Collection: Deaver, Michael
Folder Title: Miscellaneous Memos and Correspondence 1981 (1 of 3)
Box: 26

WITHDRAWAL SHEET
Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: Deaver, Michael K.: Files **Archivist:** mjd/bcb

File Folder: Miscellaneous Memos and Correspondence - 1981 [1 of 2] OA 7621 **Date:** 4/7/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. memo	Richard S. Williamson to Devid Gergen re Presidential Interview -- Federalism, 2p.	8/25/81	~~P5~~ lcb 10/26/00

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]
- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]
- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statue [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

New file

File "Fall offensive"

1-

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FALL OFFENSIVE

1) Defer all scheduled Federal cost of living adjustments until October 1, 1982:

Pete Domenici

- o Saves $5.0 billion in FY 82 and $15.0 billion over FY 82-84;
- o Would be across-the-board and include nine major pension and benefit programs including social security, SSI, railroad retirement benefits, Veterans pensions, food stamps, child nutrition, black lung, and civilian and military retirement;
- o No reduction in existing benefits, just 3-9 month delay in scheduled adjustment;
- o Social Security COLA delay is now in Administration reform package -- so not new proposal;
- o Justified as equal sacrifice to reduce deficit and interest rates;
- o Fair due to considerable over-adjustment in FY 80-81 as a result of mortgage factor.

2) Three-year plan to reduce Federal employment by 75,000:

- o Would save $300 million in FY 82 and $3.3 billion over FY 82-84;
- o Would amount to 6.5 percent reduction in Federal payroll;
- o Would dramatically convey "Shrink Big Government" theme.

3) An across-the-board 12 percent cut in 1982 appropriations request to be coupled with announced defense reduction:

- o Would amount to $25-27 billion budget authority cut with inclusion of defense TOA;
- o Domestic FY 82 outlay savings would be $7.5 billion, or $9.5 billion with defense;
- o Theme would be belt tightening across-the-board.

4) $74 billion marching order to Cabinet departments and agencies:

- o This would encompass public announcement of agency ceiling reduction;
- o Would move out-year "unidentified savings" one step closer to credibility by pinpointing program areas and expected magnitudes of cuts.

5) $15-20 billion non-social security entitlements reform package:

- o Would save $1-2 billion in FY 82 (due to late effective date in fiscal year) and $15-20 billion over FY 82-84 period;
- o President would promise delivery of welfare-entitlements reform plan by date early enough for fall legislative action;
- o Would encompass medicaid, medicare, food stamps, SSI, AFDC, and civil service and military retirement.

6) Agency reorganizations and terminations:

- o Would include DOE, Department of Education, possibly GSA, Action, BATF and CPSC, and 30-40 agencies and commissions;
- o Would underscore "Shrink Big Government" theme.

7) Cut-back in Federal loan guarantees:

- o $20-30 billion reduction in planned $90 billion increase in new loan guarantees for FY 82;
- o Effect on financial market would be same as equal dollar deficit reduction because 100% loan guarantees are equivalent of general Treasury obligations.

8) Phase-out of general revenue sharing:

- o Would save $552 million in FY 82 and $6.6 billion over FY 82-84;
- o FY 82 would involve 12% cut, same as all other appropriated programs; FY 83 would include 33% cut and program would expire in FY 84;
- o Theme would be that Federal government has no revenue to share and that healthy local tax base requires elimination of Federal deficit and resulting financial instability;
- o Would have favorable effect on financial market because it permanently removes spending commitment that cannot be financed at post-tax cut out-year revenue levels.

9) Cash management plan:

- o OMB-Treasury task force to monitor all agency actions effecting FY 82 obligations, off-setting receipts, cash-payouts, and discretionary spending to ensure that cash deficit and Treasury borrowing is held to absolute minimum and below budget targets;
- o Would minimize overruns, surprises, re-estimates and other preventable threats to announced budget plan;
- o Stepped-up debt collection and waste, fraud and abuse action.

10) Private sector initiative:

- o Stimulate volunteerism to pick-up slack and ease transition;
- o Diversionary effort to deflect attack on social spending cuts.

