other comments below:

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*Televised memo
FE:
Lance's memo on
Spring Planning
Review for 1979 Budget*

ACTION	
FYI	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MONDALE
<input type="checkbox"/>	COSTANZA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EIZENSTAT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JORDAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	LIPSHUTZ
<input type="checkbox"/>	MOORE
<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	WATSON

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	AGENCY REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE ORDER
	Comments due to Carp/Huron within 48 hours; due to Staff Secretary next day

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FOR STAFFING
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
<input type="checkbox"/>	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS
<input type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Jack Watson *Jack* April 21, 1977
RE: Bert Lance's Memorandum on Spring
Planning Review for the 1979 Budget

Attached is Bert's memorandum on the captioned subject. I have two suggestions:

1. Bert's proposal provides more than ample opportunity for Cabinet participation and discretion. I suggest, however, that you consider picking one agency or program and sitting through a much more detailed review than is contemplated for all the other agencies. This would give you a sense of how many and what kind of decisions really never reach the "top," and would give other agencies the feeling that you really know what it's like for them to go through these annual OMB reviews.

2. With respect to state and local out-reach, I think it would be extremely useful for OMB to schedule four or five regional budget meetings around the country during June and July. You might even consider chairing one of them yourself, and Bert, Jim McIntyre, Bo Cutter, and perhaps Charlie Schultze, could chair others. The hearings would provide a forum for average citizens, state and local leaders and others, to testify on national spending priorities. OMB would be exposed to a useful "people" experience and might even learn something. In addition, it would be, in appearance and in fact, one of the best possible ways to take the federal government to the people and to engage broad-based participation in the process of deciding how to spend (and save) our money.

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

1977 APR 14 APR 14 1977
PM 6 59

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance *Bha*
SUBJECT: Spring Planning Review for the 1979 Budget

This note seeks your approval of plans for:

- the spring review of the fiscal year 1979 budget;
- your participation in that review; and
- incorporation of zero-base budgeting into the budget review process this year.

Spring Planning Review

The spring review for 1979 will deal with two different levels of activity:

1. At the aggregate level, OMB -- together with the Council of Economic Advisers and Treasury -- will make fiscal policy recommendations to you based on
 - probable economic trends and their likely budget impacts,
 - tax policy issues and their expected short-term and longer-term budget effects.
2. For major agencies, we will identify, for your consideration
 - policy guidance on major program issues and planning ceilings for 1979 and for 1980 consistent with plans for a balanced budget in 1981,
 - appropriate longer-range goals and objectives,
 - the longer-range impacts of policy guidance, especially for 1981.

In addition, the review will consider:

- crosscutting program issues affecting more than one agency, and
- other issues (e.g., Federal credit programs) with significant Government-wide implications, as well as
- plans for putting zero-base budgeting into effect.

At the conclusion of the review, policy guidance letters will be sent to the agencies, specifying your budget authority and outlay ceilings for the larger agencies and your policy guidance for all agencies for preparation of the 1979 budget. This year's review will also be used to come into agreement with agencies on:

- the level of consolidation of zero-base decision packages;
- identification of key issues for zero-base papers to be submitted with the agencies' budget requests in the fall; and
- identification of longer-range zero-base evaluations.

Your participation

When OMB's Spring Planning Review sessions have been completed, we will need your decisions on the budget ceilings and policy guidance to be given the agencies, the key issues on which agencies will be asked to concentrate in preparing zero-base decision packages for their fall submissions, and on needed, longer-term, zero-base evaluations. You can expect that, despite our best efforts, the agency spending proposals, tax reform, and realistic economic assumptions will prove to be incompatible with a balanced budget in 1981, and that you will need to decide on some priorities.

Attached at Tab A is a tentative schedule for the meetings we propose with you to discuss our recommendations and to obtain your decisions. We suggest that Cabinet officers be invited to attend the meetings with you on their programs.

Zero-base budgeting

Because of the critical need to minimize the flow of paper associated with zero-base budgeting, our plans contemplate three levels of detail in the ZBB system.

- Agencies. Within a matter of days, we will issue guidance to the agencies on their internal ZBB systems. This guidance will warn against excessive detail but will require active involvement by all management levels in an agency.

