

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: President, Office of the: Presidential
Briefing Papers: Records, 1981-1989
Folder Title: 02/02/1983 (Case File:121702)
Box: 25

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>

Page 1 of 2

ID # 121702

WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
WORKSHEET

- ☐ X-MEDIA
☐ H-INTERNAL

Name of Document: BRIEFING PAPERS
FOR PRESIDENT'S
SCHEDULED
APPOINTMENTS FOR

FEB 02 83

Subject Codes:

P	R	0	0	7	-	0	1
C	O	0	0	1	-	0	7
C	O	0	8	6	-		
R	M	0	3	2	-		
					-		
F	G	0	1	0	-	0	2
F	I	0	0	5	-	0	1
A	G	0	0	4	-		
W	E	0	0	4	-	0	1
F	G	1	4	2	-		
					-		
S	O	0	0	2	-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		

1) Subject: Meeting with Jewish leaders
to exchange views on the future
of the Middle East peace process.

2) Cabinet Meeting to discuss:
A. Agricultural Credit Outlook
B. Commodity Distribution
C. Continued Federal Campaign
D. Federal Regional Councils

3) Biographical sketches of
Congressional dinner guests:
A) Henry Jackson
B) Russell Long
C) Paul Sarant
D) Dan Rostenkowski
E) Dick Cheney
F) Jake Pickle

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL		RSZ			C	

Referral Note:

WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
WORKSHEET

- ☐ X-MEDIA
☐ H-INTERNAL

Name of Document: BRIEFING PAPERS
FOR PRESIDENT'S
SCHEDULED
APPOINTMENTS FOR

FEB 02 83

Subject Codes:

P	R	0	0	7	-	0	1
C	O	0	0	2	-		
N	D	0	1	6	-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		

4) Subject: List of invitees for
meeting with Afghani
Freedom Fighters.

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL		RSZ			C	

Referral Note:

JFK

THE SCHEDULE OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9:00 - oval

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> 9:00-- (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> 9:18-- (Clark) <i>Em, SB, MKO Howard Tennen, George Kemp</i> <i>McFarlane</i>	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall</u> 9:37-- (Clark) <i>Jewish Leaders</i> (distributed separately)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> 10:04-10:17 (Clark) (Tab A) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> 10:15 Don Fenball 10:19-10:36 (Fuller) (SB, Clark) (Tab B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u> 12:15	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> 1:17-1:40 (Clark) (available in the a.m.)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> 1:00-1:15 (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein) (Tab C)	Residence

The President has seen _____

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall</u> (Clark) <i>4 Jewish Leaders.</i> (distributed separately)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Droby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark) (Tab A) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
10:15 11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (Tab B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> (Clark) (available in the a.m.)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein) (Tab C)	Residence

THE SCHEDULE OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> <i>H. TRICHER</i> (Clark) <i>6:15 am</i>	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<i>mtg w/ General Leach</i> Meeting with Donald Kendall (Clark) (distributed separately)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark) (Tab A) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
<i>10:15 to 11:00</i> 11:00 am (60 min)	<i>Don Kendall</i> <u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (Tab B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> (Clark) (available in the a.m.)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein) (Tab C)	Residence

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark)	Residence
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein)	Residence

THE SCHEDULE OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> H. TRICHER (Clark) G. CAMP	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall</u> (Clark) (distributed separately)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark) (Tab A) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (Tab B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> (Clark) (available in the a.m.)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein) (Tab C)	Residence

JER

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983

9.06 - OVAL

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time 9:06 -</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing 9:18 -</u> (Clark), <i>Em, JB, MKO, Howard T. Leichter, George Kemp</i> <i>McFarland,</i>	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall 9:37 -</u> (Clark) <i>Jewish LEADERS</i> (distributed separately)	Oval Office
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark) (Tab A) (draft remarks attached) <i>10:15 Don Kendall 10:19 - 10:34</i> <i>(JB, Clark)</i>	Residence
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (Tab B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time 12:15</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses 1:17 - 1:40</u> (Clark) (available in the a.m.)	Oval Office
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume 1:00 - 1:15</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein) (Tab C)	Residence

