

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual
collections.

Collection: President, Office of the: Presidential
Briefing Papers: Records, 1981-1989

Folder Title: 11/09/1981 (Case File: 046918)
(2)

Box: 9

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at:

reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Monday, November '9, 1981

8:30 am (15 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Residence
8:45 am (75 min)	Breakfast Buffet with Presidential <u>Appointees</u> (Helene von Damm/Peter McCoy)	Residence (TAB A) (Draft Remarks Attached)
10:15 am (15 min)	<u>Senior Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:30 am (15 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:45 am (10 min)	<u>Presentation of Christmas Seals</u> (Elizabeth Dole)	(TAB B) Oval Office
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
12:00 m (15 min)	<u>Re-opening of West Wing Press Room</u> (Larry Speakes)	Briefing Room (TAB C) (Draft Remarks Attached)
12:15 pm (2 hrs)	<u>Working Lunch - Pre-News Conference Briefing</u> (David Bergen/Larry Speakes)	Cabinet Room
2:30 pm (30 min)	Interview with Hugh Sidey for World Book <u>Yearbook</u> (Karna Small)	Oval Office (TAB D)
3:30 pm (20 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting with Local Elected Officials</u> <u>re revenue return</u> (Richard Williamson)	Cabinet Room (TAB E)
4:00 pm (50 min)	<u>Taping Session</u> (Mark Goode) (1) Interview with Westinghouse Broad- casting - 45 mins (2) Message for dinner honoring Red Auerbach and to benefit Jimmy Fund for Cancer Research	Library (TAB F) (Auerbach Remarks Attached)
5:00 pm (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Residence
5:30 pm	<u>To Private Quarters</u>	Residence

E

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1981

INTERVIEW WITH HUGH SIDEY ON THE PRESIDENCY FOR WORLD BOOK YEAR BOOK

DATE: Monday, November 9, 1981
LOCATION: The Oval Office
TIME: 2:30 p.m.
FROM: Karna Small *KS*

I. PURPOSE:

Hugh Sidey is writing a lengthy analysis of the presidency for the World Book Year Book (Encyclopedia). He will be developing approximately 20 pages of information from his interview with you. He will not dwell on current issues, but instead be asking you questions about your view of the office of President, its relationship to other institutions and your personal experiences and feelings about your position. (See attached anticipated questions).

II. BACKGROUND:

Mr. Sidey wrote the definitive article on this subject for the last edition of World Book Year Book when President Carter was in office -- he did a lengthy interview with Mr. Carter at that time.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President
Hugh Sidey
Wayne Wille, Editor of WORLD BOOK YEAR BOOK
Dennis Brack, Photographer for WORLD BOOK YEAR BOOK
Karna Small

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House Photographer
WORLD BOOK YEAR BOOK Photographer

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Hugh Sidey and others will enter Oval Office - Mr. Sidey will conduct conversational interview on the presidency for 30-45 minutes.

VI. REMARKS

See anticipated questions TAB A
See memo from Tony Dolan TAB B

TAB A

Anticipated questions about the Presidency - for interview with Hugh Sidey

- How do you feel about the role of President -- as an educator, a persuador or what?
- How do you relate, as President, to other institutions such as the Congress, the Supreme Court, the Federal Reserve?
- What about direct contact with the people -- do you feel more comfortable talking to them and dealing with them directly and is it much different from dealing with their elected representatives?
- What experiences in your life best prepared you for this job? (any individuals or personal experiences that had special meaning or impact on your role today?)
- What part of being President do you like the best? The least?
- How do you keep from becoming discouraged by criticisms or frustrations? Have you ever had a day when you think the job is more than one should have to handle?
- Of all the powers that you possess as President, which is the most important?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TAB B

November 6, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY R. DOLAN *AD*

Here is something that was written earlier this year over your signature on the presidency. Karna thought it might be useful for your Sidey interview.

THE PRESIDENTS: FORWARD

The Presidency -- "a splendid misery."

Thomas Jefferson would lament the "loss of friends caused by its hard decisions; Teddy Roosevelt said it was a chance to make "some kind of a place in history . . . " but would note that even a President's powers are limited -- "Sometimes I wish I could be President and Congress too."

He had never dreamed that "such loneliness and desolation of heart possible," Woodrow Wilson would write of his duties. Most assuredly, "not a rosewater affair. This is an office in which a man must put on his war paint", the scholar-President said.

And Harry Truman -- blunt as usual, succinct as usual: "Being a President is like riding a tiger. A man has to keep on riding or be swallowed."

Today the office remains what it has been for those Presidents: an opportunity, a burden; sometimes a delight, always a tiger.

In those first few days after an inauguration -- before an administration settles in -- a President and those who work with him will frequently find themselves stopping short -- perhaps South Portico awaiting the arrival of a foreign leader or during a walk from the West Wing past the Rose Garden into the residence and they will feel, suddenly, inexplicably, the force of history and reflect on the greatness of the place and the man who have gone before them there.

The story of that greatness is found here in the pages of "The Presidents." A few were greatly gifted; some made notable mistakes; many were good hearted; most did their best, all were patriots.

About the intentions of those men who have occupied this office, James Buchanan has spoken for them: "I have no other object of earthly ambition than to leave my country in a peaceful and prosperous condition, and to live in the affections and respect of my countrymen."

Buchanan's Presidency was a failed one -- a prelude to a terrible Civil War -- but there, in his words, is the reason for a small fledgling Nation's survival and growth: the honesty of her good intentions.

Today, the very basis of those good intentions -- the idea of self-government under God -- is gravely challenged, and yet reading these pages one cannot help but smile and realize that, always, at the moment of great crisis, America has mustered more than good intentions; she has always found wise leadership, resolute spirit and decisive action.

A President must provide a good part of that leadership, spirit, action -- he must speak for America's intentions and set her national agenda. And though he can shape events in this way, he must also respect and reflect the honest desires and good wishes of his countrymen.

This is paradox of public office and especially the high office of the Presidency: One must serve the people but be willing to lead them too in sometimes new or controversial directions.

At the end of a term of office, each of the men in these pages -- and I hope all those who follow them in this high office -- hoped to say with Teddy Roosevelt: "Someone else might have done better than I did, but I could not, for I did my best."