- OMB. Beginning now and continuing throughout the spring, OMB will work with the agencies to reach agreement on the ZBB materials that will form the basis of budget requests to OMB in the fall.

- Presidential. Our Spring Planning Review discussions with you will include consideration of major issues on which you will want zero-base reviews conducted. Zero-base review papers on these issues will be prepared by the agencies for presentation through OMB to you in the fall.

In approving a budget calendar for Defense earlier this year, you asked for a written briefing from OMB prior to the May meeting on Defense "including a ZBB assessment of all significant expenditures." We trust that the papers we will be giving you under the plans outlined above will meet your needs.

Decision

Agree with plans outlined. _____

Disagree, see me. _____

Attachment

March 31, 1977

SPRING PLANNING REVIEW

PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW SCHEDULE

May	23	1:00 p.m.	Overview
	25	1:00 p.m.	Defense
	26	9:00 a.m.	Treasury, Justice, Commerce, GSA, SBA, Postal Service
June	1	1:00 p.m.	Transportation, CSC
	2	1:00 p.m.	Foreign economic and military aid
	3	9:00 a.m.	Agriculture, Interior, Corps of Engineers, EPA, TVA, NASA
		1:00 p.m.	HUD, Labor, Veterans Administration
	6	1:00 p.m.	HEW
	8	2:00 p.m.	FEA, ERDA

Date: April 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Tim Kraft ✓

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Jack Watson memo 4/21/77 re Bert Lance's Memo on Spring Planning Review for the 1979 Budget.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 1:00 P.M.

DAY: Monday

DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

I like #1 (Watson memo), but it couldn't be scheduled until after

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

No comment.

Please note other comments below:

on #2, the President will most probably not travel this summer (June - August) -

TK

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)

Date: April 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan ✓
Tim Kraft

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Jack Watson memo 4/21/77 re Bert Lance's Memo on
Spring Planning Review for the 1979 Budget.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 1:00 P.M.

DAY: Monday

DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

No comment.

Please note other comments below:

mn

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 25, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: STU EIZENSTAT *Stu*
SUBJECT: Jack Watson Memo 4/21/77 re
Bert Lance's Memo on Spring
Planning Review for the 1979
Budget

I concur with the Spring Review plans laid out by Bert Lance and with Jack Watson's comments.

In addition, I would stress the importance of the Critical Priorities Meeting on May 18 which you approved as part of the Agenda prepared by the Vice President. The purpose of this session, in advance of your budget review, would be

- to review our major economic and budget goals,
- to determine whether they are consistent with one another,
- to determine the likely impact of major existing and pending commitments -- such as the energy policy, welfare reform, farm policy, trade policy, housing and urban policy, tax reform, welfare reform, employment policy -- on the prospects for achieving these goals.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Mr. President:

Kraft likes #1 on Watson's memo, but could not schedule it until after the Summit. On Watson's #2, he feels that you will probably not travel June -- August.

Eizenstat concurs with Lance and Watson. He also wants to stress the importance of the Critical Priorities Meeting on May 18 which you approved as part of the Agenda prepared by the Vice President. The purpose of this session, in advance of your budget review, would be:

- to review our major economic and budget goals,
- to determine whether they are consistent with one another,
- to determine the likely impact of major existing and pending commitments -- such as the energy policy, welfare reform, farm policy, trade policy, housing and urban policy, tax reform, employment policy -- on the prospects for achieving these goals.

Hamilton has no comment.

Rick (wds)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Jack Watson *Jack* April 21, 1977
RE: Bert Lance's Memorandum on Spring
Planning Review for the 1979 Budget

Attached is Bert's memorandum on the captioned subject. I have two suggestions:

1. Bert's proposal provides more than ample opportunity for Cabinet participation and discretion. I suggest, however, that you consider picking one agency or program and sitting through a much more detailed review than is contemplated for all the other agencies. This would give you a sense of how many and what kind of decisions really never reach the "top," and would give other agencies the feeling that you really know what it's like for them to go through these annual OMB reviews.