SAVINGS SUMMARY*

ITEM	FY 82	FY 83-84	TOTAL
I. Specific actions initiated in September:			
o COLA delay	$5.0	10.0	15.0
o Defense slow-down	2.0	11.0	13.0
o Pro-rata FY 82 appropriations cut**	7.0	6.7	13.7
o Entitlements reform	1.5	16.0	17.5
o 75,000 Federal employment reduction	0.3	3.0	3.3
o Revenue sharing phase-out	0.5	6.1	6.6
Total	16.3	52.8	69.1
II. Future actions (FY 83/84 budget ceilings):			
o Gross	0.0	74.0	74.0
o Net of fall action	0.0	27.2	27.2

* Tentative estimate.
** Excludes pro-rata savings in general revenue sharing.

- Would accord with Domenici injunction to get most of FY 83-84 savings on legislative agenda this fall;
- Would avoid future political surprises and need to push FY 83-84 budget proposals from position of decreasing political strength;
- Would generate fiscal credibility in financial markets because bulk of policy change and future budget savings would be specified for immediate legislative action.

N

WRC-TV News

NBC Television Stations Division
National Broadcasting Company, Inc.

David Nuell
News Director

4001 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016 202-686-4242

(HHS)

D. Newhall
for suggested
response.

1-13-82
245-7163
Sent to Sally Kelly
for routing

December 22, 1981

Michael K. Deaver
Assistant to the President and
Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Deaver:

I want to bring you up to date on the status of the Social Security disability story we discussed when you called me last month.

The officials of the Social Security Administration who contacted us as a result of your initiative have been quite helpful in explaining the specifics of the current program to dislodge the hundreds of thousands of ineligible recipients from the roles. We have some stories in preparation which will take advantage of those insights.

As for the Kindrick family, who were focused on in the report which caught your attention, I have attached a copy of a recent story which took note of your position and updated the status of their appeal.

However, in the course of researching the legislation you cited to me as the motivating force behind the review, I found that the Congressional mandate does not even take effect until January, 1982. It is my understanding that the 1982 start was intended to permit guidelines to be disseminated to the states and to ensure, as one Congressional staffer put it, that the review process would be "orderly and fair". I don't know whether you were aware of the timetable when we spoke, but there are some in Congress who feel the Reagan administration decision to accelerate the eligibility review has resulted in an extraordinary number of appeals and in some recipients being cut off who are both innocent and eligible.

There does not seem to be dispute in any quarter, though, as to the extent of fraud in the program or the Reagan administration's willingness, unlike those who have gone before you, to tackle the problem.

Michael K. Deaver
Assistant to the President,
Deputy Chief of Staff

December 22, 1981

But there is a question, in my mind at least, as to whether it would have been accurate in our original story to cite a mandate which is not yet operative as the cause for families being cut off, as you would have had me do. It seems the issue is rather the appropriateness of our use of the words "budget cuts" as the cause when we should have said "Reagan administration program initiatives".

I hope you don't consider this just a semantical exercise; it is our desire to have as much information as possible and to make our stories accurate and reflective of the realities of any situation.

I think this also points out the need for local television stations throughout the country to have greater access to policymakers in the administration so that we have the benefit of understanding what you are trying to accomplish, and how, without having our information distilled first by the national press corps. As I said in our initial conversation, local broadcasters throughout the country will be doing thousands of stories in the coming years that focus on the effects of your programs at the grassroots level.

I realize there are severe limitations on your time and that it is impractical to accede to every request. However, given the fact that the five NBC owned television stations have the potential of reaching nearly twenty percent of the nation's citizens, I hope you will at least consider our proposal for a series of briefings by top administration officials and an interview with the President.

With warmest regards for the holidays, I am

Sincerely,

D Nuell

David Nuell
News Director

DN/jm

WRC-TV4 NBC Television Stations Division
National Broadcasting Company, Inc.
4001 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016 202-686-4000

TRANSCRIPT
NEWSCENTER 4, 6:00 PM
November 27, 1981

Jim Vance: A handicapped man and his family are about to be evicted from their apartment in Reston. They can't pay the rent because they've been cut off of disability payments by the Social Security system.

Jack Cloherty first reported on the plight of the Stuart Kindrick family two weeks ago. He's here now with an update on that case.

Jack Cloherty: Jim, as you know that story has caused a lot of reaction. We received calls and donations for the Kindricks from many viewers, and Presidential aide Mike Deaver called to say that the fund cut off was not the fault of any Reagan administration policy. Top Social Security officials promised a quick review of the case, but so far all the official reaction has not done much to help the Kindricks.

