

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Bledsoe, Ralph C.: Files
Folder Title: [Drug Abuse Policy - July 1986] (3)
Box: 21

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>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

320



July 21, 1986

NOTE FOR RICK DAVIS/RALPH BLEDSOE

FROM: AL KINGON

Please read the attached and
give me an analysis.

Thanks.

Attachment



UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

July 18, 1986

From the Office of the Director

Dear Al,

These are my proposals in support of the President's drug abuse initiative. They are being delivered to Ed Meese and Carlton Turner for DPC consideration on Monday, as a response to proposals presented by Carlton to last week's DPC discussion. I think they are sensitive and will work. Ed has asked for very close hold, so that the President may make announcements of any proposals he decides to support.

Connie

cc: Rick
Ralph



Office of the Director

UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

July 18, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: EDWIN MEESE III
ATTORNEY GENERAL

FROM: CONSTANCE HORNER *Constance Horner*
DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: OPM DISCUSSION PAPER
ON SUBSTANCE DRUG POLICY

A General Approach to Policy

The operating principle in a new Federal substance abuse policy has been well articulated in the Organized Crime Commission's report. Policies should be framed that express the "utter unacceptability" of illegal drug use in the Federal workplace.

The principle of "utter unacceptability" can be operationalized a variety of ways beyond "suitable" testing for certain types of high-risk jobs: rehabilitation, education, illegal drug use prevention programs, employee assistance programs, public relations, revised security and suitability inquiries and the invocation of adverse action procedures for illegal drug users.

Any Federal substance abuse policy must be grounded in the distinction between Federal applicants and Federal employees. In pursuing a goal of a safe, healthful, drug-free workplace, we should seek to prevent the entry of users of illegal narcotics into the Federal workforce while simultaneously continuing a rehabilitational program for on-board employees. But, if on-board employees who use drugs illegally, test "positive" a second time, resist rehabilitation, or otherwise undermine the efficiency of the service, adverse action should be invoked, including dismissal.

There are no uniform, Governmentwide policies and standards encompassing various measures, such as drug testing, to exclude drug abusers from the Federal workplace. There is no systematic and uniform program of screening applicants for certain types of jobs Governmentwide, nor for testing employees in those areas. There is a Governmentwide policy geared toward rehabilitating drug and alcohol abusers once they are found in the workplace.

The following specific proposals are tentative, submitted for deliberation and further discussion and appropriate refinement. They are an attempt to provide a program of narcotics prevention, in consonance with the "utter unacceptability" criteria, as well as a program of rehabilitation.

Suggested OPM Proposals

Recommendation No. 1: Propose Legislative changes to make current illegal drug use an absolute disqualifier for entry into Federal employment and a basis for termination, regardless of a claimed "handicapping" condition or effect on job performance. First, add a new section to Title V: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual who uses illegal narcotics or drugs without a prescription may not be employed in the competitive service." Second, amend the Rehabilitation Act to exclude illegal drug users as a category to be included among those who are deemed to be "handicapped" and strike the nexus between job performance and illegal drug usage.

Rationale: The President's Commission proposes the issuance of policy guidance that would communicate the "utter unacceptability" of illegal drug use in the workplace. At the same time, Federal law forbids the deprivation of Federal employment to any person solely on the grounds of prior drug abuse. The object of current law is rehabilitative. While the rehabilitative spirit of current law is laudable, the public has a right to expect not only the highest level of performance and productivity on the part of Federal applicants, but also their devotion to the laws of the country.

While there is no requirement to hire current drug abusers, and they are normally excluded under OPM "suitability" criteria, such applicants and employees can claim to be handicapped and come under the protective language of the Rehabilitation Act. It then becomes the taxpayers' duty to accommodate a disabling condition brought on by an illegal personal vice. The Federal government is forbidden to discriminate against the handicapped in hiring.

OPM should seek the removal of the "handicapped" protection from illegal drug users because such use is, after all, illegal and, moreover, it is a voluntary act. Those who persistently and voluntarily engage in illegal acts should not be permitted to enter or remain in the Federal workforce. They should be permitted re-entry only after demonstrated rehabilitation. Because of the legal status of alcohol consumption, the traditional nexus between alcoholism or alcohol abuse and performance criteria and its designation as a "handicapping condition" would be retained.

Section 7352 of Title V declares: "An individual who habitually uses intoxicating beverages to excess may not be employed in the competitive service." The same bar to employment should be imposed on drug abuse, with a clarification that current illegal drug use will not be considered a "handicapping condition" nor an absolute bar to future

Federal employment. The enactment of such provisions will send a strong, clear message to the general public that drug abuse and Federal employment are incompatible.

Recommendation No.2: Inquire into Applicants' Past and Current Illicit Drug Usage on the SF-85 and SF-86, the Standard Suitability and Security Forms, as a means of deterring the hiring of current illegal drug users and providing appropriate information regarding past use for evaluation for security clearance.

Rationale: Just as with the habitual or excessive use of alcohol, the illegal use of narcotics, drugs or other controlled substances is potentially disqualifying for Federal employment under 5 CFR 731.202(b)(6). Despite the fact that illegal drug use is a major national problem, costing approximately \$100 billion in lost productivity each year, OPM currently does not even require a written response about the use of illicit narcotics among Federal applicants. As a first step in the prevention of the use of illicit narcotics in the Federal workplace, OPM should inquire into past, recent and current drug use or alcohol abuse on the part of applicants for Federal positions, on the SF-85 and the SF-86, i.e., forms for both sensitive and non-sensitive positions.

The questions can serve several purposes for Federal investigators and examiners in determining general fitness or access to classified

information. First, the Executive publicly charged with the faithful execution of the laws is entitled to services of those who privately obey the laws, including the Controlled Substances Act. A Federal position is one of public trust, not private right. This principle applies to both sensitive and non-sensitive jobs. Second, the inquiries are narrowly focused to elicit recency and frequency of illegal narcotics usage. The questions are designed to segregate current from more recent drug abusers, and, in turn, from those who, in the past, have enjoyed only a casual experimentation with illicit drugs. Such focused questions will also be of direct benefit to agency adjudicators making final employment decisions by giving them more detailed information on illicit drug use on a case-by-case basis. Third, with such narrowly focused questions, eliciting recency and frequency, OPM can expect to get a higher rate of positive responses. This can broaden the base for further inquiry. If the questions are answered affirmatively, they may be disqualifying. (It is not necessarily disqualifying.) It is a matter left to adjudication. If it is answered falsely and the applicant is hired under false pretences, it is grounds for dismissal. In that respect, the initial inquiry can serve as a front line deterrent to illegal drug using applicants. It can be first step toward prevention.

In OPM's draft revision of its SF-85 (Personnel Investigations Questionnaire for non-sensitive positions), the following questions are proposed:

Suitability Form

SF-85

Your Involvement with Alcohol and Dangerous
or Illegal Drugs, Including Marijuana

This item concerns the abuse of alcoholic beverages and the supplying or using without a prescription of marijuana, hashish, narcotics (opium, morphine, codeine, heroin, etc.), stimulants (cocaine, amphetamines, etc.), depressants (barbiturates, methaqualone, tranquilizers, etc.), or other dangerous or illegal drugs.