2. With respect to state and local out-reach, I think it would be extremely useful for OMB to schedule four or five regional budget meetings around the country during June and July. You might even consider chairing one of them yourself, and Bert, Jim McIntyre, Bo Cutter, and perhaps Charlie Schultze, could chair others. The hearings would provide a forum for average citizens, state and local leaders and others, to testify on national spending priorities. OMB would be exposed to a useful "people" experience and might even learn something. In addition, it would be, in appearance and in fact, one of the best possible ways to take the federal government to the people and to engage broad-based participation in the process of deciding how to spend (and save) our money.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

The Vice President
Hamilton Jordan

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox and is
forwarded to you for your
information.

Rick Hutcheson

Re: Presidential Agenda

Tom Kraft

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

ACTION	FYI
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MONDALE
<input type="checkbox"/>	COSTANZA
<input type="checkbox"/>	EIZENSTAT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JORDAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	LIPSHUTZ
<input type="checkbox"/>	MOORE
<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	WATSON

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	AGENCY REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE ORDER
	Comments due to Carp/Huron within 48 hours; due to Staff Secretary next day

<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR STAFFING
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR INFORMATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
<input type="checkbox"/>	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS
<input type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING

<input type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE



THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

①
—

April 26, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: THE VICE PRESIDENT *WJ*
SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL AGENDA

Attached is the revised Presidential Agenda Memorandum, reflecting a breakdown of priority activities, and a calendar of events which may require Presidential involvement over the next six months. It contains suggestions provided by Members of the Cabinet in reaction to the draft circulated at the recent Cabinet Meeting.

The revised charts for May-September are in preparation and will be in final form later next week.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

Revised as of April 25

CALENDAR OF PRIORITY PRESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES

I. Special Events

A. Possible Presidential Trip to West (May 16-17)

Possible trip to California farming areas. Can help to demonstrate Administration's concern for problems of Western States, and might be used to highlight energy policy.

B. Notre Dame Commencement (May 22)

C. Possible Two-Day Trip Outside Washington Featuring Issue Forum or Town Meeting (September)

II. Diplomatic and Defense

A. Official Visits

1. Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam (April 22)
2. King Hussein (April 25)
3. Prime Minister Suarez (April 29)
4. President Kaunda (May 20)
5. Prince Fahd (May 24-25)
6. Prime Minister Fraser (June 22)
7. President Perez (June 29-30)
8. Chancellor Schmidt (July 13-14)
9. Premier Andreotti (late July)

B. European Trip

1. Planning and Preparation (April 25-May 6)
2. European Trip (May 6-10)

C. Complete Review of Arms Transfers Policies (May 23-31)

D. Announce Administration Proposals on Secrecy and Restructuring of Intelligence Community (July)

-- Critical initiative in demonstrating Administration's commitment to safeguard against future intelligence agency abuses.

DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING BY Jay DATE 7/2/89

III. Budget

A. Critical Priorities Meeting (May 18)

-- In advance of Spring Budget Review, meeting on relationship between budget objectives and other critical Administration goals.

B. Spring Budget Review (May 23-26, June 1-8)

-- Meetings represent first cut at zero based budgeting and fiscal 1979 budget.

IV. Economy

Signing of Components of Stimulus Package (April-May)

-- Suggest highly visible signing ceremony involving key Congressional leaders, perhaps in President's Room of United States Senate. On day of signing or shortly thereafter, Vice President and/or Cabinet Members might be dispatched to key areas hit by the recession to talk with State and local leaders about what package might mean to them.

V. Energy

Follow-up Activities in Explaining and Building Support For Program (Spring)

VI. Welfare Reform

A. Planning and Preparation (April)

-- Weekly White House Meetings

B. Submission of HEW Recommendations to President (May 1)

(Public description of program elements)

-- Explanation of recommendations to public should be considered in prior planning sessions.

C. Announcement of Inter-Agency Follow-up in Planning of Final Proposal (May 9-14)

- D. Final Welfare Reform Planning (Spring and Summer)
- E. Final Welfare Reform Proposal (By September, sooner if possible)

VII. Long-Term Planning on Health Care and Tax Reform

- A. Health Message (April 25)
 - Includes hospital cost containment, child screening and treatment proposals as first steps toward bringing quality health care within the reach of all Americans.
- B. Tax Reform
 - 1. Tax Reform Planning Meetings (July, August)
 - 2. Treasury Department Submission and Public Revelation of Tax Reform Proposals (September)