There is a simple criteria for such success. No one suffered more during his duties and no one stood more upright -- so it should not surprise us that it was Lincoln who stated that criteria simply:

"I desire so to conduct the affairs of this administration that if at the end, when I come to lay down the reins of power, I have lost every friend on earth, I shall at least have one friend left, and that friend shall be down inside of me."

There is good advice here, but not just for Presidents. It is good advice for a country. It is advice that should be thought upon and followed by all our citizens. One's first duty is always to conscience -- which is another way of saying, especially in the case of America -- to God and the human freedom he enjoins. The recognition of this duty began this Nation and I am confident will inspire it during the proud centuries and many Presidencies ahead.

Pembroke Tables

The near pair of pembroke tables, adjacent to the sofas, were made in the Hepplewhite style in New York, circa 1785-1800. Each has a single drawer and drop leaves. The characteristic square tapering legs are inlaid with satinwood bellflowers, mock-fluting and cuffs. Satinwood stringing appears throughout. One table was a 1960 gift of the National Society of Interior Designers; the other was acquired to match in 1973.

Pair of Lamps

The pair of lamps, on the pembroke tables, are Chinese vases of the Ch'ien Lung period (1736-1795) mounted as lamps. Their hexagonal bodies are painted with multi-colored Chinese scenes framed in gold. They were acquired for the White House Collection in 1973.

Sofas

The pair of modern upholstered sofas were also purchased for the Oval Office and installed in August 1981 with the pair of armchairs. Of simple rectilinear line with a square back and arms, each is upholstered in white.

Coffee Table

The coffee table between the sofas is a modern reproduction of a butler's tray which was designed for the serving of refreshments. The four arched sections around the rectangular center of the table top are hinged so that they can be raised to provide handholds.

Rug

The oval rug was specially designed for the Oval Office by Edward V. Jones, Consulting Architect to the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, and Edward Fields, Inc., who manufactured it. Turquoise rosettes appear throughout its pale gold field. Its Savonnerie-style border shows classical motifs in shades of salmon, gold, green, and blue designed to harmonize with the upholstery and draperies. The rug was acquired for the White House Collection in 1976, with a portion of its cost contributed by the manufacturer.

D

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1981

RIBBON-CUTTING CEREMONY FOR PRESS ROOM

DATE: November 9, 1981
LOCATION: Press Room - West Wing
TIME: 12 noon (10 minutes)

FROM: Larry Speakes

I. PURPOSE

To inaugurate the reopening of the White House Press Room, and to cut a ribbon officially beginning its use.

II. BACKGROUND

The press room temporarily moved to the Executive Office Building in early August while the West Wing Press Room was having extensive renovation. That work is now complete and the press will move back on November 9.

Press Secretary James Brady will be in attendance at this ceremony, and will cut the ribbon with the President. It will be his first time back at the Press Room since March 30. Mrs. Sarah Brady and Jim's mother, Mrs. Dorothy Brady, will accompany Jim.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President
James Brady

IV. PRESS PLAN

The President's remarks and ribbon-cutting will be open coverage.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President makes brief remarks

The President proceeds in front of the podium, where Jim Brady will join him in cutting the ribbon.

The President departs

C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS -- THE AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION

PARTICIPANTS

CASEY, Dr. Edmund C.	(President, American Lung Association)
CASEY, Luliane W.	(wife of President, ALA)
LINDEMAN, Bard	(Director of Communications, ALA)
SCHROEDER, Dawn	(Sister of Ricky Schroeder)
SCHROEDER, Diane	(Mother of Ricky Schroeder)
SCHROEDER, Richard	(Father of Ricky Schroeder)
SCHROEDER, Ricky	
SPAGNOLO, Lucy	(wife of pulmonary medicine specialist)
SPAGNOLO, Samuel, M.D.	(Pulmonary Medicine Specialist)
SWOMLEY, James A.	(Managing Director, ALA)
THUMIN, Roberta	(Director of Media Relations, ALA)
WEYMUELLER, Robert	(Director, Government Relations, ALA)

ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

The President
The First Lady
Thelma Duggin

SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS FOR MEETING
TO RECEIVE CHRISTMAS SEALS

--Nancy and I are pleased to join you today to launch a
74-year old American tradition -- the annual Christmas Seals
campaign.

--Through the work of the American Lung Association, we long
ago won the battle against tuberculosis. Now, as our country's
oldest voluntary health organization, it raised some \$60 million
last year to fight asthma, emphysema, lung cancer, and other
disabling lung diseases.

--I ~~have recently learned how~~ ^{have recently learned how} ~~know how important it is to have respiratory health and how~~
agonizing it can be when ~~good~~ breathing is impaired. Dr. Spagnolo,
I'm sure glad you were around on March 30.

--And, Ricky, ^{SCHROEDER} I'm glad that California has you leading the Annual
ALA Thanksgiving Parade in Los Angeles. Your presence will represent
the thousands of children who suffer from lung disease.

--For all the volunteers throughout the country who are actively
working in support of the Lung Association, let me say, "Thank
you." You're part of what makes America great -- the volunteer
spirit where we take a little time and exert a little energy
to extend a helping hand to those in need. Without this volunteer
effort, many of the larger problems in our society would not have
been solved.

HANDWRITING FILE

--I urge all Americans to extend the Chirstmas spirit the year round by supporting the Christmas Seals Campaign -- and by participating in the American tradition of volunteerism.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 9, 1981

MEETING WITH: American Lung Association

LOCATION: Oval Office

TIME: 10:45 a.m. - 10:55 a.m.

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

PURPOSE: To be presented with the 1981 Christmas Seals.

BACKGROUND: The 77-year old American Lung Association (ALA) is our oldest voluntary health organization. With a victory first against tuberculosis and now battling lung disease, the ALA is supported by 150,000 volunteers in 149 associations in every state. Last year ALA raised \$60 million, 75 percent of which came from contributions to Christmas Seals. ALA President Edmund C. Casey, M.D.; Samuel V. Spagnolo, M.D. (a pulmonary medicine specialist who attended you on March 30); and Ricky Schroeder will make the traditional Christmas Seals presentation to you and the First Lady. Eleven-year old Ricky Schroeder, who starred in The Champ, is leading the ALA Los Angeles Thanksgiving Parade. The First Lady is a former California Christmas Seals Chairman.

PARTICIPANTS: See attached list.

PRESS COVERAGE: Press pool photo coverage.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS:

10:45 a.m. You and Mrs. Reagan will be joined in the Oval Office by Ricky Schroeder, his family, Drs. Casey and Spagnolo, and ALA officials, for a brief conversation prior to photographs.