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE
Wednesday, February 2, 1983



9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Donald Kendall</u> (Clark)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
10:00 am (30 min)	<u>Dropby Meeting of Jewish Leaders</u> (Clark)	Residence (Tab A) (draft remarks attached)
10:15 11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller)	Cabinet Room (Tab B)
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Afghan witnesses</u> (Clark)	Oval Office (available in the a.m.)
1:15 pm (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Jack Hume</u> (Meese)	Oval Office
1:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time for Remainder of Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence
6:30 pm	<u>Private Dinner</u> (Duberstein)	Residence (Tab C)

cc: Dave Fischer
Kathy Osborne
Nell Yates

MEETING WITH JEWISH LEADERS

Wednesday, February 2, 1983 -- State Dining Room

Principal Participants

Albert A. Spiegel
Chairman
National Republican Jewish Coalition

Edgar Bronfman
President
World Jewish Congress

Julius Berman
Chairman
Conference of Presidents of Major
American Jewish Organizations

Dr. David Moses Rosen
Chief Rabbi
Romania

NOTE: Social Office has complete guest list

MEETING WITH SIX AFGHANI FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Tuesday, February 2, 1983 -- 1:00 p.m. -- Oval Office

U.S. The President
 William P. Clark
 Nicholas Veliotis
 Geoffrey Kemp, NSC

Afghanistan Mir Ne' Matollah Syyed Mortaza
 Villager from Lowgar

 Habib-Ur-Rehman Hashemi
 Villager from Lowgar

 Gol-Mohammad
 Villager from Lowgar

 Omar Babrakzai
 Judge

 Mohammad Suafoor Yousofzai
 Resistance Leader

 Farida Ahmadi
 Medial Student

Michael Barry (interpreter)

cc: Dave Fischer
-Kathy Osborne
Nell Yates

MEETING WITH DONALD KENDALL, CHAIRMAN, PEPSICO

Wednesday, February 2, 1983 -- 9:45 a.m. -- Oval Office

Donald Kendall, Chairman, Pepsico

The President
William P. Clark

A

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH JEWISH LEADERS

DATE: Wednesday, February 2, 1983
LOCATION: The Oval Office/State Dining Room
TIME: 9:45 a.m./10:00 a.m.
FROM: WILLIAM P. CLARK *WPC*

I. PURPOSE

To meet and exchange views with the leaders of the World Jewish Congress Governing Board, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and the National Republican Jewish Coalition.

II. BACKGROUND

The meeting provides an excellent opportunity to influence the debate among world Jewry regarding the future of the peace process.

The World Jewish Congress is holding its annual Governing Board meeting in Washington. As you may recall, Edgar Bronfman, the World Jewish Congress President, has been outspoken in support of your Middle East peace initiative, and the World Jewish Congress will be actively debating the issue during their meetings here. National Jewish leaders, some supportive and some opposed to your initiative, are also engaged in an intense debate and are especially anxious about the future of U.S.-Israeli relations. Aside from the peace process, Jewish leaders remain very concerned over resurgent anti-semitism, terrorism, and the plight of Soviet Jewry. We expect that these issues will be addressed by each principal in the Oval Office and have prepared your remarks for the large group as a response to their concerns.

III. PARTICIPANTSPrincipals:

- 1) Albert A. Spiegel
Chairman, National Republican Jewish Coalition
- 2) Edgar Bronfman
President, World Jewish Congress

- 3) Julius Berman
Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major
American Jewish Organizations
- 4) Dr. David Moses Rosen
Chief Rabbi, Romania

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photo only.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- o The principals will meet with the President in the Oval Office from 9:45 to 10:00 a.m. Talking points are at Tab A.
- o At 10:00 a.m. the President will accompany the principals to the State Dining Room and deliver the prepared remarks (Tab B).
- o Following the President's remarks a receiving line will be formed for the President to greet the assembled guests.
- o The President departs.