VIII. Reorganization

- A. Review of Reorganization Planning and Reports (May through Summer)
- B. Announcement of Reorganization Executive Committee Members and President's Reorganization Advisory Group Members (Should be Scheduled for Week of May 1-7)
- C. Announce Advisory Committee Reductions (Early June)
 - Opportunity to show progress on key themes of reorganization and cutting government waste.
- D. Reorganization of Executive Office of the President (June 15)
- E. Civil Rights Enforcement Reorganization (August)
- F. Completion of Study of Federal Regional Offices and Councils (July)

IX. Other Initiatives

- A. National Labor Relations Board Reform (May 10-15)
- B. Executive Order on Openness in Government (April 25-30)
- C. Message on Integrity in Government (May 1-7)

-- Could reinforce theme of honesty and trust. Contents might include several items on which Administration must take positions: conflict of interest and disclosure for high level civil servants, lobby registration and disclosure, special prosecutor and independence of Attorney General.

D. Social Security Message (May 1-7)

-- Recommendations regarding financing and decoupling will be controversial. Administration must address issues and message would emphasize leadership on solving social security problems.

E. Announce White House Conference on the Family (May 9-14)

F. Possible Criminal Justice Message (May 23-31)

-- Might include DEA Reorganization, Grand Jury Reform and other steps toward improved administration of justice. Could show Administration in leadership position on important issue of crime and the Nation's justice system.

G. Results of Reduction in Paperwork (September)

-- Opportunity to demonstrate Administration's follow up on highly publicized goal.

X. Controversial Decisions Which Must be Made

A. Cargo Preference (May 1-15)

-- Decision of major importance to labor. Announcement of position to be made with reference to alternatives supported by the Administration, including agreement on grain transportation with the Soviets.

B. Import Relief Sugar (May 18)

C. Import Relief Color TVs (May 22, sooner if possible)

D. Import Relief Specialty Steel (June)

E. Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System

1. Agency Recommendations by Statute Must Be Filed and Made Public (July)

2. Presidential Decision (September 1)

-- Important regional and international interests, and mandatory decision process (1976 Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act), require early White House coordination on this decision.

F. Extension of New York City Seasonal Loan Program (July 1)

XI. Press

A. Bi-monthly News Conference

B. Editors' Meetings

CALENDAR OF EVENTS WHICH MAY
REQUIRE ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

APRIL

April Sec. of Air Force Decision on Locations for Facing of Next Tactical Fighter Wings Equipped with F-15, F-16, and A-10 Aircraft

April President's Health Message to Congress, including hospital cost containment, child health screening and treatment

April-May Signing of Components of Stimulus Package

April 25- May Announcement of White House Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development

April 25-26 Visit King Hussein

April 25- May 6 Planning and Preparation for European Trip

April 27 Administration Position on DEA Reorganization

April 29 Spanish Prime Minister Suarez

April-May Initial Review of Surface Transportation Deregulation (Announcement to be deferred pending completion of airline regulatory reform)

MAY

May-Summer Review of Reorganization Planning and Reports

May Possible Message on Drugs

May Administration Position on Clean Water Act Amendments

May Administration Position on Privacy Legislation

May 1 HEW Welfare Reform Recommendation to be Submitted to President

May 1-7 Announcement of Reorganization Executive Comm.
Members and President's Reorganization Advisory
Group Members

May 1-7 Possible Message on Integrity in Government

May 1-7 Social Security Message

May 1-15 Announce Decision on Cargo Preference

May 2 Administration Testimony on Lock and Dam 26
(Brock Adams consultation with the President:
make announcement)

May 3 Navy Decision to Reduce Corpus Christi Naval
Air Station

May 4 Justice Department Testimony on Special Prosecutor

May 6-10 Presidential Trip to Europe

May 9-14 Announce Follow Up Inter-Agency Planning on
Welfare Reform

May 15 Sec. of Army Decision on Location of Navy's
East Coast Submarine Base

Mid-May Treasury Legislation on Financial Institutions
Reform

Mid-May White House Meeting to Promote Hire Program
for Vietnam Veterans (Vice President)

May 16-17 Presidential Trip to West

May 17 Announce Regulations on Oil Pollution and Tanker
Safety

May 17-18 NATO Defense Planning Committee Meeting in
Brussels. Major Speech on Sec. of Defense