A. At any time in the past 5 years, have you used alcoholic beverages habitually and to excess? ____ Yes ____ No.

B. In the past 5 years, have you used marijuana, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other dangerous or illegal drugs?

____ Yes ____ No.

C. Have you ever been a supplier or seller of marijuana, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other dangerous or illegal drugs?

_____ Yes _____ No.

D. Are you currently (within the last 3 months) using alcohol in excess or using illegal drugs, including marijuana?

_____ Yes _____ No.

If you answered yes to any of Questions A - D above, provide details including the periods of use and treatment.

Explanation (in your comments
be sure to include a statement
of the frequency of your use
and efforts toward rehabilita-
tion, if any, including the name,

From	To	Type of	address, and zip code, of person
		substance or institution providing	
<u>mo/yr</u>	<u>mo/yr</u>	<u>used</u>	<u>treatment)</u>

In OPM's draft revision of its SF-86 (Personnel Investigations Questionnaire for Sensitive Positions), the following questions are proposed:

Security Form

SF-86

Your Involvement with Alcohol and Dangerous
or Illegal Drugs, Including Marijuana

This item concerns the abuse of alcoholic beverages and the supplying or using without a prescription of marijuana, hashish, narcotics (opium, morphine, codeine, heroin, etc.), stimulants (cocaine, amphetamines, etc.), depressants (barbiturates, methaqualone, tranquilizers, etc.), or other dangerous or illegal drugs.

A. Have you ever used alcoholic beverages habitually and to excess?

_____ Yes _____ No.

B. Have you ever used marijuana, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other dangerous or illegal drugs?

_____ Yes _____ No.

C. Have you ever been a supplier or seller of marijuana, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other dangerous or illegal drugs?

_____ Yes _____ No.

D. Are you currently (within the last 3 months) using alcohol in excess or using illegal drugs?

_____ Yes _____ No.

If you answered yes to any of Questions A - D above, provide details including the periods of use and treatment, if any.

		Explanation (in your comments
		be sure to include a statement
		of the frequency of your use
		and efforts toward rehabilita-
		tion, if any, including the
		name, address, and zip code,
		of person or institution
		providing treatment
From	To	Type of
		substance
<u>mo/yr</u>	<u>mo/yr</u>	<u>used</u>

Because the questions are directed at applicants rather than employees, there is no perceived "negative" implication for the Federal workforce nor even a suggestion of widespread drug usage on the part of the workforce. It may be strongly supported by Federal employee organizations. It is likely to gain widespread support in Congress, particularly among members who serve on committees having jurisdiction over illegal narcotics.

Recommendation No. 3: Issue Federal Personnel Manual Guidance on the use of Drug Screening

Rationale: Certain agencies are already adopting or considering the use of drug tests as a condition for the receipt of clearances for critical or sensitive jobs. OPM can and should set forth some guidelines for the use of drug tests for personnel security reasons. Governmentwide guidance should continue to allow agency-head discretion and should indicate that national security, law enforcement, and health and safety-related positions would be likely candidates for drug testing before and during employment. The provision of security clearances is another case for serious consideration of testing, including those with access to classified information or classified facilities or materials, especially nuclear facilities and materials. In this case, guidance would remove security-related testing from the arena of labor negotiability.

- Recommend the use of corroborative, alternative tests in any case where an employee tests "positive" and establish minimal

reliability and quality control standards to enhance the protection of employees subject to any such tests. The main idea here is to prevent the use of any "positive" reading of a test for drugs or alcohol disqualification without strong confirmation. OPM's staffing experts have already developed language to ensure such confirmatory standards; including separate urinalysis or blood testing by a reputable laboratory; clinical examination by a physician; or admission by the individual. The language can later be issued as binding regulations.

Recommendation No. 4: Change Adverse Action Regulations to Mandate Termination for a Second Instance of Illegal Drug Use.

Rational: The proposal here is to specify at the conclusion of a one-time "opportunity period" for general rehabilitation, that a first instance of illegal drug use is grounds for referral to rehabilitation or confidential counseling. The second instance of illegal drug use, or being under the influence of an illegal narcotic at the Federal worksite, is to result in a mandatory dismissal from the Federal civil service. The exception to this rule would be, of course, the Agency Head's legal discretion to terminate on the basis of national security in the case of a single instance of illegal drug use. The General Rule: "Two strikes and you're out."

Recommendation No. 5: Proclaim an opportunity period for the rehabilitation of on-board employees who are using illegal drugs.

The Director, OPM, would issue a governmentwide "Employee Letter" outlining the Administration's policy of "zero tolerance" for the illegal use of drugs by Federal employees. The letter would contain an appeal to any employee who is an illegal drug user to seek help during a period of six months from the date of the letter's issuance.

The letter would:

1. Re-emphasize the role and value of employee assistance programs and their availability.
2. Make an appeal to all of those who need confidential counseling to seek it.
3. State that during the six month period, there would be no change in Federal personnel policy, but that at the end of that six months changes in policy would be expected, with a view toward mandating termination of any employees who use illegal drugs.

4. Announce:

(a) A Drug Hotline: The establishment of an OPM Drug/Alcohol "Help Hotline" for Federal employees who have a problem and need confidential professional help. The "Hotline" can be part of the governmentwide OPM Employee Assistance Program.

(b) Drug Education: A continuing Drug and Alcohol Awareness Program; the use of several hard-hitting film strips, educational materials to explain the costs and consequences of drug and alcohol abuse to Federal employees.

Recommendation No. 6: Initiate Immediate Discussion between OPM and OMB and the White House on the Feasibility of Upgraded or Increased Coverage for Alcohol and Drug Related Medical Programs in the Federal Employees Health Benefits.

Rationale: During the 1981 FEHB crisis, when OPM ordered across-the-board benefit reductions, medical benefits covering alcohol and drug abuse were included in those reductions. OPM, as a matter of policy, has nevertheless regularly pressed for the inclusion of alcohol and drug-related medical coverage as part of an overall FEHB benefit package. It has paid dividends. A national study of 3000 persons treated for alcoholism among FEHB enrollees in the Aetna plan, conducted

by NIAAA, found that over a three-year time frame (1980-83) there was a net savings to the program; and the savings increased with time. ("Alcohol and Drugs in the Workplace," BNA Special Report, 1985).

In conjunction with other near-term measures, OPM may want to encourage upgraded coverage for drug and alcohol-related medical problems during this year's negotiation with carriers, consistent with market conditions and the need for a balanced benefits package for Federal employees.

Recommendation No. 7: OPM Should Upgrade and Re-emphasize the Availability of Governmentwide Employee Assistance Programs.

Rationale: In the near term, OPM can perform a valuable service in upgrading and re-emphasizing the role of Employee Assistance Programs as part of any comprehensive Administration anti-drug effort. This can be done through the issuance of a new FPM guidance; a Governmentwide "employee letter" from the Director of OPM, to advise employees of agencies' confidential counseling services, could also be issued. Any employee having such problems can obtain confidential help and return to productive work. A renewed effort on the "rehabilitative" role of OPM to curtail illegal drug use and alcohol abuse would pay bountiful dividends both psychologically and materially.