10:50 a.m. The Press Pool enters the Oval Office for photographs. You are presented with the Norman Rockwell design for the Christmas Seals by Dr. Casey, and the First Family Christmas Seals by Ricky Schroeder. You express your gratitude and support for the Christmas Seals Campaign.

10:55 a.m. The Press departs the Oval Office.
The ALA group departs the Oval Office.

Attachments: Participants/Talking Points

B

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1981

MEETING WITH PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: State and East Rooms

TIME: 7:45 AM to 9:45 AM

FROM: E. Pendleton James and Helene von Damm

I. PURPOSE

To meet your appointees who came on board over the past seven months; to give them an overview of your administration's goals; and enlist their wholehearted support of your programs and budget cuts.

See attached talking points.

II. BACKGROUND

This is the second of what will be an ongoing series of meetings throughout your administration with new appointees to become acquainted and to ensure their loyalty and commitment. The first such get-together took place on March 30,

III. PARTICIPANTS

Approximately 200 confirmed and announced appointees.

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House Photographer Only

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

7:45 AM Appointees arrive for a buffet breakfast in the State Dining Room

8:10 AM Everyone proceeds to East Room

8:15 AM Program begins:

Welcoming Remarks by the Vice President, who will also MC the meeting

The guests will then be addressed by:

Don Regan
Dave Stockman
Pen James

8:45 AM The President arrives and makes remarks (10 minutes)

9:00 AM The President proceeds to Foyer for receiving line and photographs

10:00 AM The President departs for Oval Office

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1981

MEETING WITH PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES

DATE: November 9, 1981
LOCATION: State and East Rooms
TIME: 7:45 AM to 9:45 AM

FROM: E. Pendleton James and Helene von Damm

I. PURPOSE

To meet your appointees who came on board over the past seven months; to give them an overview of your administration's goals; and enlist their wholehearted support of your programs and budget cuts.

See attached talking points.

II. BACKGROUND

This is the second of what will be an ongoing series of meetings throughout your administration with new appointees to become acquainted and to ensure their loyalty and commitment. The first such get-together took place on March 30.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Approximately 200 confirmed and announced appointees.

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House Photographer Only

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

7:45 AM Appointees arrive for a buffet breakfast in the State Dining Room

8:10 AM Everyone proceeds to East Room

8:15 AM Program begins:

Welcoming Remarks by the Vice President, who will also MC the meeting

The guests will then be addressed by:

Don Regan
Dave Stockman
Pen James

8:45 AM The President arrives and makes remarks (10 minutes)

9:00 AM The President proceeds to Foyer for receiving line and photographs

10:00 AM The President departs for Oval Office

"MSG. NOT... MUCH ONE... (1
WLCM. - (MOST "U" BN. HR.
LONG ENUF "KNOW WHR."
CLOAK RM. IS) AS "IS" THANKU
... COMING "WASH. + FOR ALL - BN.
DOING" OH "MT. GV. - SMTHNG
... BTWN. $\frac{1}{2}$ S TLK. ABT. ALL "REMAINS
... DONE "WR. ELECTD "MIST...
"WRST. EC. MESS... HIST -
MESS "TOOK SVRL. DECADES"
ACCUMULATE. "CNT. CLND. UP
OUR NITE "OUR CHNG. HV. NOT
GROWN LESS & NEITHR "OUR ND.
"WRK. TOGETHR "COMM GOAL.
U & I "ONLY TEMP. CARETHER...
THS. GRT. LND. "WE "NOT HR. "BM
BUROCRTS "ECH DAY "U WCK. INTO

HANDWRITING FILE

" OFFICs REMEMBR "CM. HR. 12
" CUT GOVT. BCK; " REDUCE
" MASSV SIZE, " POWER + " WASTE
MAY " SUGGST SMTHNG " MT. HELP ?
WHN " BCM. GOV. " CALIF. WHN " ST.
WS. " ABT. " SIM SHAP AS. CO. IS NOW
~~THE~~ GOVT. " GROWNG " SIZE ABT. 2 1/2
X " FAST " INCRS. " POP. " DEVELOPD
" KND. " WATCH WRD. " STAYED WITH
" 8 YRS. " WHN. " STRT. " TANK. GOVT.
" WE' INSTD. " THEY - WE'VE BN. HR.
" LONG. " PEN " PROBLY ALRDY STRESSD
SO LET " REITERATE - " P. " EMPLOY. YR.
DEPTs. & AGENCIES BE COMMITD " GOALS
& POLICIES " THS. ADMIN. " HV. CONF.
IN " EXCEPTIONAL QUALs. & TALNTs U
" BRNG HR & APPREC. " SACs. ~~U~~
" NY. " U " MO. " HR. " DAYs " COME

YOU'LL KNOW MOMENTS...

13

FRUSTRATION } YOU'LL KNOW MOMENTS
TOO WHN. YOU'LL FEEL 10 FT. TALL-

-MOMENTS WHN. WE'VE MD. INDIVID.
FRDM. MORE SECURE - WHN. GOVT.
EXTRAV. - BN. REDUCED - WHN. UNNEC.
INTRUSN - P. LVs. - BN. RESTRAINED.

WE CN. KNOW ... MOMENTS IF
"PULL TOGETHR & ALWYS REMEMBER
WHY "CM. HR. ... 1ST PLC.

AS SOME ONE "SD. WHN YOU'RE
UP ... ARKPTS " ALLIGATORS ITS
SMTH. HARD " REMEMBER YOUR
INTENTION WS. DRAIN " SWAMP

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 9, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

FROM: RICHARD S. WILLIAMSON *Rich*

SUBJECT: MEETING WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS --
ADDENDUM TO REMARKS

DATE: Monday, November 9, 1981
TIME: 3:30 - 3:50 p.m.
LOCATION: Cabinet Room

In your opening remarks to the group, you should congratulate Republican incumbent Mayor George Voinovich on his successful reelection bid last week as Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio. Mayor Voinovich won with an overwhelming 76.5 percent of the vote in a largely Democratic stronghold.

Mayor Voinovich is the only local elected official attending today's meeting who has been involved in a recent election.

SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS FOR MEETING WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS

NOVEMBER 9, 1981 - 3:30 P.M.

I'M HAPPY ALL OF YOU COULD BE WITH US TODAY.