May 18 Import Relief Decision on Sugar

May 18 Critical Priorities Meeting

May 20 President Kaunda

May 22 Import Relief Decision on Color TVs (sooner
if possible)

May 22 Notre Dame Commencement

May 23 Law of Sea Conference Commences

May 23-31 Possible Criminal Justice Message

May 23-31 Complete Review of Arms Transfers Policies

May 24-25 State Visit from Saudi Arabia (Prince Fahd)

May 23-26 Spring Budget Review

May 25 Democratic Congressional Dinner

May 30 Wreath-Laying, Arlington Cemetery

May 30 Meeting of Council on International Economic Cooperation, Sec. of Treasury to Attend

Late May Signing of Corporate Bribery Legislation

May-June Dept. of Labor hearings on proposed regulations governing the use of temporary aliens as farm-workers

Late May-June Administration Position on Grand Jury Reform

Late May-June Administration Position on Consolidated Transportation Fund

Spring Signing of Strip Mine Bill and OCS Legislation

Spring Follow Up Activities in Explaining and Building Support for Energy Program

Spring-Summer Final Welfare Reform Planning

Summer Administration Position on 1872 Mining Act Reform

JUNE

June Announce Advisory Committee Reductions

June Announce Fuel Economy Standards for Autos (DOT) by July 1

June Announce Findings of Study on HEW Regional Offices

June Administration Position on Reauthorization of Public Broadcasting

June (Spring) Possible Proposals on Sex Discrimination

June Decision on Specialty Steel Imports

June 1 Right of Way Decision on SOHIO Pipeline

June 1-8 Budget Meetings: Spring Planning Review

June 8-9 NATO Nuclear Planning Group Meeting in Ottawa: Secretary of Defense Major Policy Speech

June 9 Democratic National Committee, NYC

Mid-June Signing of Youth Bill

June 15 Reorganization of Executive Office of the President

June 19-25 Sec. of Defense-US Delegation to Korea

June 22 Official Visit, Prime Minister Fraser

June 29-30 Official Visit, Perez

June 30 Announce Interagency Day Care Regulations

JULY-SEPTEMBER

July Completion of Study of Federal Regional Offices and Councils

July Announce Administration Proposals on Secrecy and Restructuring of Intelligence Community

July Agency Recommendations; Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System

July Possible Legislation on No Fault Insurance

July Deepwater Ports Decision

July Final EIS, Loring Base Closing

July 1 Next Quarterly Review for Dairy Price Support

July 1 Decision on Renewal of NYC Seasonal Loan Program

July 13-14 Chancellor Helmut Schmidt

July-August Possible Treasury Legislative Proposals on Urban Development Bank

July-August Preparation of Tax Reform Package

July (late) Premier Andreotti

Post July-Pre-November Decision on US Withdrawal from ILO

August Announce Civil Rights Enforcement Reorganization

August Sec. of Army Decision on Closure of Ft. MacArthur, Ca. Decision on Reduction of Activities at Ft. Devens, and Ft. Indiantown Gap, Pa.

Sept. (sooner if possible) Final Welfare Reform Proposal

Sept. Sec. of Army Decision on Closure of Ft. Hamilton and Totton, NY; Ft. Story, VA; Decision on Reductions at Ft. Dietrick, MD; Consolidation of ORD Center and School from Aberdeen Proving Ground MD to Missile School at Redstone Arsenal, ALA.

Sept. Treasury Department Submission on Tax Reform Proposals

Sept. Decision on Future Concord Landings at Dulles

Sept. Presidential Decision on Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System

Sept. Possible 2-day Trip Outside Washington Featuring Issue Forum or Town Meeting

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 27, 1977

Bert Lance

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

Rick Hutcheson

cc: Z. Brzezinski

Re: 1978 Budget Amendmnts
U.S. Information Agency &
Board for International
Broadcasting



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

C
1

APR 22 1977

THE PRESIDENT HAS SENT.

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance *Bla*
SUBJECT: 1978 Budget amendments: United States Information Agency and Board for International Broadcasting

On March 22 you transmitted a report to the Congress recommending additional shortwave broadcasting facilities for the United States Information Agency's Voice of America and for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty over the next three to five years. To begin four separate relay station expansions, USIA is seeking a 1978 budget amendment to add facilities in the United Kingdom and Liberia, and the Board for International Broadcasting is requesting an amendment for projects in Germany and Portugal. After thorough OMB/agency review and discussion, the agencies have agreed to some OMB suggested reductions and their requests now total \$16.1 million for 1978. The only outstanding issue concerns the timing of the expansions.