In the private sector, employee assistance programs have proven to be a valuable resource in combatting illegal drug use, and they are growing.

Approximately 30 percent of the Fortune 500 firms have established EAP's. Their purpose is to get rid of the problem, not the employee. This is a positive, constructive and humane way to deal with "on-the-job" drug and alcohol abusers. Beyond that, EAP's are cost-effective. It is less costly to retain an otherwise good and well-trained employee through an "employee assistance program," than to incur again the initial cost of hiring and training a new employee. Moreover, an effective EAP program will reduce absenteeism, and early referrals to EAP's can have a positive impact on health insurance premiums.

Recommendation No. 8: OPM and the White House Should Initiate an Aggressive Public Relations Campaign Focusing on the Incompatibility of Illicit Drug Use and Federal Employment.

Rationale: A public relations campaign focused on the incompatibility of illicit drug use and application for Federal employment could be very effective. OPM could explore incorporating such a campaign into a broad-based recruiting program. The theme can be simple and direct: "If you are using drugs, get off drugs and get help before you join us." Peer pressure, especially among the young, is a contributing factor in illicit drug use. Making it clear that one's future employment is contingent upon conformity to the law creates an effective counter to peer pressure. An effective public relations campaign conducted by OPM, in cooperation with HHS or the White House, could very well serve the

President in communicating to the public "the utter unacceptability" of drug use in the Federal workplace. Such an effort would also contribute to the cultural delegitimization of illicit drug use.

Recommendation No. 9: OPM Should Issue Regulations Requiring Referral of a Drug or Alcohol Disqualified Applicant for Counseling and Rehabilitation before Reconsideration of the Applicant.

Rationale: Under Section 3301 of Title V, the President has the plenary authority to proscribe rules and regulations for entry into the Civil Service.

OPM can require agency referral of a drug or alcohol disqualified applicant for counseling and rehabilitation and allow, after an appropriate period of time, reapplication to the Federal service only after written certification from a reputable rehabilitation service that the applicant has been successfully rehabilitated. This can be done at no cost to the government.

Recommendation No. 10:

OPM Should Initiate the Collection of Governmentwide "productivity" Data Correlated with a Qualitative and Quantitative Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Agency Employee Assistance Programs.

Rationale: Though there is no evidence of widespread illegal drug usage in the Federal workforce, available evidence does suggest that the

Federal workplace is not free of problems of alcohol addiction that affect the general society. What is needed is a strong data base to give us some idea of how well we are doing in the war against substance abuse. This data could include indices such as accidents on the job, absenteeism (particularly on Mondays) and sick leave usage. Much of the data is already collected in agencies, but the relationship of the data to alcohol or drug related problems is unclear.

Recommendation No. 11: In Consultation with HHS, OPM Should Issue Regulations Setting Forth Quality Control Standards Governing the use of any Biological Testing of Federal Employees.

Rationale: Drug testing has been a growing practice in private industry for the past two and one half years and it is growing among government agencies. Technology is evolving, but the most common method is urinalysis. Chemical reactions can reveal the presence of various narcotics or drugs, including cocaine, barbituates, amphetamines, marijuana, qualudes, PCP, and alcohol.

The major impact of the Civil Service Reform Act was the decentralization of the Federal management system. The determination as to whether such testing is appropriate and as to what class of employees should be subjected to testing should remain with the agency head.

Agencies, thus far, have been prudent in their approach to drug testing. They have identified categories of critical or sensitive jobs where

testing is appropriate in order to safeguard the safety and security of the public. They have tended to focus on the nature of a position, its performance requirements or the mission of the agency. Few can quarrel with testing for such occupations as Air Traffic Controllers, Firefighters, Pilots, Law Enforcement Officers, Health and Safety Inspectors, and employees at nuclear facilities.

However, every employee who is subject to a test of this sort has the right to the highest degree of accuracy that is humanly possible. Even in the best programs, there is the possibility of error. OPM should set forth regulations, after consultation with the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Institute for Drug Abuse, to ensure high standards for "positive" tests, the confirmation of "positive" results, standards for claim of custody of test specimens, and a high degree of quality control in the testing process.

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

July 30, 1986

The Briefing Room

12:05 P.M. EDT

INDEX

SUBJECT

PAGE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Schedule.....1
Meeting with Secretary Shultz
Appointment of David Mack

FOREIGN

Soviet Relations.....20-21
Space Program/Shuttle.....21-23

DOMESTIC

Anti-drug Program.....1

12:51 P.M. EDT
#1847-07/30

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

July 30, 1986

The Briefing Room

12:05 P.M. EDT

MR. SPEAKES: The President today is announcing the appointment of David Lyle Mack to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates.

At 1:45 p.m., the President meets with Secretary Shultz.

To expand a little bit on the President's ideas as far as an anti-drug abuse effort, looking first at some of the goals and some of the achievements of the administration -- when the President came into office in 1981, there was a lack of information or a focused national program on drug abuse. The main effort of the government had been to reduce the supply of heroin.

Legal, criminal, and moral issues surrounding drug use were confusing to the young and to -- really to all citizens. Recognizing this, the President began a campaign that was designed to improve drug law enforcement, to strengthen international cooperation, to expand drug abuse health functions, to reduce drug abuse in the military, and he created a nationwide drug abuse awareness effort to strengthen public attitudes.

Within the military, since 1981 -- this has been our most successful program -- there have been a -- there has been a two-thirds drop in drug abuse since -- in that time frame.

Q Since when?

MR. SPEAKES: 1981 to 1985, I believe.

We found when we came in that 27 percent of all military personnel used drugs and in some units, the rate of drug use was nearly 50 percent. Independent studies show that last year we have reduced drug use in the military to less than nine percent of all personnel. That is a 67 percent, two-thirds drop in the number of people that were using drugs.

The Secretary of Defense believes that there is more that can be done and he is planning to continue the program of protection, prevention, rehabilitation, and education. And this will certainly be a model for the President's program.

Q Larry, how did those --

MR. SPEAKES: In addition, the First Lady's leadership and dedication to the youth of America and the world has been a focal point of our efforts. She has had a crusade that has set the tone, really, on an international basis. She has raised the consciousness in the advertising industry, the television networks, in the high schools, sports programs, the medical profession, the entertainment industry, law enforcement officers and many others joining in a nationwide effort to reduce drugs.

The President's program has been successful thus far, but the President is convinced that the best way to achieve the ultimate objective of total eradication of drug abuse and illegal trafficking is to reduce the demand side of the drug equation. To do that he intends to use the full power of the Presidency to accomplish his goal.

Q Can you go a little slower, please?

MR. SPEAKES: That means a blend of the substantive program implementation and a personal communications effort to make sure that his program enjoys the full support that will be needed to eradicate drugs.

Q That last sentence?

MR. SPEAKES: This means a blend of the substantive program implementation and a personal communications effort to make sure that his program enjoys the support that will be needed to achieve his goal of total eradication of drugs. He understands that there are -- that the powers behind the drug industry are well entrenched. He recognizes this will not be an easy job, but he believes that the American people are ready to do something about drugs.