FIRST OF ALL, I UNDERSTAND YOUR CONCERNS WITH RESPECT TO THE 12% CUT IN GENERAL REVENUE SHARING. DICK CONDER MADE THOSE VERY CLEAR TO ME AT OUR MEETING IN THE OVAL OFFICE IN SEPTEMBER, AND RICH WILLIAMSON GIVES ME A WEEKLY UPDATE OF THE LETTERS, TELEGRAMS, AND PHONE CALLS WHICH WE RECEIVE ON REVENUE SHARING.

IT IS NOT A FIRST STEP TO PHASING OUT THIS PROGRAM. IN THE FACE OF NEW ESTIMATES DICTATED BY THE HIGH COST OF BORROWING TO FUND DEFICITS WHICH WERE INCREASED IN PART BY THE REDUCTION IN INFLATION WHICH EXCEEDED OUR EXPECTATIONS & THUS REDUCED REVENUES WE ASKED FOR AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUT EXEMPTING ONLY SUCH THINGS AS THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL CARE, THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, AND THE PEACEKEEPING FORCES. THE 12% CUT APPLIES TO THE WHITE HOUSE STAFF AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. I'M AWARE THAT IT WILL CAUSE YOU PROBLEMS. WE WERE HOPEFUL THAT THE REDUCTION IN INFLATION MIGHT EASE YOUR PROBLEM SOMEWHAT BY REDUCING YOUR COSTS.

BUT LET ME RESPOND TO THE MANY RUMORS ABOUT THE "PHASE-OUT" OF REVENUE SHARING. I WILL NOT SUPPORT ANY KIND OF PHASE-OUT OF REVENUE SHARING UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT AN ALTERNATE SOURCE OF FUNDING SUCH AS AN EXCISE TAX CAN BE IDENTIFIED AND A TRANSFER MECHANISM DEVELOPED TO TURN THAT REVENUE SOURCE BACK TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

HANDWRITING FILE

I THINK THAT MANY OF YOU HEARD ME SAY DURING THE DEBATE ON BLOCK GRANTS THAT MY ULTIMATE GOAL WAS TO RETURN REVENUE SOURCES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, IN ADDITION TO PROGRAM AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY. THIS WOULD END THE ROUND TRIP OF THE PEOPLE'S MONEY THROUGH WASHINGTON, WHERE A CARRYING CHARGE IS DEDUCTED AND STRINGS ARE ATTACHED TO THE SPENDING OF WHAT IS LEFT.

I KNOW ~~THAT~~ THERE ARE SOME ~~WHO~~ HAVE SAID THAT THE REVENUE TURNBACK HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE IN THE FORM OF OUR RECENTLY-ENACTED TAX CUT. IT IS TRUE THE TAX CUT MAY REDUCE OPPRESSIVE LEVELS OF FEDERAL TAXATION WHICH HAVE USURPED REVENUE SOURCES ONCE AVAILABLE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. BUT THAT IS NOT WHAT I MEAN BY RETURNING A SPECIFIC TAX -- A SOURCE OF REVENUE TO YOU.

DON REGAN'S CABINET COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS HAS ESTABLISHED A WORKING GROUP OF REVENUE SOURCE RETURN, CHAIRED BY ED GRAY. THAT WORKING GROUP IS NOW MOVING ON A BRISK SCHEDULE AND I HOPE THEIR WORK CAN PROGRESS SUFFICIENTLY SO THAT SOME OF THEIR IDEAS AND PROPOSALS CAN BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE FY '83 BUDGET PROCESS.

IN CLOSING, LET ME JUST SAY THAT I KNOW THE TRANSITION WHICH IS TAKING PLACE IN FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS IS NOT PAINLESS.

YOU AT THE LOCAL LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT ARE ON THE FRONT LINES EVERY DAY. BUT IF WE ALL TIGHTEN OUR BELTS AND CARRY THE LOAD TOGETHER, I AM CONVINCED WE CAN TURN THE ECONOMY AROUND AND MAKE GOVERNMENT WORK MORE EFFECTIVELY FOR ALL OF OUR CITIZENS.

I WOULD NOW LIKE TO HEAR FROM YOU AND I UNDERSTAND THAT DICK CONDER HAS THE FIRST COMMENT.

Excerpts From Brezhnev's Printed Answers

Following are excerpts from questions submitted by *Der Spiegel*, the West German news magazine, to Leonid I. Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, and his written answers as published Monday by *Der Spiegel* and translated by *The New York Times* from the German:

Fate of Détente

Q. East-West relations today appear burdened by strong tensions. How do you see the situation in the world and how do you see the fate of détente?

A. It is turbulent on the earth today. In several parts of the world trouble spots are arising. The arms race with weapons of mass destruction goes on. New kinds of arms are developed which are especially dangerous because they, as the experts say, lower the threshold to a war with nuclear weapons, that is, make its outbreak more probable. Especially insidious seem to be in this regard the utterances of some strategists and politicians in the West about the admissibility of a "limited" nuclear war and the possibility of winning this war.

But if one addresses the heart of the matter, a "limited" nuclear war can't exist at all. Once begun — in Europe or somewhere else — a nuclear war would unavoidably and irrevocably take on a worldwide character. Such is the logic that is inherent to war as such and the character of today's arms and international relations. That one has to see clearly and grasp it.

The Soviet Union is menacing no one and does not have the intention of assaulting anyone. Also, our military doctrine has a defensive character. It excludes preventive wars and the concept of "first strike."

Desire for Friendly Ties

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we are, as I have already repeatedly said, seriously prepared to maintain normal relations with the United States based on mutual respect and taking into account the rights and interests of each. More than this, we wish to have good, friendly relations with the U.S.A. and cooperate with it in the interest of strengthening peace in the world.

Soviet-American negotiations about the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe are imminent. Following these, we hope, the SALT negotiations will begin. President Reagan recently announced the readiness of the U.S. to discuss other problems where there are differences of opinion between the two countries as well. We welcome this readiness, because we have always considered negotiations the suitable means for the solution of international problems. But of course, what matters above all is that words are supported by deeds.

Regarding the dreams of reaching military superiority over the U.S.S.R., one would do better to drop them. If it has to be, the Soviet people would find the possibility to undertake any additional efforts and to do everything that is necessary to guarantee a reliable defense of their country.