Attachments:

Tab A - Talking Points for Oval Office
Tab B - Prepared remarks

TALKING POINTS

MEETING WITH JEWISH LEADERS

- SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, WE HAVE BEEN MAKING EVERY EFFORT TO ACHIEVE PROGRESS IN LEBANON AND THE PEACE PROCESS.
- WHILE SOME PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE, DELAYS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS HAVE STUNTED OUR EFFORTS.
- MEANWHILE, SIGNIFICANT EFFORTS ARE UNDERWAY IN THE ARAB WORLD TO BRING KING HUSSEIN INTO THE PEACE PROCESS.
- I WELCOME YOUR VIEWS ON HOW BEST TO PROCEED.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Meeting With Representatives of the
Governing Board of the World Jewish
Congress and Other Jewish Leaders
February 2, 1983

FROM:

Muffie Brandon

Muffie Brandon

9:15 a.m. Guests arrive the Diplomatic Reception Room
(SouthEast Gate buses, SouthWest Gate cars)
and are led up the back staircase to the State
Dining Room to be seated for the meeting.

A member of Mr. Howard Teicher's office will
meet the following guests and escort them to the
Red Room for a short briefing: Mr. Julius
Berman, Mr. Edgar Bronfman, Rabbi David Rosen,
Mr. Albert Spiegel.

9:50 a.m. All guests should be seated at this time, includ-
ing three gentlemen from the Red Room (all except
Mr. Spiegel).

9:57 a.m. Mr. Albert Spiegel will proceed to the platform
from the south door of the Red Room and will
stand to await THE PRESIDENT.

10:00 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives the State Floor via the
elevator and proceeds to the Red Room where he
is announced into the State Dining Room via
the south door.

THE PRESIDENT proceeds to the lectern and makes
brief welcoming remarks. Mr. Albert Spiegel,
Chairman of the National Republican Jewish
Coalition, will be standing to his left.

THE PRESIDENT then calls on Mr. Spiegel, who
will make remarks. THE PRESIDENT will take
his seat on stage, which will be to his right.

Following Mr. Spiegel's remarks, Mr. Spiegel
will call on three gentlemen (listed below)
to speak one at a time. Each of the gentlemen,
seated in the front row of the audience, will
approach a microphone positioned at stage left
off of the platform when he makes his remarks.

Mr. Edgar Bronfman - President of the World
Jewish Congress

Rabbi David Moses Rosen - Chief Rabbi of
Rumania

Mr. Julius Berman - Chairman of the Conference
of Presidents of Major American Jewish
Organizations

PAGE 2

10:20 a.m. Following Mr. Berman's remarks, Mr. Spiegel will thank him from the lectern, and THE PRESIDENT will then get up from his seat and make remarks at the lectern.

10:30 a.m. Following THE PRESIDENT'S remarks, THE PRESIDENT will step off of the stage to his left and will shake hands of the three gentlemen, seated on the front row, who had spoken earlier. THE PRESIDENT will shake hands also with as many other guests seated on the front row as time allows, and a White House photographer will be photographing this.

THE PRESIDENT then departs the State Dining Room via the south door into the Red Room and proceeds to the elevator.

All guests may then depart via the back stairs and the Diplomatic Reception Room.

(Rohrabacher/TD)
February 1, 1983
7:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: MEETING WITH JEWISH LEADERSHIP
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1983

Thank you for your kind words and for coming to the White House today. I welcome this opportunity to meet with you, hear your concerns, and exchange ideas. I want to take a few moments now to discuss some thoughts of my own about the critical issues we face together. But, first let me say that I am honored today that the leaders of American and world Jewry, many of you whom I've known for so long, are meeting together here in the White House.