OMB recommends that projects rated lower priority by each agency (Liberia and Portugal) be postponed until 1979 to spread outlays more evenly over the 1978-81 period and to allow for a more orderly construction schedule. It should be noted that in this time period, USIA also will be undertaking a \$16 million expansion of its Philippine facility. The proposed delay is consistent with your recommendation to build these projects over the next three to five years.

John Reinhardt opposes the delay in expanding the USIA Liberian facility, because he believes a stronger signal in eastern and southern Africa is needed as soon as possible. The project will take three to four years to complete. The Board for International Broadcasting accepts the 1979 delay of the Portuguese station but believes that if the USIA Liberian expansion begins in 1978, their Portuguese expansion should also begin in 1978 to be consistent with your report's emphasis on Eastern Europe.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

(BA \$ in millions)

	Total Project Cost	1978	
		Modified Agency request	OMB recom.
<u>United States Information Agency</u>			
United Kingdom (4 transmitters)	6.3	6.3	6.3
Liberia (4)	11.6	4.5	-0-
	(17.9)	(10.8)	(6.3)
<u>Board for International Broadcasting</u>			
Germany (4)	5.3	5.3	5.3
Portugal (7)	9.0	-0-	-0-
	(14.3)	(5.3)	(5.3)
Total	32.2	16.1	11.6

_____ Accept OMB recommendation, beginning projects in the United Kingdom and Germany in 1978 but delaying Liberia and Portugal until 1979 (\$11.6 million).

✓ _____ Allow also USIA Liberian project in 1978 (\$16.1 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian and Board's Portugese projects in 1978 (\$25.1 million).

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: April 22, 1977

MEMORANDUM

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Zbigniew Brzezinski *concur*
Stu Eizenstat *nc*
Jack Watson *nc*

FOR INFORMATION:

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Bert Lance memo 4/22 re 1978 Budget Amendment
U.S. Information Agency and Board for International
Broadcasting.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

DAY: Monday

DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

No comment.

Please note other comments below:

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*U.S. Info Agency
+ Board for
International
Broadcasting*

ACTION	
FYI	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MONDALE
<input type="checkbox"/>	COSTANZA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EIZENSTAT
<input type="checkbox"/>	JORDAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	LIPSHUTZ
<input type="checkbox"/>	MOORE
<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WATSON

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENROLLED BILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	AGENCY REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAB DECISION
<input type="checkbox"/>	EXECUTIVE ORDER
	Comments due to Carp/Huron within 48 hours; due to Staff Secretary next day

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FOR STAFFING
<input type="checkbox"/>	FOR INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
<input type="checkbox"/>	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

<input type="checkbox"/>	ARAGON
<input type="checkbox"/>	BOURNE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
<input type="checkbox"/>	BUTLER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CARP
<input type="checkbox"/>	H. CARTER
<input type="checkbox"/>	CLOUGH
<input type="checkbox"/>	FALLOWS
<input type="checkbox"/>	FIRST LADY
<input type="checkbox"/>	GAMMILL
<input type="checkbox"/>	HARDEN
<input type="checkbox"/>	HOYT
<input type="checkbox"/>	HUTCHESON
<input type="checkbox"/>	JAGODA
<input type="checkbox"/>	KING

<input type="checkbox"/>	KRAFT
<input type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
<input type="checkbox"/>	LINDER
<input type="checkbox"/>	MITCHELL
<input type="checkbox"/>	POSTON
<input type="checkbox"/>	PRESS
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. RAINWATER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHLESINGER
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHNEIDERS
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCHULTZE
<input type="checkbox"/>	SIEGEL
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH
<input type="checkbox"/>	STRAUSS
<input type="checkbox"/>	WELLS
<input type="checkbox"/>	VOORDE

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4/22/77

TO: Rich Hutchinson

For Your Information: _____

For Appropriate Handling: _____


Robert D. Linder

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

ACTION
FYI

	MONDALE
	COSTANZA
	EIZENSTAT
	JORDAN
	LIPSHUTZ
	MOORE
	POWELL
	WATSON

	ENROLLED BILL
	AGENCY REPORT
	CAB DECISION
	EXECUTIVE ORDER
	Comments due to Carp/Huron within 48 hours; due to Staff Secretary next day