Stuart Kindrick: A rough opinion of it being about like a half a human being just about. Some can be used and some can't and I'm constantly in pain all the time, you know.

Jack Cloherty: Stuart Kindrick was partially paralized on his left side in a work-place accident back in 1973. For the last five years he's been receiving $590 a month in Social Security disability payments. The money has allowed the family to get by, but now Kindrick and his family have been cut off. Even though his doctor says he is unable to work, the Social Security Administration thinks otherwise.

Winona Kindrick: But he can work between eight and sixteen hours a day...he can be a security guard. I've talked to so many security agencies. They said they would not hire him because he couldn't even protect himself.

Jack Cloherty: After our first story on the Kindricks the administrator of the Social Security system reviewed the case file. But only in clear cut emergency cases is disability aid restored immediately, and the administration did not feel the Kindrick case warranted that intervention, so their appeal is slowly working its way through the bureaucracy.

cont'd...

(Cont'd)
TRANSCRIPT
NEWSCENTER 4, 6:00 PM
November 27, 1981

Winona Kindrick: In the mean time, you know, what does a person do? Our Social Security payments were $590 a month including the children's and my husband's and myself. Now he only gets $80 a week Workman's Comp and that is all we get. Our rent is $410 a month...and I have no other income. I can't work 'cause I was on the accident myself with my foot, so I can't work.

Jack Cloherty: So, on Monday the Kindricks and their two children will pack up and move before the rental firm takes what property they have left in lieu of rent.

Jack Cloherty: Do you have any family or anything to go to?

Winona Kindrick: Yes, I have a mother-in-law, but she's on Social Security too, so I don't know what we're gonna do.

Jack Cloherty: The Kindrick's appeal to have disability payments reinstated could be settled within a month, but if their original appeal is denied they will run into a heavy backlog of cases in the second step of the process. Many people have been knocked off the roles in recent case reviews, and many like the Kindricks feel that they have been treated unfairly.

Decision/Making/Information

file here

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Edwin Meese III
James A. Baker, III
Michael K. Deaver

FROM: Richard B. Wirthlin

DATE: December 7, 1981

SUBJECT: Partial Results from Eagle Tracking V:
November 30 - December 4

While it will be another eight days before we complete Eagle Track V, given the number of major events that have occurred over the last three weeks I felt the following results would be of interest:

(1) The presidential job rating stabilized this period at the mid-November levels. We cannot assume, however, that this rating will necessarily remain in its present range through the coming months. Quite the contrary, I believe we should be prepared to expect further erosion in the presidential job rating over the next few months unless the economic news vastly improves.

Three major events conditioned a good deal of the news during this period and all were favorable. First, two out of every three Americans approve of the President's proposal to reduce nuclear weapons in Europe; second, his vetoing the Congressional Appropriations Bill on November 24th and third, Allen's taking adminstrative leave (the day prior to the initiation of this project) lifted some of the media heat being brought to bear on the Administration.

(2) Now, Americans express less concern about inflation, but considerably more worry about unemployment than two months ago. There has also been a sharp drop in the number of people who tag high interest rates as the most important problem facing our country today.

(3) It should be of some concern to us, however, that almost four out of ten say that they are worse off now than they were a year ago.

(4) Six out of ten still believe that "unless a major change is made in our Social Security System, it will go bankrupt in 1982." We must show some action on this issue soon.

(5) Six out of ten Americans felt they knew enough about Richard Allen to rate him. At this juncture, he is perceived very negatively by adult Americans.

Decision/Making/Information

(6) Americans almost unanimously reject the concept that, "In most cases when we have negotiated with the Russians for reduction of nuclear arms they have given up about as much as we have." Contrarily, a strong majority believes that, "In most cases, when we would negotiate with the Russians for reduction of nuclear arms, we have given up more than has been good for our country.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 2, 1981

FOR: FRED F. FIELDING
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOSEPH R. HOLMES, DIRECTOR
WHITE HOUSE TV, FILM & RADIO SERVICES

SUBJECT: Sale or Rental of Videotapes of Presidential Speeches

I would appreciate a meeting to discuss your position that there are legal and policy impediments to my desire to make Presidential speeches available to the public.

In particular, I would like to discuss the interpretation of Public Law 89-274 dated October 20, 1965.