Just as we remember the immigrants who made America their home, we must never forget the horror which befell millions of less fortunate Jews who remained in Europe. This week marks the 50th anniversary of Adolf Hitler's rise to power. It is incumbent upon us all, Jews and gentiles alike, to remember the tragedy of Nazi Germany -- to recall how a fascist regime conceived in hatred brought a reign of terror and atrocity on the Jewish people; and to pledge that never again will the decent people of the world permit such a thing to occur. Never again can people of conscience overlook the rise of anti-semitism in silence.

Americans can be proud that our government is moving forward to build a memorial in our Nation's Capital to commemorate the Holocaust. Those who perished as a result of Nazi terror, millions of individual men, women and children whose lives were taken so senselessly, must never be forgotten. I am aware that

in April, American Holocaust survivors and their families will gather in Washington to thank our country for what it has done for them. This gathering should touch the heart of every American.

You know, perhaps better than I, that the defeat of the Third Reich did not represent a final triumph over anti-semitism. Even today in the free world, the scourge of anti-semitism and racism still rears its ugly head. Too often we hear of swastikas painted on synagogues, of holy books and scrolls desecrated by hoodlums, and of terrorist attacks against the Jewish people. We see Jewish schools in Europe forced to employ armed guards to protect children, and many congregations even in this country hiring guards to protect worshippers during the high holy days. These things bear witness that the fight, even in the free world, is not yet won.

In totalitarian societies, and particularly the Soviet Union, Jews face even greater adversity. Despite the rights enumerated in the Soviet constitution and in the Helsinki agreements, Soviet Jews are denied basic rights to study and practice their religion, to secure higher education and good jobs, or to emigrate freely. Heroic men and women, like Anatoly Shcharansky, who openly proclaim their Jewish pride and desire to emigrate, are subjected to brutal harassment and imprisonment.

But just as Soviet Jews will not forget their heritage nor abandon hope for freedom, we will not forget them. We will not, as the Western democracies did four decades ago, turn a deaf ear to distant pleas for help. There are those who suggest that a

new era of improved East-West relations is possible because the new Soviet leadership shares Western tastes. We are told that Mr. Andropov drinks scotch and fine French wines, listens to jazz and rock and roll, and reads Western literature. Frankly, it doesn't appear to have affected Soviet policy in Poland or Afghanistan.

But make no mistake, we seek better relations with the Soviet Union. We pray for the day when all Soviet citizens will enjoy basic human liberties; improvement in that area -- and the Kremlin knows this -- would do much to better East-West relations. My Administration has persistently maintained pressure on Soviet authorities to live up to their agreements; specifically, in the CSCE Review Conference, our representative, Max Kampelman, has continued to raise not only the emigration issue but also to challenge those Soviet internal practices which deny Soviet Jews, and other citizens as well, their basic human rights and violate the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Accords. Secretary Shultz has also discussed these issues with Foreign Minister Gromyko.

Those of us who believe in better relations with the Soviet Union, yet at the same time value freedom and human decency, want deeds -- not rhetoric and repression -- from the new Soviet leadership. There is no better way for them to begin than by releasing the prisoners of conscience in Siberia and restoring Jewish emigration to the levels of the late 1970's. And, I might add, they could give us an accounting of one of mankind's true heroes, Raoul Wallenberg.

Let me now turn to a third item I wanted to discuss with you, the Middle East. America's commitment to Israel remains strong and enduring. Again I ask you to focus on deeds. Since the foundation of the state of Israel, the U.S. has stood by her and helped her to pursue security, peace and economic growth. Our friendship is based on historic, moral and strategic ties, as well as our shared dedication to democracy. We've had disagreements, as should be expected between friends -- even good friends. But there should be no doubt, as long as I am in this office, America's commitment to Israel's security is ironclad.

Over the last year, U.S. diplomats and Marines have been engaged in a campaign for peace and security in the Middle East. As I said last September, we believe that the events of the past year have created new opportunities for peace that must not be lost. The current political fluidity and general desire to break the cycle of terror and war present a special chance to bring peace to this long-troubled region. It is vital to the United States, to Israel and to all those who yearn for an end to the killing that we not let current opportunities pass by.