He wants the public at large to face the program head on and he believes it's imperative that we do it now. He believes there is a turnaround in public support, a major change in attitude that we must do something about drugs and we must do it now. The idea is to take the potential user away from drugs and this will require the united effort of many elements of our society. The President's strategy which is being finalized will seek to remove drug abuse from schools, the workplace, athletic programs and from all elements of our society. The President will seek to form a partnership with government, industry, schools, and the American public. He believes this must be truly a national effort if it is to succeed.

Q Does he want drug testing in the workplace and in schools -- have people --

MR. SPEAKES: That's been asked four or five days running. There is already drug testing in the workplace, both private and public. The military program -- I have stressed which was largely successful because of drug testing and screening. There is screening in sensitive areas of the federal government now -- people who are involved in public safety are screened. There are also certain private sector major companies that have taken up drug screening as a part of their --

Q I should say, does he want to expand that?

MR. SPEAKES: He's looking at the possibilities of expanding that, yes.

Q Is he rethinking the idea of --

Q In what way? You mean a mandatory --

MR. SPEAKES: We covered that too, two or three days ago.

Q I don't know -- but you said that the President wants to follow the military model.

MR. SPEAKES: There's a difference in military and people in sensitive and safety-related positions and those that are not. There are certain legal and constitutional questions that are involved and those are being studied. As to whether to expand it mandatory of voluntary, that has not been determined.

Q Is he thinking -- when you talked about communication, the blend of communication, is he rethinking giving a major speech, which I think we were guided away from?

MR. SPEAKES: No, you weren't guided away from it. You were told that there was no decision to make one and the President will be deciding as to how he takes his message to the American public --

Q We were told not to look for it before vacation.

Q Before vacation.

MR. SPEAKES: That's true.

Q Is that still correct?

Q Is that still operative?

MR. SPEAKES: Don't look for it before vacation.

Q And will there be --

Q -- any kind of kick-off --

Q Did you say --

Q Well, he said --

MR. SPEAKES: Wait, wait. One, two, three, four, five are talking. Andrea still has the floor.

Q Did the President see the editorial in today's Washington Times, and if he did, did it upset him?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. I didn't see it so --

Q Is he aware of their criticism of his efforts so far?

MR. SPEAKES: No. Sorry they're not happy.

Q The President said in the speech this morning that he had more to say about his participation next week --

MR. SPEAKES: That's right.

Q -- and that civic organizations would be announcing how they were -- Is this a coordinated thing? Can you elaborate on that at all?

MR. SPEAKES: He will be beginning to -- beginning next week -- and we'll have specifics later on this week -- to begin to speak out on his drug program -- his goals, his ideas, his ways that he will proceed in order to bring about a national effort on -- to eradicate the use of drugs.

Ira?

Q The President --

MR. SPEAKES: But I don't have a firm date. That's what it amounts to.

Q Does that include travel?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm sure he will speak on it when he travels. I don't look for any travel next week.

Q The President said that as far as drug users are

concerned, we don't want to throw them in jail and ruin their lives; we want to get them free from dependency. Does that imply any kind of shift in the law enforcement goals of the administration regarding drug use such as lighter penalties or more probation?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think we've come to that much detail so far. Many of -- and Carlton Turner can be much more specific on this and we will, once the President announces his full program, we will have Carlton here for a backgrounder -- about the impact of stricter enforcement on drugs and the over-population in federal and state prisons as a result of drug-related crimes. So that would go a long way toward a reduction of over-population in prison facilities if we could reduce the number of drug-related crimes.

Go ahead.

Q A follow-up. By stating that the President's primarily looking at the demand side of the equation, number one, does that represent the end result of some debate on how to proceed?

MR. SPEAKES: No. It's from both ends of the equation, Ira. As you know, we're participating in eradication at the sources, we have for a number of period of times. We're participating in interdiction efforts on the border and at ports -- quite an extensive program that the Vice President has headed. We will be doing more in that area and the area of law enforcement. But at the same time, we believe that it is essential that you remove the customer, the user, from the equation. And so you're really attacking it from both ends and in the middle.

Q All right, but if there is any new emphasis on the demand side, is it fair to assume that that's effective in another way because it doesn't cost that much money? In other -- you can do a demand or supply side. Supply side implies the use of more aid and more eradication and more helicopters; demand implies more public awareness. Is that a fair--

MR. SPEAKES: I think that's a fair statement, but I mean I don't get the point of the statement.

Q Well, I thought I heard you say -- and I can't read my own notes at the moment, I'll have to listen to the tape -- something about demand side of the equation being the principal focus of this new --

MR. SPEAKES: That will be the public awareness effort. But that does not diminish that we will be involved from the supply side and the interdiction side. I would look for the President to continue and the First Lady to continue their efforts at international cooperation. I would look for us to seek better ways to enforce the law on drugs.

Lesley?

Q Will this mean more money spent on -- you talked about programs. Are you talking about --

MR. SPEAKES: It won't mean any more than we have in the budget at the present time, but it will probably, hopefully, mean a more concentrated, more effective effort, but also a more -- more of a partnership between government and the public, the individual, business, and so forth.

We think that by perhaps involving the service organizations is a first step toward a partnership with non-government people, but you can bring in corporate heads, you can bring in labor leaders, you can deal with various youth groups, sports figures, entertainment industry, so forth -- all of those.

Q But you're not talking about starting any new program, government program?

MR. SPEAKES: No, but I mean that's not to say that we don't think that we can't make -- we can make giant strides by simply putting the power of the Presidency behind it.

Gene?

Q And so -- no, I have one more. Will there be a kick-off event? You had talked about this is the prelude to the kick-off this morning. Will it --

MR. SPEAKES: There will be -- however the President decides he wishes to open it. I don't look for hot-air balloons or anything along that line, but I think the President --

Q But there'll be an opening --

MR. SPEAKES: There will an announcement of the program by the President.

Q Next week?

Q In Washington --

MR. SPEAKES: Next week in Washington.

Q -- at the White House?

MR. SPEAKES: Don't know. We're working on it.

Q Peter Bensinger, the former head of DEA, said in an article last week that one of the problems in combatting drug abuse is the division of jurisdiction, that there were internal wars between DEA and Customs and the Coast Guard and other agencies. Is any effort or any consideration being given to streamlining the government effort?

MR. SPEAKES: I think more interagency cooperation, but I think there -- Bensinger's comments may be based on what happened some time ago, or several months ago, and not what's happening now because there is a considerable amount of cooperation between, for instance, DEA and the military, or the Coast Guard and the DEA, FBI, so forth.

Chris.

Q Following up on Lesley, you said that there's not going to be any new money.

There had been reports that there was going to be an extra \$200 million, I think --

MR. SPEAKES: I've seen that. Do you know the facts on that? I don't.

MR. BRASHEAR: It hadn't been determined yet. I mean, there's a possibility that there might be some --

MR. SPEAKES: Somebody put that out and I don't -- that has not -- you're right, that has not been decided.