This law was expressly designed to cover the showing of the John F. Kennedy documentary-drama "John F. Kennedy, Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." This movie was the story of John Kennedy, his life and death, and was produced by ICA (then USIA) which is prohibited from distributing their products within the U.S.

I would agree that a videotape or film of Ronald Reagan's life would fall under 89-274. However, a speech is somewhat removed from a life history.

Section 4 of 89-274 restricts the release of a government film "concerning the life, character, and public service of any individual ....during the lifetime of said official." Once again, I believe a speech does not fall under that restriction.

Additionally, all public appearances of the President of the United States are filmed or videotaped for the National Archives. This has been a policy since 1963 and is tasked to a Navy film crew assigned to the White House. Therefore, there are no additional costs involved except for videotape duplication of the original speech which we charge at $60.00. Obviously, this then does not violate Ed Harper's efforts to cut down "propaganda" film expenditures. Insofar as releasing such tapes during an election year, this restriction would not be a problem.

(continued)

We have received literally hundreds of requests from individuals, schools and other groups for copies of the President's speeches. To prohibit these showings during his lifetime seems, at the very least, a great loss to the public.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 18, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR JOSEPH R. HOLMES

FROM: FRED F. FIELDING
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: Sale or Rental of Videotapes of Presidential Speeches to the Public

In response to your November 9, 1981 inquiry I believe there are both legal and policy impediments to the sale or rental of videotapes, made at government expense, to members of the public.

Public Law 89-274, a copy of which is attached, prohibits display of any government funded "documentary film" about the life, character, and public service of a government official during his lifetime without express permission of Congress. While an extremely literal interpretation of this statute would permit us to argue that the word "film" does not encompass videotape, such reasoning would be disingenuous. Clearly the intent of Congress was to prohibit use of government funds to publicize the work of an individual official.

Another statute applicable to this situation is 31 U.S.C. 483a which requires the government to charge fees for services, in accordance with published fee schedules, in an amount which will make the service self-sustaining. Even if we deemed the sale or rental of videotapes outside the scope of the statute discussed above, the fees we would be obliged to charge might limit the "marketability" of the tapes.

Aside from these legal constraints, there are several policy considerations which militate against the sale or rental of videotapes.

- This Administration, under Ed Harper's leadership, has been engaged in a highly visible effort to cut down on agency expenditures for "propaganda" in the form of films, videotapes and publications. It would be awkward for the White House to move in the opposite direction.

- In election years it is almost certain that the sale or rental of these videotapes would be subject to a charge to the Federal Election Commission that public funds were being improperly used for campaign purposes.

While we might prevail on the merits before the FEC, the publicity attendant to such a charge may prove damaging.

- o The government cannot copyright material it produces and therefore cannot control subsequent use of the material once released. If a program of sale or rental was undertaken we would almost certainly have to have an even-handed distribution policy or face a lawsuit such as the one now pending over network "tight pool" coverage. Yet with non-selective sales or rentals and no copyright protection, we run the risk of political opponents or satirists cutting, splicing or doctoring the tapes in a form that might be harmful to the President.

None of these constraints apply to the videotapes of campaign appearances. These are subject to the President's sole control and he may sell or rent them as he pleases. Moreover, he has the authority to copyright them and thus assert control over their use.

Joe - Here is the copy 2 talked to you about on the phone - Marie

ICT

Public Law 89-274
89th Congress, S. J. Res. 106
October 20, 1965

Joint Resolution

79 STAT. 1009

To allow the showing in the United States of the United States Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums".

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy.

"John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

It is further the sense of Congress that the expression of congressional intent embodied in this joint resolution is to be limited solely to the film referred to herein, and that nothing contained in this joint resolution should be construed to establish a precedent for making other materials prepared by the United States Information Agency available for general distribution in the United States.

SEC. 2. Accordingly, the United States Information Agency is authorized to make appropriate arrangements to transfer to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts six master copies of such film and the exclusive rights to distribute copies thereof, through educational and commercial media, for viewing within the United States. The net proceeds resulting from any such distribution shall be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and shall be available, in addition to appropriations authorized in the John F. Kennedy Center Act, to the trustees of such Center for use in carrying out the purposes of such Act.

Transfer and distribution of film.