The proposals I made to build an enduring peace are strongly rooted in the history of the region and are designed to promote negotiations that will achieve a solution acceptable to all the parties. They are based on an historic U.S. commitment to Israel's security. They reaffirm the Camp David Accords which deem that peace must bring security to Israel and provide for the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Our proposals are founded on the Camp David process and United Nations Security Council

Resolutions 242 and 338 which produced the region's first meaningful peace treaty, ending the state of war between Egypt and Israel.

Israeli and Arab leaders must take the necessary risks for peace to take root and bloom if we are to succeed. It is riskier to do nothing -- to let this time pass with no tangible sign of progress. We share with Israel three goals in Lebanon: a speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces, a strong central government for Lebanon with jurisdiction over all its territory, and full and effective guarantees that southern Lebanon will no longer be used as a staging ground for terrorist attacks against Israel. To achieve these goals will require negotiating flexibility by all of the parties.

With respect to the broader peace process, again, great courage and some risk will be required on both sides. Israel must be prepared to engage in serious negotiations over the future of the West Bank and Gaza. As I have stated previously, the most significant action demonstrating Israel's good faith would be a settlements freeze. On the other hand, King Hussein should step forward, ready to negotiate peace directly with Israel.

Each of these steps is independent but related and, for all three, the time to act is now.

The fight against anti-semitism, the struggle for Soviet Jewry, and the search for peace and security in the Middle East require courage, sacrifice, and tenacity from all parties. There are ample excuses for those who do not share our goals or

dedication. But if history is the guide, those who see opportunities for peace and pursue them, who see injustice and condemn it, and who fight for liberty, will, in the end, prevail. We are making the future in which our children will live. Only the courage to act will insure that it is a more peaceful, secure and free world. The Talmud tells us, "The day is short, the work is great. You do not have to finish the work, neither are you free to desist from it." And also from the Talmud, "for God could find no vessel which was full of blessing as shalom, peace."

America knows God's blessing, our cup truly runneth over. We seek only to share the blessings of liberty, peace and prosperity. Thank you and shalom.

B

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1983

Cabinet Meeting

DATE: February 2, 1983
LOCATION: Cabinet Room
TIME: 11:00 A.M.

FROM: Craig L. Fuller



I. PURPOSE

To discuss these issues: Agriculture Credit Outlook (Farm Foreclosures); Commodity Distribution; Combined Federal Campaign; and Federal Regional Councils.

II. BACKGROUND

Agricultural Credit Outlook - Secretary Block will brief the Cabinet on USDA activities in agriculture credit. The critical issue at this time is farm foreclosure and the Cabinet should be aware of Department of Agriculture involvement and what specifically is occurring in this area. Congressional initiatives will also be reviewed.

Commodity Distribution - This will also be a briefing by Secretary Block advising the Cabinet on the activities under way in the surplus dairy product distribution program. Options will be presented of new and different ways to increase the distribution.

Combined Federal Campaign - A decision is required regarding future participation of organizations in the Combined Federal Campaign. The options are: maintain the current policy of admitting all organizations which qualify; change the Executive Order to limit participation to strictly health and welfare organizations thus eliminating advocacy groups; provide for full eligibility for health and welfare organizations but permit write-in support of other non-profit human service agencies.

Federal Regional Councils - The Cabinet Council on Management and Administration recommends that Federal Regional Councils be eliminated as they are simply another level of federal government.

2/1 Cabinet Briefing
Page Two

III. PARTICIPANTS

Full Cabinet
Don Devine - Director of the Office of
Personnel Management for presentation on
Combined Federal Campaign.

IV. PRESS PLAN

None

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Secretary Block will lead the discussion
on the first two items.

Ed Meese will lead the discussion on the
final items.