A special role in safeguarding the peace and deepening détente devolves, of course, upon Europe. For one thing, it is the narrowest and most fragile of all the "houses" that would inevitably fall victim to a nuclear conflagration.

Weapons in Europe

Q. Medium-range weapons, Soviet as well as American, have come to be one of the most acute problems. Do you still see a way of stopping this development?

A. I have said that already more than once. We are of the opinion that there is no sector of disarmament and no category of arms about which one couldn't agree. Likewise the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe can be solved in the interest of all European peoples. Can and must be.

From the 1950's on the U.S. stationed nuclear arms in Europe and adjacent waters in order to be able to strike at vital centers in the U.S.S.R. and its allies. These weapons were called "forward-based systems." At the same time or a little later, nuclear arms came into some other NATO countries.

Now put yourself in our position. Could we watch impartially as one surrounded us on all sides with military bases, as a growing number of carriers of atomic death in different parts of Europe were aimed at Soviet towns and factories, regardless in what shape: as sea- or land-based missiles, bombers or the like? The Soviet Union had to build weapons to defend itself, not to threaten anybody, Europe least of all. We built them and stationed them on our own territory and in an amount that counterbalances the arsenal of those who have declared themselves our potential opponents.

Comparison of Weapons Units

Let's look at how the relationship of the nuclear forces in Europe really stacks up.

If one counts as medium-range weapons on NATO's side the main nuclear missile and air force units in territories of West European countries and waters bordering on Europe that can reach targets in the Soviet Union — that is, those with a range of a thousand kilometers and more (of course, below the intercontinental range) — as well as the Soviet arms of corresponding range stationed in the European part of the U.S.S.R., there is at present in Europe an approximate parity between NATO and the U.S.S.R. in such weapons.

The NATO countries have here 986 carriers of this type, of which the United States alone has more than 700 (F-111's, FB-111's, F-4's and airplanes aboard aircraft carriers in the seas and oceans around Europe). A further 64 ballistic missiles and 55 bombers are in the British force. France has 144 units (98 missiles and 46 bombers).

The Soviet SS-20

The Soviet Union has 975 units of similar arms at its disposal. The situation has not changed even as the Soviet Union has begun to exchange the obsolete SS-4 and SS-5 for the more modern SS-20 type. With the installation of a new missile we withdraw one or two old ones from our arsenal in order to scrap them together with the launch pads.

It is true that the SS-20 can carry three warheads. But their total detonating power is less than that of one of the old types. And so it follows that in the process of exchanging outmoded missiles the number of delivery systems at our disposal decreased and at the same time the overall strength of our medium-range potential was diminished.

But NATO's medium-range weapons are also constantly being improved and added to. In Britain, for example, aboard the *Polaris* submarines there are modernized ballistic rockets with six warheads (instead of the three so far). In France, it is planned to replace the land- and sea-based missiles carrying one warhead with missiles carrying seven warheads. The number of French missile-carrying submarines will also be increased. And this even though NATO is already one and a half times superior in the number of nuclear warheads capable of reaching combat targets — a very essential criterion.

The Issue of 'Superiority'

These data show unmistakably that the fuss made by NATO about "unacceptable superiority" of the U.S.S.R. in medium-range weapons and the "necessity of rearmament" is without foundation. If anyone, then the Soviet Union should bring up the question of rearmament.

When almost 600 additional missiles are stationed in Western Europe, NATO will achieve a superiority of one and a half times in the number of delivery systems and a superiority of about two times in the number of nuclear warheads. Is it perhaps not obvious that it thereby could come to a significant disturbance of the existing approximate balance (considering all factors) and that a serious threat to the security of the USSR and its allies would arise?

Just think of how the U.S.A. reacted two decades ago when at the request of the Castro Government a few dozen Soviet missiles were to be stationed in Cuba. Cries were raised in Washington: mortal threat to the U.S.A. But now one tries to persuade us that the forward-based American nuclear arms along our Western border are taboo and cannot be a topic of discussion. What is undertaken by us to neutralize the existing threat is declared as being "in excess of the defensive requirements of the U.S.S.R." On the contrary, the intention to station in front of our door hundreds of the newest American missiles beyond all those already at hand is passed off as a "defensive measure."

Talks to Begin in Geneva

Meanwhile, we have agreed with the U.S.A. on the resumption of the negotiations about medium-range nuclear arms. They will begin shortly in Geneva. The U.S.S.R. welcomes this agreement.

At the same time the following must not be passed over in silence: Even as the negotiations draw nearer, claims from the American side, and at a rather high level, are made ever more frequently for a "special position" of the U.S.A.

It is hard to see the logic at the bottom of this attitude. In any case, it has not the least to do with objectivity or with realism.

Rather it is to be assumed that the originators of such "suggestions" in reality don't want negotiations at all, let alone successful ones. They need a failure of the negotiations as a kind of alibi for the continuation of the planned arms buildup and the intended transformation of Western Europe into a launching pad for new American missiles targeted at the U.S.S.R. They are building, from the very beginning, a dead end for the negotiations so that they can then say, See, the U.S.S.R. doesn't care about the opinions of the West, so there is nothing for the U.S. to do but station the rockets.

Ready for Reductions

Who is going to press the start button for the missiles? In which of the "two and a half" wars Secretary Weinberger is playing through will they be activated? To realize the essence of what's going on it is enough to pose these and some similar questions. We should take into consideration that the targets of the American rockets are strategic objects on the territory of the U.S.S.R. and that the new American carriers can be used as first-strike weapons.

As we said before: we would be ready to reduce the total of Soviet missiles in the event of a reasonable position being adopted by the U.S., if the NATO plans for new missile weapons were dropped. I will add: we would be prepared to reach agreement on very substantial reductions on both sides.

If it is a question of the necessity of taking into account the nuclear weapons potential of the NATO allies of the U.S., we simply suggest counting in what is already there. The Soviet Union does not insist on the reduction of this particular potential.

Precisely in order to make it easier to reach a practical solution of the problem we have also made the suggestion — and we make it again — of deciding on a moratorium on stationing new medium-range missiles by NATO and the U.S.S.R. effective on Nov. 30 of this year, when the negotiations begin, to stay in effect until a treaty is completed. The NATO countries would install no Pershing-2 missiles, no cruise missiles and no other medium-range nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union would stop installing SS-20 rockets.

Strategic Arms Talks

Q. President Reagan's Administration does not want anything to do with the SALT II treaty negotiated between Washington and Moscow. Do you think there is a realistic expectation of reviving it?