72 Stat. 1698; 78 Stat. 4.

SEC. 3. In order to reimburse the United States Government for its expenditures in connection with production of the film, such arrangements shall provide for payment, at the time of delivery of the said master copies, for such rights in the amount of $122,000, which shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. Any documentary film which has been, is now being, or is hereafter produced by any Government department or agency with appropriations out of the Treasury concerning the life, character, and public service of any individual who has served or is serving the Government of the United States in any official capacity shall not be distributed or shown in public in this country during the lifetime of the said official or after the death of such official unless authorized by law in each specific case.

Future Government-produced films. Restriction.

Approved October 20, 1965.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 1093 (Comm. on Foreign Affairs).
SENATE REPORT No. 647 (Comm. on Foreign Relations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 111 (1965):
- Aug. 26: Considered and passed Senate.
- Oct. 5: Considered in House.
- Oct. 7: Passed House.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 30, 1981

1- Good keep here,

MEMORANDUM FOR: MARTIN ANDERSON
JOSEPH W. CANZERI
MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF
DAVID R. GERGEN
JAMES W. NANCE

FROM: RICHARD G. DARMAN
CRAIG L. FULLER CF

SUBJECT: Weekly Update for the President

Messrs. Meese, Baker, and Deaver have decided to establish a new weekly informational briefing system for the President -- as a supplement to briefing systems now employed. This new system will be comprised of two basic elements:

- A "Weekly Update" briefing book -- to be delivered to the President each Friday evening, for his week-end reading; and

- A "Weekly Update" meeting each Monday -- to discuss issues raised by review of the briefing book, along with a weekly selection of other issues that may merit special Presidential attention.

We have been asked to coordinate the staff work for this briefing system.

The weekly briefing book is to be comprised of the following elements -- prepared by the offices noted parenthetically:

(I) Agenda for Weekly Update Meeting (Darman/Fuller) Note: The meetings will last one hour. The agenda will not provide much time for review of the briefing book -- unless the President wishes. It will provide time for special informational briefings on 4-6 topics deemed worthy of Presidential attention. Suggested topics should be provided to Darman/Fuller for selection by Meese/Baker/Deaver.

(II) President's tentative schedule for the coming week (Scheduling);

(III) Weekly press update (Communications);

(IV) Summary status report re pending Cabinet/Cabinet Council matters (Office of Cabinet Administration, in coordination with Office of Policy Development);

(V) Summary status report re pending NSC matters (NSC staff);

(VI) Summary status report re legislative priorities (Office of Legislative Affairs); and

(VII) Other noteworhty issues (as appropriate) not included in the above (Darman/Fuller).

Would you please:

(1) Assure that the section of the briefing book for which your office is responsible is prepared and delivered to us by noon each Friday; and

(2) Provide suggested special briefing topics to us by 5:00 p.m. each Wednesday.

The first "Weekly Update" is to be delivered to the President this Friday (December 4). In preparation for this initial book, we will follow up with you orally.

cc: E. Meese
J. Baker
M. Deaver

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TO: Craig Fuller

FROM: MICHAEL K. DEAVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

12/6

☐ Information

☐ Action

MKD

Em is trying to bust the cap to provide the 4.8% increase at least.... ...even for philosophical jerks!

Craig

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

OFFICE OF
THE ADMINISTRATOR

C7

November 24, 1981

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HOA-1

3-

The Honorable Michael K. Deaver
Assistant to the President and
Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mike:

I'm convinced that the pay cap should be modified so that our top careerists can be compensated more equitably. I know the arguments against this move: the "wrong signal" to the general public; the fight to balance the budget; the House hasn't been supportive; the Administration's critics would have a field day!

But prudent management practice, equity, employee morale, and good judgment all call for this action.

Regardless of public jibes which would surely result, I believe the President's support for adjusting the cap would inure to his and the Administration's benefit. The present situation is not good. The general perception is that the top Administration appointees are all independently wealthy, and thus they cannot really appreciate the dilemma of top management salaries being frozen at a fixed level for years on end.

My suggestion: modify the cap for <u>career</u> employees only. Those of us who have come on board are philosophical jerks anyway who never excepted life-time jobs or monetary rewards out of our government service.