United States
**Office of
Personnel Management**

The President has seen _____

Washington, D.C. 20415

In Reply Refer To:

Your Reference:

January 31, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Donald J. Devine 
Director
Office of Personnel Management

Subject: OPTIONS FOR REFORM OF THE COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN (CFC)

I. ACTION FORCING EVENTS

- * The timely action cycle for the 1983 CFC began December 1, 1982. We are already two months behind
- * Employee pressure is building for nationwide boycotts next year if advocacy groups are included

II. BACKGROUND

- * Employee boycotts of the CFC were averted this year by strong efforts by responsible Union leaders and local Federal officials on the basis of Administration pledges to reform the next CFC; aversion will not be possible in the coming year
- * In the 1982 CFC, even with boycotts and employee resistance, overall employee participation declined slightly and contributions increased slightly
- * The overwhelming majority of employees give to health and welfare charities, while a small minority of employees give to advocacy groups
- * Many more advocacy groups seek admission to the 1983 CFC
- * Unions, Federal Executive Boards, and managers all strongly favor focusing the CFC on health and welfare charities, while "non-traditional" advocates favor no exclusions

III. OPTIONS

Option 1. Continue the Status Quo.

Description: Retain the Executive Order as is. Advocacy groups, as well as health and welfare agencies, may continue to solicit through the CFC.

- Advantages:
- * Avoids lawsuits over exclusion
 - * Gives appearance of freedom-of-choice
 - * Pleases advocacy and other non-traditional agencies
- Disadvantages:
- * Presidential pledge unfulfilled
 - * Many new advocacy groups will join: National Association for Advancement of White People has applied
 - * Unions and employees will boycott
 - * Federal managers will resist administering CFC
 - * Displeases health and welfare charities, United Ways, and Washington Post
 - * Fails to focus Government support on health and welfare needs and programs that lessen the the burdens of Government
 - * Raises charge that taxpayers pay for fundraising for advocacy groups.

Option 2. Limit Eligibility to Health and Welfare Charities

Description: Participation in the CFC would be limited to health and welfare charities.

- Advantages:
- * President fulfills pledge
 - * Boycotts averted
 - * Legally defensible
 - * CFC focuses on lessening burdens of Government, building safety net
 - * Unions will strongly support
 - * Local officials and Washington Post support
 - * Health and welfare agencies strongly support
 - * Government resources not used to fund advocacy groups
 - * Lawsuits by advocacy groups on "clean" legal issue of focus on health and welfare
- Disadvantages:
- * Advocacy groups will sue
 - * Appearance of less freedom-of-choice
 - * Some media will oppose

Option 3. Limit Full Eligibility to Health and Welfare Charities; Permit Write-in Gifts to Other Philanthropies.

Description: National eligibility in the CFC solicitation would be limited to health and welfare charities. Local donors would be permitted, however, to earmark gifts to any nonprofit human service agency (including organizations not participating in the CFC and therefore not listed in brochures) by a write-in mechanism on the donor card.

- Advantages:
- * President arguably fulfills pledge
 - * Employees have more freedom-of-choice
 - * Unions might not boycott
 - * Probably satisfies health and welfare agencies
- Disadvantages:
- * Advocacy groups will sue on stronger legal grounds than with Option 2, colorably claiming that they are admitted but with 2d class 1st Amendment rights
 - * Administratively burdensome
 - * Still displeases advocacy groups, with some support, for not being equally open to all
 - * Government resources still subsidize fundraising for advocacy groups

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The status quo is untenable and the President is on record saying so. Under either Option 2 or Option 3 the legal bullet must be bitten; Option 2 presents the cleaner legal position. Option 3 generates new legal exposure by "admitting" advocacy groups sub silentio while denying them the right to "speak" through CFC brochures. The key distinction between this half-step and Option 1 is that here advocacy groups are not allowed to "speak." Simple exclusion of non-health-and-welfare groups may be easier to defend than admission with unequal status. Option 3 also raises many questions of administration that might cost more than it will gain cosmetically. Accordingly, I recommend Option 2.

V. DECISION

(Draft Executive Orders for Options 2 and 3 are attached).

Option 1 _____

Option 2 ✓RR

Option 3 _____

(OPTION 2)

Draft

Executive Order

CHARITABLE FUND-RAISING

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, and in order to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order 12353 is amended as follows:

(a) In Section 1 delete "such national" and "and such other national voluntary agencies as may be appropriate".