	FOR STAFFING
	FOR INFORMATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FROM PRESIDENT'S OUTBOX
	LOG IN/TO PRESIDENT TODAY
	IMMEDIATE TURNAROUND

	ARAGON
	BOURNE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BRZEZINSKI
	BUTLER
	CARP
	H. CARTER
	CLOUGH
	FALLOWS
	FIRST LADY
	GAMMILL
	HARDEN
	HOYT
	HUTCHESON
	JAGODA
	KING

	KRAFT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LANCE
	LINDER
	MITCHELL
	POSTON
	PRESS
	B. RAINWATER
	SCHLESINGER
	SCHNEIDERS
	SCHULTZE
	SIEGEL
	SMITH
	STRAUSS
	WELLS
	VOORDE

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

APR 22 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: Bert Lance 
SUBJECT: 1978 Budget amendments: United States Information Agency and Board for International Broadcasting

On March 22 you transmitted a report to the Congress recommending additional shortwave broadcasting facilities for the United States Information Agency's Voice of America and for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty over the next three to five years. To begin four separate relay station expansions, USIA is seeking a 1978 budget amendment to add facilities in the United Kingdom and Liberia, and the Board for International Broadcasting is requesting an amendment for projects in Germany and Portugal. After thorough OMB/agency review and discussion, the agencies have agreed to some OMB suggested reductions and their requests now total \$16.1 million for 1978. The only outstanding issue concerns the timing of the expansions.

OMB recommends that projects rated lower priority by each agency (Liberia and Portugal) be postponed until 1979 to spread outlays more evenly over the 1978-81 period and to allow for a more orderly construction schedule. It should be noted that in this time period, USIA also will be undertaking a \$16 million expansion of its Philippine facility. The proposed delay is consistent with your recommendation to build these projects over the next three to five years.

John Reinhardt opposes the delay in expanding the USIA Liberian facility, because he believes a stronger signal in eastern and southern Africa is needed as soon as possible. The project will take three to four years to complete. The Board for International Broadcasting accepts the 1979 delay of the Portuguese station but believes that if the USIA Liberian expansion begins in 1978, their Portuguese expansion should also begin in 1978 to be consistent with your report's emphasis on Eastern Europe.

(BA \$ in millions)

	Total Project Cost	1978	
		Modified Agency request	OMB recom.
<u>United States Information Agency</u>			
United Kingdom (4 transmitters)	6.3	6.3	6.3
Liberia (4)	11.6	4.5	-0-
	(17.9)	(10.8)	(6.3)
<u>Board for International Broadcasting</u>			
Germany (4)	5.3	5.3	5.3
Portugal (7)	9.0	-0-	-0-
	(14.3)	(5.3)	(5.3)
Total	32.2	16.1	11.6

_____ Accept OMB recommendation, beginning projects in the United Kingdom and Germany in 1978 but delaying Liberia and Portugal until 1979 (\$11.6 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian project in 1978 (\$16.1 million).

_____ Allow also USIA Liberian and Board's Portugese projects in 1978 (\$25.1 million).

Date: April 22, 1977

Gate

MEMO ~~from~~
Kelle W
by
BK

FOR ACTION:

The Vice President
Zbigniew Brzezinski
Stu Eizenstat
Jack Watson ✓

FOR INFORMATION:

1977 APR 22 PM 6 23

FROM: Rick Hutcheson, Staff Secretary

SUBJECT: Bert Lance memo 4/22 re 1978 Budget Amendment
U.S. Information Agency and Board for International
Broadcasting.

YOUR RESPONSE MUST BE DELIVERED
TO THE STAFF SECRETARY BY:
TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DAY: Monday
DATE: April 25, 1977

ACTION REQUESTED:

Your comments

Other:

STAFF RESPONSE:

I concur.