Q And one other thing -- on the military thing -- do you have any facts or figures at all on how they've achieved this decrease and the kinds of programs --

MR. SPEAKES: Do you have that paper, Rusty? Mainly from screening -- is it.

Q I mean, is it -- I don't know what it is. What is it in the military? Is it a mandatory, universal screening?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, it is.

Q How often --

MR. BRASHEAR: -- of compulsary urinalysis testing in all services --

MR. SPEAKES: And if you're caught you're out. Simple as that.

Q How often do they do that?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know how often they do it.

Q How do you --

Q Anything else that you particularly point to as being important in getting the military down?

MR. SPEAKES: I think education, peer pressure --

MR. BRASHEAR: Drug abuse treatment programs --

MR. SPEAKES: -- treatment programs --

Q How many have been kicked out?

MR. BRASHEAR: Don't know that.

MR. SPEAKES: Let me see that paper.

Q Can you square the \$200 million with what you told Meese -- would you clarify that?

MR. SPEAKES: There has been no decision for \$200 million.

Q You said no new money and no new programs. I mean --

MR. BRASHEAR: There's been no decision --

MR. SPEAKES: I think some -- no, no -- I think somebody must have put that figure in Bernie's backgrounder -- the \$200 million figure, but --

Q Do you expect a decision soon?

MR. SPEAKES: -- but, I don't know.

Q Well, I'm confused as to what -- is it --

MR. SPEAKES: No decision made to spend additional money.

Q But he might? Is it being considered?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know of any major consideration, certainly not outside of the budget, I don't believe.

Q In other words, if there is money, it would come from something else and re-allocate it?

Q Hunger programs.

MR. SPEAKES: I would presume, yes. I would presume, yes.

Q General Singlaub would be put on the case.
(Laughter.)

Q That's right.

Q Do you think the President realized when he cited the Bank of Boston for special praise as cooperating on drug programs that several officers of the bank were indicted recently for not reporting large transactions, some of which were supposed to have involved drug money?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes.

Q He was aware of that?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. Gosh. Bernie?

Q Why did he do it?

Q He wanted to. (Laughter.)

Q Will the White House be in charge of the program and will there be one person appointed to run the whole thing?

MR. SPEAKES: I would assume that it will continue to be sort of an interagency effort and I don't know that there'll be any specific person. Carlton Turner has been actively involved from the White House and the Attorney General will have a role, and so forth. But I don't think there will be any structure set up.

Frank?

Q In testimony today, the Bolivian Ambassador requested \$100 million in economic aid to help with some of the economic dislocation caused by going to the source, disrupting the cocaine crop in Bolivia. Is the administration considering as part of this program, or otherwise, increased economic aid as a part of --

MR. SPEAKES: We can't get what we've asked for from the Congress now.

Q Well, I'm asking --

MR. SPEAKES: I'm glad he told them.

Saul?

Q So, the answer is no?

MR. SPEAKES: That's right.

Q I just want to know what the President's attitude is towards furnishing aid to the states and cities that report long waiting lists of people trying to get into drug treatment centers? I want to know --

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I would assume he would like to do as much as possible within the constraints of the budget, but I don't know of any plans to increase funding in that area. I think that the President is seeking public -- I mean, private cooperation and assistance that could aid in those areas.

Q Is it his attitude that that's basically a state and city problem?

MR. SPEAKES: Never really have heard him address it. There's certainly some federally funded drug abuse facilities in virtually every state. I'm sure, but I'm not --

Q It seems to me that what we're dealing with is basically volunteerism and then on the federal level enforcement. Again, as you know, two weeks ago there was a hearing and most of the -- in the House -- and most of the people actually pleaded with the White House for some help because of the crack epidemic, which has created long lines of people already addicted to the drug who cannot get treatment. Is -- do you know of any consideration being given to --

MR. SPEAKES: We can check on that. I really don't know.

George?

Q When you talk about bringing in service organizations and labor leaders and corporate heads and sports figures, are you talking about commission -- making a commission with Ueberroth running it?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q Has that been ruled out?

Q Commission without Ueberroth? (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know that we've ever discussed that in much detail.

Leo?

Q Are you saying the commission is not --

Q Well, I don't know -- have you discussed this -- you mean, internally you haven't discussed it in much detail?

MR. SPEAKES: I haven't heard it.

Q So, that's not part of his plan?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think so.

Leo?

Q Do you anticipate a legislative program?

MR. SPEAKES: Possibility of legislation. There are many -- several hundred bills pending on the Hill.

Q That's what I mean -- in the administration, legislative program for --

MR. SPEAKES: Possibility, yes.

Q Okay. In that connection, as you know, Social Security and some other things were shielded from Gramm-Rudman's automatic cut. Would the administration favor a re-write of Gramm-Rudman so as to also shield programs dealing with drug abuse?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think we've crossed that bridge.

Pat?

Q You said your lawyers are looking at the question of drug testing in the civilian sector. Now, there's no way the federal government could mandate testing by itself, by law, could it, in the civilian sector?

MR. SPEAKES: I think they could, yes. Oh, you mean in the private -- outside of government?

Q In other words -- the government telling, you know --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't believe so --

Q -- employees --

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. No, no, no -- I thought you meant of federal employees. I don't think so, Pat.

Q Is the thing that you're looking at sort of urging employers to make the test mandatory?

MR. SPEAKES: Right. Yes. And some have already taken those steps, that as a condition to employment that you would have drug screening.

Bob?

Q Did the death of Len Bias play any role at all in this?

MR. SPEAKES: We were, of course, involved in it all these years, but I think it did heighten the interest in it -- the sports deaths -- and I think it has had a tremendous impact on public opinion as far as something must be done and must be done now.

Al?

Q Do you have any figures on how much is being spent on combatting drug abuse now?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't have that, Al. Sorry.

Q Do you have any ideas -- are there any figures on how much revenue was generated by illegal drug sales?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm sure there is. Rusty?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'll try and get that.

MR. SPEAKES: Okay. Try -- Carlton is a virtual walking encyclopedia of those type of things, and once we get him in here we really -- it will be helpful to you.

Yes?

Q Will there be a proposal to make mandatory testing for all federal employees?

MR. SPEAKES: We covered that a couple of times. That, in fact, we covered in the last five minutes. That has -- there's been no decision for that.

Bob?

Q Just back on Len Bias and the other sports stuff -- you said it had tremendous impact and -- made people feel that something must be done and must be done now. Would it be going too far to say that this had triggered this campaign?

MR. SPEAKES: No. These type of things --

Q No, it would not be going too far?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, it would be going too far. No, it did not trigger the campaign. We had had these type things in mind. The President had expressed an interest in stepping into it earlier than that.

Bernie?

Q Democratic platform again.

Q The President recently cited a poll in which he said that 71 percent, I believe, of the American public sited drugs as the number one issue. Do you know what poll that was and are there any other relative statistics from it that you could share with us?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know -- sure don't.

Owen?

Q Is the focus of this campaign to be illegal drugs? Or will the President be speaking about abuse of, say, prescription drugs or alcohol or even tobacco?

MR. SPEAKES: I would assume all of the above, but the main emphasis on the illegal drugs.