(b) In Section 2 insert "(a)" after the Section number and add the following new subsections:

"(b) In establishing those criteria, the Director shall be guided by the following principles and policies:

"(1) The objectives of the Combined Federal Campaign are to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare; to provide a convenient channel through which Federal public servants may contribute to these efforts; to minimize or eliminate disruption of the Federal workplace and costs to Federal taxpayers that such fund-raising may entail; and to avoid the reality and appearance of the use of Federal resources in aid of fund-raising for political activity or advocacy of public policy, lobbying or philanthropy of any kind that does not directly serve needs of human health and welfare.

"(2) To meet these objectives, eligibility for participation in the Combined Federal Campaign shall be limited to voluntary, charitable, health and welfare agencies that provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services to individuals or their families. Such direct health and welfare services must be available to Federal employees in the local campaign solicitation area, unless they are rendered to needy persons overseas. Such services must benefit human beings, whether children, youth, adults, the aged, the ill and infirm, or the mentally or physically handicapped. Such services must consist of care, research or education in the fields of human health or social adjustment and rehabilitation; relief of victims of natural disasters and other emergencies; or assistance to those who are impoverished and in need.

"(3) Agencies that seek to influence the outcomes of elections or the determination of public policy through political activity or advocacy, lobbying, or litigation on behalf of parties other than themselves shall not be deemed charitable health and welfare agencies and shall not be eligible to participate in the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(4) International organizations that provide health and welfare services overseas, and that meet the eligibility criteria except for the local services criterion, shall be eligible to participate in each local solicitation area of the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(5) Local voluntary, charitable, health and welfare agencies that are not affiliated with a national agency or federation but that satisfy the eligibility criteria set forth in this Order and by the Director, shall be permitted to participate in the Combined Federal Campaign in the local solicitation areas in which they provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services."

Section 2. All rules, regulations, and directives continued or issued under Executive Order No. 12353 shall continue in full force and effect until revoked or modified under the provisions of this Order.

Draft

Executive Order

CHARITABLE FUND-RAISING

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, and in order to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order 12353 is amended as follows:

(a) In Section 1 delete "such national" and "and such other national voluntary agencies as may be appropriate".

(b) In Section 2 insert "(a)" after the Section number and add the following new subsections:

"(b) In establishing those criteria, the Director shall be guided by the following principles and policies:

"(1) Eligibility for participation in the Combined Federal Campaign shall be limited to voluntary, charitable agencies whose principal purpose is to provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services to individuals and families; provided, however, that, subject to such regulations as the Director may prescribe, Federal employees and members of the uniformed services shall be permitted to designate gifts to voluntary human-service agencies not participating in the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(2) Where required by this Order, direct health and welfare services must be available to Federal employees in the local campaign solicitation area, unless they are rendered to needy persons overseas. Such services must benefit human beings, whether children, youth, adults, the aged, the ill and infirm, or the mentally or physically handicapped. Such services must consist of care, research or education in the fields of human health or social adjustment and rehabilitation; relief of victims of natural disasters and other emergencies; or assistance to those who are impoverished and in need.

"(3) International organizations that provide health and welfare services overseas, and that meet the eligibility criteria except for the local services criterion, shall be eligible to participate in each local solicitation area of the Combined Federal Campaign."

(c) In Section 6, in the first sentence thereof, delete "such" and the period, and add "including voluntary human-service agencies not participating in the Combined Federal Campaign."

Section 2. All rules, regulations, and directives continued or issued under Executive Order No. 12353 shall continue in full force and effect until revoked or modified under the provisions of this Order.



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

January 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

FROM: John R. Block
Secretary of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Agricultural Credit Outlook

BACKGROUND

During the past 60 days, the news media have extensively reported on a number of farm sales which have been disrupted by a small group of farmers and rural residents. The reports suggest that the Federal Government is actively forcing out of business small family farmers through foreclosures and withdrawal of necessary operating credit.