A. If I am asked about the SALT II treaty I always have to think back on the difficult and tedious negotiations on various levels that preceded its completion. The finished treaty reflected a precisely measured balance of interests of both sides. At the time of its completion, the Soviet Union had more warhead carriers, the U.S. had more warheads. But we said we were prepared to reduce the number of strategic weapons vehicles by about 10 percent, or 254 units, when the treaty went into effect.

It is not our fault that the treaty — perhaps the most important of all arms control treaties — has not gone into effect.

In Washington, the refusal to ratify the SALT II treaty is justified by saying the U.S. was behind the Soviet Union, which supposedly had some great advantage in strategic weapons already or was about to achieve it. In reality, however, the treaty would rule out advantages for each side.

I declare quite emphatically: the Soviet Union has done nothing since the signature of the SALT II treaty in 1979 in the area of strategic arms which could lead to a change in the existing approximate situation of parity.

In contrast, new military programs are continually being approved in the United States. It looks as though in Washington they are not working toward reductions but toward increases in strategic arms and toward making the negotiations depend on the speed of the armaments assembly lines.

The Means of Verification

A little on the question of verification. In Washington they like to say that arms limitation treaties should be subject to careful verification. Who is against that? We, too, want to be certain that the United States fulfills its obligations. Therefore we are interested in verification no less than the U.S. — and maybe even more.

But in the U.S., plans of various kinds are being discussed in all seriousness for concealing intercontinental missiles more thoroughly and excluding them from verification by the other side's technical means.

Not in the Soviet Union, but in the U.S., scenarios for a surprise pre-emptive nuclear strike are being rehearsed.

Our position is to abstain from a nuclear first strike. We, just like the U.S., have experience with verification of the SALT I agreements. We are convinced that each side's own means guarantee the necessary verification.

The effectiveness of these means of observation, including space technology, is continually being improved so that the applicability of national means is increasing. The American Administration certainly knows this. But if mutual trust is achieved, other forms of verification can also be developed. But in any case, national means of verification have to have priority for they correspond better to the security interests of each side.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS ON REVENUE RETURN

DATE: Monday, November 9, 1981
TIME: 3:00 - 3:50 p.m.
(You will attend from 3:30 - 3:50)
LOCATION: Cabinet Room

I. PURPOSE

This is an opportunity for you to discuss the issue of revenue source return with local officials and to reiterate your commitment to returning responsibility and resources to state and local governments.

II. BACKGROUND

In the campaign, you promised to support continuing General Revenue Sharing (see Attachment I). Your September 24th economic package proposed a 12 percent cut in revenue sharing. A White House statement was released at that time stating that you did not support a "phase out" of revenue sharing (see Attachment II).

In light of the Administration's proposal to cut funding for revenue sharing by 12 percent in fiscal year 1982, local officials have serious doubts about the Administration's commitment to the turnback of revenue sources. In addition, Norm Ture's recent statement (see Attachment III) expressing his view that the Administration has already acted on the tax turnback in the form of the recently enacted tax cut, has also eroded the confidence of state and local officials in the Administration's desire to return revenue sources.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The Vice President
Secretary Donald Regan
Richard S. Williamson

12 Mayors and 2 County Commissioners (see Attachment IV)

IV. PRESS PLAN

The Mayors and county officials will meet with local and regional press immediately following the meeting. There will be no press coverage during the meeting.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

3:00 - 3:05	Rich Williamson will welcome the group, introduce staff and call on the Vice President.
3:05 - 3:10	The Vice President will make brief remarks and call on Secretary Regan.
3:10 - 3:30	Secretary Regan will make brief remarks (5 minutes) on the economy in general and open the meeting for general discussion.
3:30	You will arrive, make brief remarks (5 minutes - see Attachment V -- talking points) and open the meeting for general discussion.
3:50	You may leave.
3:50	Meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT I

"I am astonished that the Carter Administration and the Democratic Congress have allowed the general revenue sharing program to expireI pledge that when elected, reenactment of revenue sharing will be among my highest priority (sic)."

Telegram to the National Association of Counties,
October 4, 1980

"One of the goals of my administration will be to decentralize responsibility and resources to Mayors under federal revenue sharing."

Speech to the U.S. Conference of Mayors,
Seattle, Washington, June 8, 1980

"We should maintain general revenue sharing, at least until the transfer program (of returning responsibilities to state and local governments) is completed."

Speech to the National Urban League,
St. Louis, Missouri, August 5, 1980

ATTACHMENT II

September 25, 1981
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Due to press inquiries and some confusion on General Revenue Sharing, the White House Press Office is releasing the following clarification.

The President has proposed a 12% reduction in General Revenue Sharing funding for the 1982 fiscal year. No Presidential decision has been made to phase out revenue sharing in FY '84. The President has informed the Executive Committee of the National Governors' Association that he would like to find an alternate source of funding, such as transfer of a federal excise tax, in lieu of General Revenue Sharing. The President has stated that until such an alternative funding source is identified and a transfer mechanism developed, he does not support a "phase out" of General Revenue Sharing. The President asked Treasury Secretary Donald Regan and OMB Director David Stockman to work with state and local elected officials to develop options addressing this matter.

Tax Turnback to States Is Done, Aide Says

By David S. Broder
Washington Post Staff Writer

A senior Treasury Department official said yesterday that the Reagan administration has "already substantially accomplished" all it can to make new tax sources available to state and local governments, as President Reagan has periodically promised to do.

Norman Ture, the Treasury undersecretary for tax and economic affairs, said the administration had given the states and local jurisdictions this extra taxing room through last summer's federal income tax cut that he said would provide "an average per-state turnback" of \$2.24 billion when fully effective in 1984.

Ture's declaration that "we can't do much more than that" to help states and localities finance federal programs being turned over to them drew expressions of astonishment and protest from members of Congress, state legislatures, county and city governments who met as the "revenue source return subcommittee" of Reagan's advisory committee on federalism.

Richard S. Williamson, Reagan's assistant for intergovernmental relations, had opened the meeting with a long list of questions about the desirability of earmarking the proceeds of various federal taxes for state-local governments or turning those tax sources over to the states and localities. Reagan has long promised to turn back both program responsibilities and the revenue sources to sustain them.