Sincerely,

Ray

R. A. Barnhart
Federal Highway Administrator

SUTURE

File

Richard N. Koffler
Benson Manor, Apt. 408
Jenkintown, Pa. 19046

Nov. 23, 1981

Mr. Michael Deaver
Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Deaver:

This letter is written with the full knowledge that what it has to say will more than likely go unanswered, inasmuch as it addresses itself to a problem of propriety that has just recently attached itself to the more than sanitized White House.

On this Wednesday last there appeared an article which covered your intervention for a product made by Ethicon. You inquired of the FDA about a suture. Indeed, you wanted to know how the FDA felt about that suture and where it was with respect to the approval of that ordinarily slow-deliberating body.

According to the article, you did this at the request of Dr. Davis.

You failed to see any impropriety in this request. You said, if I recall the article in detail, that you were merely trying to help a friend.

This smacks of the kind of morality which trickled down from the first century Roman Empire or from Louis XIV who was alleged to have said, "L'état, c'est moi."

Sincerely,

Richard N. Koffler

Richard N. Koffler

Public Citizen

November 2, 1981

Craig Fuller
Director, Office of the Cabinet
West Wing
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fuller:

This is a Freedom of Information Act request of the Health Research Group. Pursuant to the FOIA we request the following records:

-The memorandum from Susan Simms, a former employee of the Office of the Cabinet, to Michael Deaver concerning the PDS suture. Approval for mass-marketing of the PDS suture is presently being considered by the Food and Drug Administration. The memorandum from Ms. Simms was written sometime during the spring or summer of 1981.

-All other memoranda or documents concerning the PDS suture written or received by the Office of the Cabinet.

The Health Research Group is a private, non-profit research and advocacy organization concerned with protecting the health and safety of consumers. These documents will be used in our continuing oversight of government efforts in the area of health and safety. Since we have a limited budget for investigations in this area, we request a waiver of fees as provided for in the FOIA.

Sincerely,

Allen Greenberg

Allen Greenberg
Staff Associate

HEALTH RESEARCH GROUP • 2000 P STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 872-0320

COPY

"Chron"
044855
FE
PP005-01
CM001

June 8, 1981

NOTE TO: Ken Cribb

I am returning the memo on the Polydioxanone Suture. Mike appreciated the information and asked us to continue to follow this matter on a "low-key" basis for him. We need to have somebody check the current status within the next week or so.

CLF

Information on the Polydiopanone Suture (PDS)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

5/8/81

TO: Mike Deaver

FROM: CRAIG L. FULLER

( ) FYI

( ) Comment

Would you like any additional information on PDS?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 7, 1981

MEMORANDUM TO CRAIG FULLER

FROM: KENNETH CRIBB, JR. THC Jr

SUBJECT: Information on Polydioxanone Suture for Michael Deaver

Susan Sims put together the attached information on the Polydioxanone Suture (PDS).

Mike Deaver is interested in this question, due to discussion with Dr. Loyal Davis, Mrs. Reagan's father.

May 7, 1981

INFORMATION ON THE POLYDIOXANONE SUTURE (PDS)

The PDS is an absorbable suture material which is left in the body following surgery, and then dissolved by the body. The issue of concern has been over the chemicals which are released into the body as the material dissolves. The liver detoxifies these materials, and if the chemicals are carcinogenic, there is a possibility that tumors could form in the liver.

In 1979, applications were submitted to the Bureau of Drugs for the PDS. Following approval, the application was then sent to the Bureau of Devices. When any application is sent to the Bureau of Devices, an advisory panel studies the issue and makes a recommendation before the Bureau Director signs the application. In the case of this application, the advisory panel had some questions regarding the rat study that had been performed in the manufacturer's testing of the product. The questions concerned whether or not the substance that the suture was made of was a potential carcinogenic.

On March 12, 1981, the advisory panel reommended to delay making a recommendation until the questions about PDS could be answered. A subcommittee was asked to look into the questions, and the past two months have been spent gathering information for the advisory panel.

Two weeks ago, representatives from the Bureau of Devices met with the PDS manufacturer, Ethicon, to go over questions and to discuss the preparation of formal answers. On May 6, the company presented its formal responses to the Bureau of Devices.

This new information will be distributed to the subcommittee early next week, and a report will be made for the advisory panel in approximately two weeks.The whole panel will convene, probably in July of this year, for a formal vote on the PDS matter.

If, after reviewing all of the information, the panel is still not totally satisfied with the answers they receive on PDS, they have two options:

1. They can dissapprove the application and ask the manufacturer to conduct another rat study. This would cost approximately $250,000 and would take two years to complete.