Bill?

Q Yes. I was just going to ask to clarify Bob's question-- you said that the death of the sports figures heightened interest. Are you referring to public interest or Presidential interest?

MR. SPEAKES: Both, really.

Bernie?

Q The fact that Tip O'Neil and other Democrats pushed or were saying that they want drug legislation by early September, did this in any way spur the White House to act early?

MR. SPEAKES: No, we generally planned about this time frame.

Andrea?

Q Any consideration of legislation to change the penalties? Is that one of the things --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. I have not looked at any of the legislative ideas.

Q And is the President stepping into this any reflection on the way Bush handled the issue for the last few years?

MR. SPEAKES: No. The President has nothing but the highest praise for the way the Vice President's handled the issue.

Q Just feels that more is needed?

MR. SPEAKES: Nor is it any criticism of the way the First Lady's handled the issue.

Q I'll bet. (Laughter.)

Q Isn't he riding on her coattails on this? I mean, she's been pushing this for years.

MR. SPEAKES: And he's proud of her too.

Q But why didn't he get involved earlier?

MR. SPEAKES: Feels the time's right now.

Q Larry, if I could continue -- you said that there's been a tremendous outpouring of public feeling since the Len Bias and other sports deaths. Do you have any research or evidence of what kind of public feeling there is on this issue?

MR. SPEAKES: No. That poll that Frank cited is one. I don't know whether that's pre-Len Bias or not. May not be.

No. I just think it's an obvious feeling about the amount of publicity that was given to the two most recent sports drug deaths that have really peaked the public interest and so forth.

Q The President mentioned talking about this at the economic summit -- apparently raised by a lady there -- was that Thatcher?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. This really came up in detail at the London -- I believe it was London and not --

Q No. It was Bonn.

MR. SPEAKES: -- Bonn summit when -- after the First Ladies' International Drug Conference and one of the leaders brought it up -- not the President -- about the tremendous job that Mrs. Reagan had done and how much -- it may have been Chancellor Kohl -- that their wives were impressed by the effort being made. And that launched into one of those three-hour dinner discussions on the subject of drug abuse on an international level.

Q Any comment on the breakup of the talks in Geneva on SALT?

MR. SPEAKES: No. I think they were supposed to end and --

Q And how about low level talks beginning in Zambia with the ANC?

MR. SPEAKES: Not aware of that. Any -- I've not heard that, Helen.

Q What about the -- you were going to try and give us something on the meetings --

Q The work plan.

Q The working meetings?

MR. SPEAKES: We have agreed with the Soviets to a general pattern -- we through with drugs?

Q No.

Q One more.

Q This morning you said alcohol probably would be the focus. Now you said it's illegal drugs and I would like to pose the policy question -- on why not alcohol, since that also is abused by children and athletes and business people?

Q Judges.

MR. SPEAKES: That's true. I think alcohol abuse would be a part of it, but the main focus will be on drug abuse.

Owen?

Q I just want to clarify the President's feelings about drug testing because I missed some of those earlier briefings. While no decisions have been made, I gather he favors, in general, the principle of drug testing?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes -- mindful of the legal and constitutional arguments that go to the basic principle of whether this constitutes an individual accused of a crime testifying against himself.

Q -- mandatory --

MR. SPEAKES: That's right. Yes.

Q Can we find out specifically what the poll is that we've been referring to here that --

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, let's see if we can run that down, Rusty. Rusty will be the point man for that.

Q Are you looking at any federal pressure to get employers to do this drug testing? I mean there's an awful lot of federal contracts, for example. Or is it simply going to be job-owned?

MR. SPEAKES: There have been -- and not in this specific instance -- but ideas that have been proposed. For example, that -- in the case of Defense contractors where it's very important that it be a drug-free workplace, that there might be attached to the contract bidding procedure that -- for drug abuse programs and reduction and drug abuse within a contracting firm or within a bidding firm would add points to their ability to bid. In other words, it would be part of the criteria for consideration. But I don't know that a decision has been made on that.

Steve?

Q How is this going to affect Mrs. Reagan's program? Is it going to supplant it? Is she going to be involved? Are they going to merge it? How is that going to work now?

MR. SPEAKES: It -- she will continue. In fact, I think she has a meeting today with one of the entertainment industry people to talk about that. And she will continue to do what she's doing in it, but the President will also be involved at different levels. So, it will be companion programs -- sometimes working together, sometimes working separately.

Bob?

Q Are White House employees required to take drug tests?

MR. SPEAKES: All White House employees are not, but the drug abuse office under Carlton Turner has taken drug abuse tests and everybody passed -- contrary to previous administrations that might not have been able to get through.

Q Ohhh.

MR. SPEAKES: The military that works in the White House are also -- come under the mandatory military restrictions on that.

Q Can I -- you say everyone in the White House has taken it?

MR. SPEAKES: No, no, the drug abuse office has -- Carlton Turner's office.

Saul?

Q Just to follow up -- have the staff people in the White House taken the test?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know of anybody that has other than Carlton's office and the military people.

Q Would anyone object?

MR. SPEAKES: I doubt if they would. I'd certainly volunteer mine.

Q Would you volunteer yours? (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: Me and my staff.

Q Volunteer your what? (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: Me and my staff --

Q Are you listening in there?

MR. SPEAKES: -- would do it.

Q Would you --

MR. SPEAKES: Let me go to this --

Q Larry, the President talking of gurus of hedonism in the '70s -- and you opened this briefing by saying that when the President was first elected in '81 there was no focus. Now you've just said that, contrary to the previous administration, this one might pass a drug test. Are you blaming Jimmy Carter for drug abuse?

MR. SPEAKES: Of course not.

Q Well, you seem to be --

MR. SPEAKES: The facts speak for themselves -- that that fellow did have a problem.

Q What fellow?

Q What fellow?

Q Well, now, wait a minute.

MR. SPEAKES: Whoever worked for Carter. Wasn't that --

Q Who?

Q Who?

Q Peter Bourne.

Q Peter Bourne.

MR. SPEAKES: Or was selling it, or writing prescriptions or whatever the story -- I don't remember, but that was it.

Q You're not talking about the candidate for the Democratic nomination?

Q Are you talking about Peter Bourne?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, whatever that controversy on writing the prescriptions --

Q Hamilton Jordan?

Q You're not talking about Hamilton?

Q You're not talking about Hamilton?

Q It wasn't his own failure of a drug test but the fact that he was writing out prescriptions for staffers.

MR. SPEAKES: Writing prescriptions for those, yes.

Q And --

MR. SPEAKES: I wasn't here.

Q -- when they took the drug tests here, was that

voluntary or were they all asked to do it?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm sure it was voluntary.

Q Are you saying that you and your office will -- you think it would be good idea for you and everyone in your office to have drug testing?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm saying I wouldn't object to it -- be glad to do it.

Q And to what extent do you think the development of crack --

Q Where's Mark?

Q Has Mark agreed to this? (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: What?

Q Mark?

Q To what extent do you think the epidemic of crack, if you will, has precipitated the White House's concern? Is it because that is so readily available and is so addictive? Is that --

MR. SPEAKES: Just another step in the spread of drugs. (Laughter.)