Please note other comments below:

No comment.
JW
4/23
1:30 pm

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately. (Telephone, 7052)

April 25, 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: RICK HUTCHESON
FROM: MICHAEL HORNBLOW *WH*
SUBJECT: OMB Memorandum to President on 1978
Budget Amendments for VOA and BIB

The NSC Staff recommends that the President approve option three which would allow for both the Liberia and Portuguese projects in 1978. International broadcasting is an important element in our national security posture and in the projection of our ideals and values to the world. It will take two to three years--almost to the end of the President's first term--for the actions discussed in this memorandum to reach completion. A year lost now cannot be made up later and costs are likely to rise. There is, therefore, a strong case for getting on with this job as fast as possible.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

4/27/77

To Cabinet & other Officers

Too much confusion exists concerning the one spokesman for me on major issues, particularly in dealing with Congressional leaders. Conflicting positions have hurt us on occasion.

On some matters, responsibility is clear. Broader issues, though should be decided through thorough consultation, then a single spokesman should deal with the committee members on the bill.

(e.g.) Foreign trade - Strauss

Energy - Schlesinger

Tax (including welfare, energy, etc.)

- Blumenthal

Welfare (including tax, jobs, etc.)

- Califano

Labor reform - Marshall -- etc.

Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes

cc Stu

Jimmy Carter

Sent by Messenger to those indicated:

4/11/77

4/27/77

HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, ESTABLISHMENTS
AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT (with names)

The Honorable Cyrus Vance Secretary of State Washington, D.C. 20520	The Honorable Cecil D. Andrus Secretary of the Interior Washington, D.C. 20240 ✓
The Honorable W. Michael Blumenthal Secretary of the Treasury Washington, D.C. 20220 ✓	The Honorable Bob S. Bergland Secretary of Agriculture Washington, D.C. 20250 ✓
The Honorable Harold Brown Secretary of Defense Washington, D.C. 20301	The Honorable Juanita M. Kreps Secretary of Commerce Washington, D.C. 20230 ✓
The Honorable Clifford L. Alexander, Jr. Secretary of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310	The Honorable Ray Marshall Secretary of Labor Washington, D.C. 20210 ✓
The Honorable W. Graham Claytor Secretary of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20350	The Honorable Joseph A. Califano, Jr. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Washington, D.C. 20201 ✓
The Honorable John C. Stetson Secretary of the Air Force Washington, D.C. 20330	The Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C. 20410 ✓
The Honorable Griffin B. Bell The Attorney General Washington, D.C. 20530	The Honorable Brockman Adams Secretary of Transportation Washington, D.C. 20590 ✓

The Honorable Samuel Winfred Brown, Jr. Director of the ACTION Agency Washington, D.C. 20525	General Mark Wayne Clark, USA, Ret. Chairman American Battle Monuments Commission Washington, D.C. 20390
The Honorable Robert Armstrong Anthony Chairman Administrative Conference of The United States 2120 L Street, NW. Washington, D.C. 20037	The Honorable Frank Stanton Chairman of the Board of Governors American National Red Cross Washington, D.C. 20006
The Honorable John J. Gilligan Administrator Agency for International Development Washington, D.C. 20523	The Honorable Jean McKee Acting Administrator American Revolution Bicentennial Administration Washington, D.C. 20276

more

The Honorable Charles L. Schultze
Chairman
Council of Economic Advisers
Washington, D.C. 20506 ✓

The Honorable Charles Hugh Warren
Chairman
Council on Environmental Quality
Washington, D.C. 20006 ✓

The Honorable Gus W. Weiss, Jr.
Executive Director
Council on International
Economic Policy
Washington, D.C. 20500

The Honorable Robert W. Crandall
Acting Director
Council on Wage and Price Stability
Washington, D.C. 20506

Executive Director
Domestic Council
Washington, D.C. 20500

Executive Secretary
National Security Council
Washington, D.C. 20500

The Honorable
Director
Office of Drug Abuse Policy
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Thomas Bertram Lance
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503 ✓

Personnel Officer
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

The Honorable
Director
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable
Director
Office of Telecommunications Policy
Washington, D.C. 20504

The Honorable Robert S. Strauss
Special Representative
for Trade Negotiations
1800 G Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20506 ✓

Mr. Thomas J. English
White House Office
Washington, D.C. 20500

The Vice President
Midge Costanza
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Bob Lipshutz
Frank Moore
Jody Powell
Jack Watson
Frank Press ✓
Z. Brzezinski
Jim Schleslinger