2. The Bureau could approve use of the suture, with the stipulation that the PDS carry a warning label, telling of possible side effects.

There has not been an intentional delay by the Bureau in the case of the PDS. Rather, the people at the Bureau feel that it is in the public's interest to make sure that all of the questions regarding the use of the PDS have been answered, and that the PDS is safe, before the device is made availible for use.

MKD

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 30, 1981

MEMORANDUM

TO: CRAIG FULLER

FROM: MICHAEL K. DEAVER

SUBJECT: Memo from Dr. Loyal Davis

The attached memo is from Dr. Loyal Davis, Nancy Reagan's father. He discussed this with the President and me recently. It has to do with a particular suture that has been under investigation by the FDA since 1975.

I would very much like to know what the future holds for this project.

POLYDIOXANONE SUTURE - PDS

Began Work - 1975 - Cost to Date - $12 Million

Submitted NDA to Bureau of Drugs - June, 1979

Bureau of Drugs Approved - January, 1981

Submitted CAP to Bureau of Foods - March, 1979

Bureau of Foods Approved - 1980

Submitted to Bureau of Devices by Bureau of Drugs to Comply With New Law - January, 1981

Bureau of Devices Approved but Submitted to a Panel for Final Review - March, 1981

Panel Refused to Approve

Refusal Affects New Ligating Device of Great Value to Surgeon and Patient.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 17, 1981

Set up sometime with Joe

FOR: MIKE DEAVER

FROM: JOE HOLMES Joe

I am getting down to writing the script for the one-hour documentary on the President's First Year.

I see the main thrust or theme of this First Year that Ronald Reagan began to change the course of the nation; away from a nation with fumbling indecisive leadership to a nation with a restored pride and self-esteem.

I want to dwell on his decisiveness. The uplift in patriotism, the response of young people to his leadership; his honesty.

Obviously I will cover the budget cut, the slicing away of regulations, the reduction in government size, the tax cut and so on.

I have every foot of film of his public appearances and of course, all of his speeches. It will take some time to edit this to one hour.

In any event, I would like your thoughts on the theme of this project before I get to writing.

11-20-81 Called + said Call me when we get back for mtg

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 16, 1981

file here

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES BAKER, III
MICHAEL K. DEAVER

FROM: RICHARD S. WILLIAMSON

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF IGA/FEDERALISM ISSUES

I. GOALS

A. To make government work again

B. To establish a firm partnership with state and local officials

C. To make Reagan "New Federalism" revolution permanent by returning as much authority and responsibility to the states as possible

II. SUCCESSES

A. Structure to address federalism has been established

1. Presidential Advisory Committee on Federalism.

- Established April 8, 1981.
- Senator Paul Laxalt, Chairman.
- First full Committee meeting, June 23, 1981.
- Subcommittee meetings:

Revenue Source Return	October 22
HHS	October 29
HUD	November 5

2. Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR).

- Chaired by Executive Branch member for second time in its 20-year history -- Secretary James Watt.
- Executive Branch members involved.

B. Coordination and cooperation with departments and agencies

1. President Reagan asked Cabinet members on March 20 to ensure that a high-level person had responsibility for intergovernmental affairs in their agency.

2. President Reagan instructed Cabinet members on March 20, 1981, to conduct "early and genuine consultations" with state and local officials concerning program and policy changes.

3. Federalism initiatives have been undertaken by departments and agencies.

C. Establishing a good relationship with state and local officials

1. At least initially, a good relationship has been established with state and local officials.

   - Frequent consultations. (Example: IGA called state and local officials prior to Presidential Address to the Nation with budget cut highlights. Many have not had this courtesy extended by previous administrations.)

   - President has met with 1400 state and local officials in White House since January 20, 1981.

2. Contrast with unions' relationship with Reagan Administration.

III. FAILURES

A. Because domestic policy has been driven by the budget, we have failed to consider impact of proposals on state and local governments

1. Budget cuts 12%, across-the-board, below our March proposals.

   State and local government, which accounts for only 14% of total federal spending, have been required to absorb 66% of the cuts.

   They haven't screamed louder because they know proposals won't get through Congress.