MR. WEINBERG: Can I see my lawyer? (Laughter.)

Q Is this why Djerejian is leaving? (Laughter.)

Q Is that another step in the --

Q Yes, this is all happening around the same time that Senator Thurmond's bill is about to come to the floor of the Senate to make bank money laundering illegal for the first time. Is the President also going to enhance the enforcement capabilities now to go after these institutions that were identified and as organized crime commissions report laundering massive, hundreds of millions of dollars -- billions through the bank?

MR. SPEAKES: I think we've always been after the -- and made giant strides in the area of white collar crime and I'm sure that would follow in it. The FBI has -- and Justice Department have been heavily involved in it.

Q This means that bank money laundering is technically illegal for the very first time, assuming this bill passes and now the President has the option basically of beefing up the enforcement of a new law, which seems to me --

MR. SPEAKES: He'd enforce the law.

Q -- is going to be one of the key elements in this whole drug fight.

MR. SPEAKES: We'll do it.

Q Larry, the President's Commission on Organized Crime, during its sessions, when it was talking about cocaine trafficking and other drug abuse, talked about a lot of the problems of surveillance and enforcement, electronic devices the traffickers use, the problems with laws regarding phone tapping and surveillance. Are you planning anything along those lines by way of either endorsing or producing legislation to help in those efforts?

MR. SPEAKES: The whole legislative thing is under consideration, and we are working with the Hill. There is a Republican group under Bob Michel that has been actively involved in considering which legislation is feasible to push, which has possibilities of passage. And we will be working closely with them as we develop what we are going to get behind.

Q But it won't necessarily be entirely a newly developed package? It could be --

MR. SPEAKES: That's right.

Q -- partially an endorsement of things that already exist?

MR. SPEAKES: Absolutely.

Q Will the President himself, and perhaps Mrs. Reagan, actually travel outside of Washington to speak on this issue?

MR. SPEAKES: There is no specific outside-of-Washington travel planned, but certainly the President will take various opportunities to go to the public at large, and will, when he travels, I am sure be willing to speak on it, as will all other Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officials.

Q Just to clear things up, is the President proposing now, since he wants it -- favors it for private industry but has no real say about the private sector, is the President favoring now for federal employees in sensitive positions drug testing as a condition of employment?

MR. SPEAKES: We would be working with the federal employee unions -- in fact, the Office of Personnel Management is already having discussions with employee unions about that. I think in the case of, as I pointed out, law enforcement agencies -- FBI, DEA, others -- in the military, in sensitive positions such as travel, aviation, railroads -- recent legislation has just been passed, I believe, for mandatory testing for those who operate railroads.

Q How about the White House taking part in -- other personnel -- civilian personnel -- in security sensitive positions?

MR. SPEAKES: I think that, once again, raises a lot of legal questions that we would want to look at in their fullest to be sure.

Q But this is under consideration specifically?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I can remember the day that a briefer stood here and said pardons for other Watergate lawyers were under consideration. That's always a dangerous term, "under consideration." Many options have been looked at in expanding the way that we can enforce drug -- anti-drug abuse efforts within the federal government. We'll continue to look at them.

Q But it just seems to me that before --

MR. SPEAKES: So I wouldn't want to -- it would be a red flag to say that the President is considering mandatory testing for all federal officials. We are certainly looking at the possibilities of how it would work and how to expand drug testing, as we are any efforts to reduce drug abuse within the federal employment.

Q What is the difference between looking at possibilities and considering? I'm not clear what the difference is.

MR. SPEAKES: It's subject to misinterpretation when you write it.

Q So if we write that the President is looking at the possibilities of doing it, that's all right?

MR. SPEAKES: The President is exploring all possibilities.

Q But that takes three or four seconds longer than considering. (Laughter.) Right, Sam? No?

MR. SPEAKES: That's right. Just talk faster.

Q It would help you get on the air.

MR. SPEAKES: Okay, the Soviets.

Q Larry, what is the difference between today and the kicking off or announcing? I mean, it feels like --

Q They want us to do it twice. (Laughter.)

Q Oh, they want it twice. Never mind.

MR. SPEAKES: No, the --

Q I recommend that I just do it once. I either do it today and not next week or vice versa.

Q It feels like a send-off, kick-off.

MR. SPEAKES: No, the President will be stating specifics, he will be discussing goals, he will be discussing methods, he will be laying out his own personal view on it, and so forth.

Q Could he do it at a news conference?

Q Larry, would you say that this represents a major change of position for the United States? Until now the U.S. was always saying that the problem was at the source and one had to go to the source, which were the drug-producing countries.

MR. SPEAKES: No, we've always said it is at the --

Q And they kept on saying the problem was consumers.

MR. SPEAKES: No, we say it's at both ends of the spectrum and in the middle.

Q Yes, but until now the emphasis was much more on the

source than on the market, so this is a change.

MR. SPEAKES: I wouldn't call it a change. It's just an expansion of our efforts.

Q Do you recognize the validity of the argument of the drug-producing --

MR. SPEAKES: Work on both ends of the pipeline.

Q Larry, are you looking at possible drug-testing programs for college students, high school students?

Q Babies?

MR. SPEAKES: Not from the federal standpoint. I think that those decisions would have to be made by local officials. It would be a local decision.

Once again, all of this is a very broad program that is under consideration. There seems to be a little bit of headline seeking here, and --

Q Ohhh. Noooo.

Q Come on.

Q What?

MR. SPEAKES: And I think the important issue is not to be sensational, but be sincere in the effort to do it. We will also, I think, be asking the media cooperation in efforts to publicize and increase public awareness, and I would trust that the media would be cooperative and not facetious.

Q Then what's wrong with headline seeking?

MR. SPEAKES: No, no, what the headline seeking is is that we either want to say that the President is considering federally mandated tests for all federal employees or even elementary and high school students and college students.

Q Well, which is it?

Q I want to say he's looking at the possibilities of doing that. I'm going to embrace your language.

MR. SPEAKES: Go ahead.

Q Larry, you said that's true, though, as far as the President favoring drug testing in a federal civilian workplace mindful of the constitutional problems.

Q And legal.

MR. SPEAKES: True.

Q So he favors -- he's not -- regardless of whether he considers, he's for it?

MR. SPEAKES: Sure. We're looking at any and every way to reduce drug abuse in the workplace, both the federal and the private sector, in the media. We're looking at ways to do that. You got any suggestions?

Q Teach people to use drugs. (Laughter.)

Q Is he going to announce it at a news conference or in Santa Barbara? Is he going to announce it at a news conference?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Annette?

Q This is a change of subject.

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, wait a minute. I've got another change of subject ahead of you.

Leo? Ken?

Q The President, when faced with a big problem historically has always liked appointment of a task force or presidential commissions which come into the White House, is that one of the possibilities being looked at?

MR. SPEAKES: Is that a possibility? Nooooo. I've been over it three times. Leo.

Ken?

Q Larry, illegal drugs are today more available and more varied and more potent and cheaper than they've ever been. Doesn't a new initiative on demand suggest that you are really throwing in the towel by --

Q Say yes and we'll get a story.