But Ture, who would help draft any legislation the administration offered in this area, put a twist on the discussion by saying that the alternative to "returning specific revenue sources" is for the federal government to "preempt less of the revenue

resources." That alternative, he said, "has already been substantially accomplished" by the three-year, 25-percent tax cut passed last summer.

He conceded that state and local officials who had to raise taxes to finance programs the federal government is dropping would not be in "an enviable position" in the short run, but insisted that "true federalism" required that the same unit of government collect the taxes as spent the money.

That triggered a wave of protests. Benjamin L. Cardin, the Democratic speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates, said that the federal tax cuts were being made to "reduce taxation, not to shift taxes to state and local governments." Indianapolis Mayor William H. Hudnut III, a Republican, said that constitutional limits on local taxes made it "difficult, if not impossible" for many cities to do what Ture was suggesting.

They and several others of both parties argued strongly against the administration's proposed 12-percent cutback in general revenue sharing with the states and cities. Rep. Clarence Brown (R-Ohio) said that reduction in the no-strings federal aid program is "absolutely inconsistent" with the president's professed desire to return authority to localities.

But Ture argued that "any kind of revenue-sharing—whatever form it takes—interferes with the efficiency and rationality of decisions made when the same unit does the taxing and spending."

Son, David Durenberger (R-Minn.) said, "I strongly disagree," because the federal tax system offers "a much fairer way" to collect and redistribute revenues.

Cardin asked Ture what he would do about financing services "in a jurisdiction that has one-

fourth the fiscal resources of the neighboring jurisdiction?"

"You don't do anything," Ture said. "You decide where you want to live."

Williamson told reporters after the session that the commission would meet again to frame recommendations but said it was "hard to speculate" whether the 1983 budget would contain any revenue-return measures. "The president would like to have something we can point to, something that goes beyond what Norm says we have done. Remember," he said, "Norm Ture is expressing Norm Ture's point of view."

10/31/81

The New York Times

Founded in 1851

ADOLPH S. OCHS, *Publisher 1896-1935*
 ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER, *Publisher 1935-1961*
 ORVIL E. DRYFOOS, *Publisher 1961-1963*

ARTHUR OCHS SULZBERGER, *Publisher*

A. M. ROSENTHAL, *Executive Editor*

SEYMOUR TOPPING, *Managing Editor*

ARTHUR GELB, *Deputy Managing Editor*

JAMES L. GREENFIELD, *Assistant Managing Editor*

LOUIS SILVERSTEIN, *Assistant Managing Editor*

MAX FRANKEL, *Editorial Page Editor*

JACK ROSENTHAL, *Deputy Editorial Page Editor*

CHARLOTTE CURTIS, *Associate Editor*

TOM WICKER, *Associate Editor*

JOHN D. POMFRET, *Exec. V.P., General Manager*

JOHN MORTIMER, *Sr. V.P., Asst. to General Manager*

J. A. RIGGS, JR., *Sr. V.P., Operations*

DONALD A. NIZEN, *V.P., Consumer Marketing*

JOHN M. O'BRIEN, *V.P., Controller*

LANCE R. PRIMIS, *V.P., Advertising*

The Emperor's New Tax Cut

Though the occasion attracted little attention, the Reagan Administration last week unveiled the final, and most miraculous, phase of its economic plan for the country.

Phase One, it will be recalled, followed the supply-side prescription for economic recovery: tax less so people save and invest more, thus stimulating growth. Phase Two was get the Federal Government off people's backs and let states and local governments look after domestic needs. The next step was to answer the question, where would they get the money? What revenue stream would Washington relinquish for them to tap instead?

Now Norman Ture, a Treasury Under Secretary, has revealed the answer. The cut in Federal income taxes, he noted, makes new billions available to state and local taxation — available, that is, if governors and mayors have the nerve to try to tap it.

That is a puzzle and a contradiction, but not an answer. Either the tax cut is intended to leave more money in private pockets, and thus stimulate the economy; or it means there is more money for state and local governments to take out of private pockets, to pay for public services. Unless it wishes to be regarded as cynical and insincere, the Administration cannot have it both ways.

Last spring President Reagan told some county officials that, like Martin Luther King, he had a dream. To compensate them for assuming prime responsibility for welfare and other programs, he contemplated turning back tax sources that Washington had pre-empted. Now, Mr. Ture says, the mission is substantially accomplished. The three-year, 25 per-

cent cut in Federal personal income taxes will by 1984 provide states with an average of \$2.24 billion in new taxing room.

Does the President really want states to pursue this source? Obviously not, if that would torpedo his recovery plan. No matter what one thinks of other aspects of the Reagan program, his brand of federalism looks suspiciously like a shell game, whose only sure losers are the poor.

The Administration's concept of federalism turns on Mr. Reagan's conviction that the units of government that spend taxpayers' money should answer directly to those who pay taxes. He also says he knows that states cannot cope with added social welfare responsibilities unaided. But last summer's cuts were deeper than expected, and they aren't the last. Instead of absorbing welfare, Medicaid and food stamps, White House planners talk of dumping more of the burden on states.

What chance, realistically, have states to finance mounting social welfare obligations with higher taxes? A beleaguered state like Michigan, its automotive industry in trouble, finds ever more people dependent on unemployment, welfare and other social programs; just at the time it needs more help it is getting less.

What should a resident of Detroit, say, do as a result? For Mr. Ture, that's easy: move. "You decide where you want to live," he says. That means Americans who don't have much choice about where to live are left stranded. Washington, able to help, has become unwilling. The states, willing for the most part, are not able. Mr. Reagan may consider his vision of federalism a dream; to America's needy people and communities, it's a hoax.

MAYORS AND COUNTY OFFICIALS ATTENDING REVENUE RETURN MEETING

November 9, 1981

Mayor Robert Isaac (R- Colorado Springs)
Mayor William Hudnut (R-Indianapolis)
 President, National League of Cities
Mayor Helen Boosalis (D-Lincoln, NE)
 President, U.S. Conference of Mayors
Mayor George Latimer (D-St. Paul)
Mayor Jane Byrne (D-Chicago)
Mayor George Voinovich (R-Cleveland)
Mayor George Israel (R-Macon, GA)
Mayor William Donald Schaefer (D-Baltimore)
Mayor Henry Cisneros (D-San Antonio)
Mayor Patience Latting (D-Oklahoma City)
Mayor Lewis Murphy (R-Tucson)
Mayor Richard Carver (R-Peoria, IL)
County Commissioner Richard Conder (D-Richmond County, NC)
 President, National Association of Counties
County Commissioner Virgil Brown (R-Cuyahoga County, OH)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

INTERVIEW WITH MR. UDWIN

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: Oval Office

TIME: 4:00 PM

FROM: Mark Goode

I. PURPOSE

To video tape an interview with the President on his priorities for the coming months and the fresh approach he has brought to the presidency.