2. Lack of consultation regarding the fall economic offensive.

3. Apportionment of monthly block grant payments to the states.

   - States which adjusted to spending levels of Gramm-Latta II will automatically receive further cuts.

     - Causes layoffs.
     - States must cut off contracts already entered into.

   - Example: Energy Assistance Block Grant

     - Funding levels not resolved in next few months will place enormous pressure on Midwest and Northeast states.

B. Revenue Sharing

1. City and county officials support general revenue sharing more than any other federal program.

   - 12% cut in revenue sharing is anti-federalism and reneges on the President's campaign commitments.

   - 4,000 letters, telegrams and phone calls received.

C. Revenue Sharing - Fear of phaseout

1. Tentatively agreed to by President.

2. The day after September 24 speech by President, Secretary Regan said that revenue sharing would be phased out.

D. Revenue Source Return

1. No action, even though the President has repeatedly assured state and local officials of his desire to return revenue sources to them.

2. Norm Ture says revenue return has already occurred in the form of tax cuts.

   - Major newspapers reported this after Federalism Subcommittee meeting 10/22.

E. AFDC Block Grant

1. Bob Carleson quoted in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and Los Angeles Times that a decision was made to propose AFDC block grant -- the same week that the Vice President, Secretary Schweiker, and Rich Williamson assured Governors at NGA annual meeting that there would be full consultation with them before any new policy initiatives were taken.

F. Block Grants - Not enough flexibility

1. President assured increased flexibility to offset budget cuts.

   - Officials supported block grants on that basis.

2. October 1, 1981 - officials now realize how limited the flexibility is.

G. Block Grants - Governor receive blame

1. Although cuts are in federal funds, those who implement programs are getting the blame for cuts.

H. Failure of Administration to take stands on issues that preempt state and local power

1. S. 960 - Would have prohibited states and localities from determining guidelines and standards for transportation of hazardous materials. (Administration did not oppose.)

2. S. 898 - Would have preempted state and local authority to regulate cable television (Administration did not oppose.)

I. No urban policy

1. Inaction on enterprise zones.

2. City officials see budget cuts only. We have no answer to their criticism.

J. Only 5 IGA events since August 1, 1981 with Presidential participation.

IV. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?

A. Don't permit budget to consume all else.

B. Policy initiatives

1. Revenue return -- transportation proposals FY '83 budget.

2. Sorting out.

3. More block grants; increased flexibility for those already passed.

4. Urban "policy".

C. Use ACIR.

D. President's time to consult with and stroke state and local officials.

E. Cabinet meeting - President briefly reviews federalism initiatives and urges them to continue the good work.

MEMORANDUM

To 9/21

D. Gergen | JMB

where does this fit in the communications plan? mike

9/4

9/8

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 25, 1981

MD + DG:

I strongly support this idea. They'll be doing pieces anyway. Let's discuss please.

Thanks

JABIII

TO: DAVID GERGEN

FROM: RICHARD S. WILLIAMSON Rich

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL INTERVIEW -- FEDERALISM

I would suggest that we arrange an interview with the President with one or a small cluster of reporters on the federalism question. I strongly urge that we consider setting up such an interview for the first half of September.

There is a small group of reporters who cover the "federalism beat" (Drummond Ayres, New York Times; Warren Wheat from Gannett News Service; Dave Broder and Herb Denton, Washington Post; Peggy Simpson, Boston Herald; Neil Peirce, National Journal; and a few others.) I would suggest that we either arrange a brief, 15-minute, one-on-one interview between Drummond Ayres and the President, or, preferably, an interview with Ayres, Broder, Simpson, Wheat and Peirce for one-half hour.

The President has a substantial record of achievement with respect to his federalism initiatives. They range from the consolidation of 57 categorical grants into 11 block grants to over 50 regulatory relief initiatives, to the nomination of Judge O'Connor (a jurist with a strong states' rights record,) to the formation of the Federalism Advisory Committee, strengthening of ACIR, developing proposals for batching and swapping of western lands, etc.

A number of the above-mentioned reporters have made inquiries with respect to the possibility of having interviews with the President. I think it would be a tremendous shot in the arm for the overall federalism initiative. It would be a positive vehicle which could couple both a budgetary message, fiscal message, focus on a major theme close to the President's heart, and project his initiatives beyond just economic+foreign policy considerations.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter and hope we can discuss this as soon as you return from vacation.

cc: James A. Baker III