MR. SPEAKES: By?

Q By recognizing that you've lost the battle on supply?

Q If you had won the battle on supply, then you wouldn't be working on demand.

MR. SPEAKES: No. (Laughter.)

The Soviet work plan. We have agreed with a general pattern of consultations on issues on the U.S.-Soviet agenda across the board. Part of this process, we are setting up a series of meetings on the expert level. In addition, we are having discussions that of course include the arms control issues talks that are taking place in various fora that can serve to advance U.S.-Soviet differences and eliminate U.S.-Soviet differences in heading toward a summit.

We also have a series of regional conferences, including a conference on Afghanistan that will take place in the near future.

Q With the Soviets?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, we are working with the Soviets through diplomatic channels about scheduling an experts' meeting on Afghanistan. As you know, others have been held on Central America, Middle East, East Asia.

A meeting on Afghanistan will be part of our regular series of consultations with the Soviets on regional issues.

At the Geneva summit, the President and the General Secretary agreed to continue on a regular basis bilateral views on regional issues at the senior expert level. These, as I said, began in '85 and they've had separate meetings in '85 on Afghanistan, Central America, Caribbean, southern Africa, the Middle East, East Asia and the Pacific.

In addition, we have a number of ongoing talks on bilateral issues that are taking -- that have taken place, and specifically, cultural exchanges. The USIA has a very active interchange program or interchange of visits with the Soviet Union in which Director Wick has both gone to Moscow and is hosting meetings that would advance issues on the cultural and information exchange levels.

Also, the recent Deputy Foreign Minister visit in Washington is a series -- part of the ongoing process.

Q Larry, the President seemed to talk specifically about things that had been proposed by the Soviets. Much of what you've mentioned here, as I understood it, was something that the U.S. had proposed with the Soviets over a long period of time, not something that had come in this recent spate of meetings. Can you sort out for us which things the President was talking about when he said he's embracing the work plans submitted or proposed by the Soviets?

MR. SPEAKES: These -- some of these ideas were proposed by the Soviets at the Geneva summit. I don't know specifically which is which. We have, as you know, set up -- I don't know whether the expert meetings such as Afghanistan and so forth were set up as a result, or not. Do you, Dan, of the summit? I don't know the answer to that.

Q Do you have a better sense of what it was the President was talking about? He seemed to be saying that the Soviets had proposed something specific that gave impetus to this whole process, that it now appears to be leading to a summit.

MR. SPEAKES: No --

Q I don't understand --

MR. SPEAKES: Yes -- I don't know. I just think he meant -- well, I guess that discussions that we've had with the Soviets, that we talked about a broad outline when Shevardnadze was here and met with the President. There were discussions of a way to work up to the summit, of an outline. This is it.

Bob?

Q Were you able to find out if there was an analysis on impact on employment if we don't import textiles?

MR. SPEAKES: Anything on that, Rusty?

MR. BRASHEAR: So far, I've been able -- nobody knows of any.

MR. SPEAKES: Don't know of any.

Bill?

Q Yes, Economic Policy Council today on space policy?

MR. SPEAKES: Discussing civilian -- or commercial use of space.

What time was that meeting, by the way? Has it been?

MR. BRASHEAR: It was at 11:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKES: Did you go? You weren't able to go?

MR. BRASHEAR: No, I didn't.

MR. SPEAKES: I should have gone.

Q Has an orbiter decision been made?

MR. SPEAKES: No -- not unless he made it between 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. today.

Q Well, what -- well, I don't have the exact quote but in a public forum the Chief of Staff said an orbiter decision had been made to go ahead.

MR. SPEAKES: In a public forum at 8:00 a.m. he had not made a decision. Is that -- he did make a speech at 11:00 a.m.

Q No, it was afterward and we questioned him. What the Chief of Staff said was reiteration that the President favors going ahead with a fourth orbiter, but the question of financing still has to be decided.

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, well, that's --

Q And he said the President had not made the decision.

Q Is there a decision --

MR. SPEAKES: Okay. The reporter from NBC then cited it incorrectly.

Q There was no reporter from NBC -- no, that's unfair. There was no reporter from NBC there.

MR. SPEAKES: No, no. I mean this reporter from NBC just said that the Chief of Staff said there had been a decision made on the fourth orbiter. The reporter from ABC says that's not what he said.

Q Let me clarify.

Q I withdraw.

Q I said I don't have the exact quote, but I was told.

MR. SPEAKES: Obviously, you don't if the ABC reporter has the correct quote.

Q Well, the Chief of Staff was also quoted in USA Today as saying there is a decision made to proceed with an orbiter, but the decision on the financing will not be made until the fall. Is that the --

Q No.

Q -- posture we're in?

MR. SPEAKES: No, I think that's a little bit overdrawn on what he said. It's basically that I think he probably told the reporter from USA Today that there was -- seemed to be a preponderance of those present who indicated they favored a fourth orbiter. The dissent was how to finance it.

Q Well, has there been a decision?

MR. SPEAKES: There has been no decision on the proposal to the President concerning the -- closing the gap in space caused by the Challenger accident.

Q Are you saying that there is a preponderance of opinion that it should -- that a fourth orbiter should be built, but the question now is over how to pay for it?

MR. SPEAKES: The President has before him a decision on how many -- on whether to build additional ELVs, whether to build a fourth orbiter, whether not to build a fourth orbiter, and how to finance all of the above.

Q But is there --

MR. SPEAKES: So no decision made on any of it.

Q Let me just try to understand --

MR. SPEAKES: But as you sit around a meeting you listen to people who -- one guy says I think we ought to build an orbiter, another says I think we shouldn't, another says, well, I don't know whether we should or not, another says, well, how are we going to pay for it? -- that's what goes on.

Q That's always been the issue. It is one of the options that could be resolved this week -- or has been resolved, perhaps -- to just say let's proceed with the fourth orbiter and make a decision in the fall --

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q -- to resolve the cost issue. So do you still expect a decision shortly?

MR. SPEAKES: In the next several days.

Q Which will include a decision on costs?

MR. SPEAKES: It may or may not. The President may say I'll figure on it later.

Q I have a number of questions on various other subjects. I'll defer them --

Q No, no, no.

MR. SPEAKES: I'd like to eat lunch.

Kathy?

Q Was it correct that most advised the President to delay funding until next year's budget?

MR. SPEAKES: Wouldn't want to go into detail on what the advise given to the President. Wait until he makes his decision.

George.

Q Any decision on subsidized grain sales yet?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Saul.

Q Yes. Just housekeeping. Is it possible to get a copy of that statement from which you were reading on drugs?

MR. SPEAKES: I extemporize from time to time. I'd be

glad for you to look over my notes and maybe compare them with yours if you'd like. But I did spin off of it from time to time. But you're welcome, or we could probably produce the transcript here fairly quickly of that part of it if you want to. Either way.

Q That would be helpful.

Q Hurry, Sam.

Q Any reaction to Ortega's speech?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q What about this guy that gave up his Medal of Honor
-- his Gold Medal or --

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Had enough? Okay.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

12:51 P.M. EDT

#1847-07/30