II. BACKGROUND

Mr. Jerry Udwin, Vice President and Washington Bureau Chief of Group W (Westinghouse Broadcasting Company) will conduct the interview which will air in a series of five segments on both their Westinghouse television and radio stations beginning the week of November 16, 1981.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

Gerald Udwin - Interviewer

IV. PRESS PLAN

Westinghouse is bringing their own photographer for some shots before the interview.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President and Mr. Udwin will be seated in the Oval Office in front of the desk. The interview, in it's entirety will last approximately 30 minutes.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TAPING SESSION

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: Library

TIME: 4:45 PM

FROM: Mark Goode

I. PURPOSE

To video tape a message for a dinner honoring Red Auerbach on November 12 and to benefit the Jimmy Fund for Cancer Research.

II. BACKGROUND

The tribute, which usually features a giant of the sports world, is held in Boston annually to benefit the Jimmy Fund. The Fund was founded by the Red Sox back in the 1940's to research the causes of cancer in children. The dinner on November 12th will be taped to be broadcast over WNAC-TV, the Boston CBS affiliate at a later date.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

IV. PRESS PLAN

none

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President will be seated in a chair in front of the fireplace and read his message off a teleprompter.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

INTERVIEW WITH MR. UDWIN

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: Oval Office

TIME: 4:00 PM

FROM: Mark Goode

I. PURPOSE

To video tape an interview with the President on his priorities for the coming months and the fresh approach he has brought to the presidency.

II. BACKGROUND

Mr. Jerry Udwin, Vice President and Washington Bureau Chief of Group W (Westinghouse Broadcasting Company) will conduct the interview which will air in a series of five segments on both their Westinghouse television and radio stations beginning the week of November 16, 1981.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

Gerald Udwin - Interviewer

IV. PRESS PLAN

Westinghouse is bringing their own photographer for some shots before the interview.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President and Mr. Udwin will be seated in the Oval Office in front of the desk. The interview, in it's entirety will last approximately 30 minutes.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TAPING SESSION

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: Library

TIME: 4:45 PM

FROM: Mark Goode

I. PURPOSE

To video tape a message for a dinner honoring Red Auerbach on November 12 and to benefit the Jimmy Fund for Cancer Research.

II. BACKGROUND

The tribute, which usually features a giant of the sports world, is held in Boston annually to benefit the Jimmy Fund. The Fund was founded by the Red Sox back in the 1940's to research the causes of cancer in children. The dinner on November 12th will be taped to be broadcast over WNAC-TV, the Boston CBS affiliate at a later date.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

IV. PRESS PLAN

none

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President will be seated in a chair in front of the fireplace and read his message off a teleprompter.

(Rohrabacher/TD)
November 6, 1981

TAPING: RED AUERBACH, NOVEMBER 9, 1981

Good evening to all of you in Boston. You're gathered together tonight to accomplish two worthwhile goals. First, you're raising money for a research program that is aimed at finding some very important answers about children's cancer. Your contribution to the Jimmy Fund exemplifies the unequalled generosity of the American spirit.

Secondly, you are honoring a man who also has something to do with the American spirit. To millions of sports fans, Red Auerbach is a symbol of the will to win, of pride, and of teamwork.

We've all seen Red arguing his case with a referee with all the heart and soul he could muster. Believe me, a President who is trying to get spending cuts through the Congress can really appreciate a man like that.

But Red's success wasn't based on his ability to state his case. It was his understanding and respect for his fellow man that brought the fruits of victory. It was hard work, teamwork and a family-like devotion to those with whom he worked that won the day on so many occasions.

Now these values may seem a bit old fashioned, but Red made this formula work for the Celtics. Under his leadership, the words Celtics and Pride became inseparable.

Tonight I am delighted to join in this salute to Red and to thank all of you who are doing so much for the Jimmy Fund.

And now for a personal word: Red, when the dinner is coming to a close and the last accolade has been said, sit back, light up one of those big cigars, and enjoy the moment -- as you have so many times before. We are saluting two winners tonight: Red Auerbach and the Jimmy Fund.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TAPING SESSION

DATE: November 9, 1981

LOCATION: Library

TIME: 4:45 PM

FROM: Mark Goode

I. PURPOSE

To video tape a message for a dinner honoring Red Auerbach on November 12 and to benefit the Jimmy Fund for Cancer Research.

II. BACKGROUND

The tribute, which usually features a giant of the sports world, is held in Boston annually to benefit the Jimmy Fund. The Fund was founded by the Red Sox back in the 1940's to research the causes of cancer in children. The dinner on November 12th will be taped to be broadcast over WNAC-TV, the Boston CBS affiliate at a later date.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

IV. PRESS PLAN

none

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The President will be seated in a chair in front of the fireplace and read his message off a teleprompter.



THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE -- (UNPUBLISHED)

Monday, November 9, 1981

7:30 a.m.	The Vice President arrives OEOB Office	
8:00 a.m. (15-minutes)	C.I.A. Briefing	(WW Office)
8:15 a.m. (60-minutes)	<u>Breakfast Buffet with Presidential Appointees</u> (Helene von Damm/Peter McCoy)	(East Room)
10:00 a.m. (30-minutes)	Vice President's Senior Staff Meeting	(WW Office)
**** 10:30 a.m.	Meet with Chris Buckley	(WW Office)
**** 11:00 a.m. (20-minutes)	Meet with Members of the Synfuels Fuel Board	(WW Office)
**** 12:15 p.m. (2 Hours)	<u>Working Lunch - Pre-News Conference Briefing</u> (David Gergen/Larry Speakes)	(Cabinet Room)
3:00 p.m. (60-minutes)	Meet with Local Elected Officials re <u>Revenue Return</u> (Richard Williamson)	(Cabinet Room)
5:30 p.m. (30-minutes)	Meet with U.S. Ambassador to Bulgaria, <u>Robert Barry</u> (Nancy Bearg Dyke)	(WW Office)
6:00 p.m.	Depart for Vice President's Residence	