Beginning in 1970, there has been a rapid increase in the total outstanding farm debt from \$54.5 billion to an estimated \$215 billion in 1983. As farmers expanded their operations and invested heavily in capital equipment, the lending community made credit readily available. This credit availability relied heavily on the rapidly inflating values of real estate which continued to rise during the decade before leveling off -- and beginning to show slight declines -- in 1981 and 1982. During this period, many lenders did not adequately supervise their loans. They frequently neglected to determine whether adequate repayment ability existed as producers expanded. In some regions of the country, principally the South and Southeast, changing cropping patterns and consecutive years of poor weather put further pressure on lenders for liberal lending standards to accommodate the financial needs of agricultural producers.

Beginning in 1977, the commercial and Farm Credit System lenders found it necessary to begin to review agricultural loan standards more carefully. However, at this same point, the Congress passed the Economic Emergency Act which provided unusually liberal lending standards for the Farmers Home Administration. This Act, coupled with a similar program in the Small Business Administration, produced a massive runup in Federal farm lending, substantial amounts of which were of poor quality and counter-productive to the best interests of the individual producer.

Thus, as the agricultural community entered the 1980's, marked by rapidly escalating interest rates and high inflation, the accumulation of large agricultural surpluses and depressed agricultural commodity prices, a small

but significant number of agricultural producers found themselves under major economic stress. Although actual numbers of foreclosures remain small, as a percentage they have more than doubled between 1981 and 1982 and appear to be holding at about 1982 levels or slightly higher as we move into the 1983 lending season.

Currently, delinquent accounts held by commercial and Farm Credit System lenders range from 2.5 to 3.9 percent of their portfolios. At the same time, the delinquent accounts of USDA's Farmers Home Administration, the lender of last resort, currently make up 24 percent of its portfolio of 268,000 borrowers. During 1982, completed foreclosures for the Farm Credit System, the largest agricultural lender, totaled approximately 1,200 while the Farmers Home Administration had 844. Commercial and Farm Credit System lenders are genuinely concerned about the trend they are experiencing. For example, the Farm Credit System's Production Credit Associations which provide short term credit to farmers, report that loan losses increased from \$22 million in 1981 to \$156 million in 1982. The 1982 figure represents 75 percent of the total losses which had been experienced by that System in its entire history prior to 1982. While the Farm Credit System anticipates a leveling off of this trend in 1983, commercial and Farm Credit System lenders have tightened their agricultural lending standards to require adequate repayment ability in addition to adequate security. This has placed additional pressure on the Government lending agency, Farmers Home Administration, to accommodate commercial lenders or assume additional agricultural loans directly. As a result, the total market share of Government agricultural lending by FmHA and CCC has risen dramatically through 1982 and will continue to rise in 1983. In total, the Government through FmHA and CCC will provide an all-time record level of short term credit to the farming community of approximately \$16 billion in 1983.

Although the actual number of producers facing serious financial difficulty is small, there is a public perception enhanced by the media that the problem is more widespread and serious than the record would support. This perception has led Congress four times in the last 18 months to attempt to pass some form of loan deferral legislation. These bills have had one common thread: they would allow, at the request of the farmer, a moratorium on loan repayments to FmHA for a period certain. USDA has aggressively opposed this type of legislative action. The Farm Bureau and leaders in various commodity organizations have indicated that the farming community strongly supports the position that each farmer's situation should be evaluated individually and that a general moratorium should not be granted. In the next few weeks, at least eight significant legislative proposals on agricultural credit can be expected to be introduced. Congressional Agricultural Committee leaders in the Congress, particularly the House, have indicated that they will concentrate their Congressional attention on the credit question during the next few months. Attachment 1 summarizes the most significant proposals being brought forward by Congress.

The major media outlets indicate significant continuing attention to this issue which will probably occur during the next 60 days, including segments being developed for "60 Minutes" and the major weekly news magazines.

USDA PLANNED ACTIONS

1. USDA implemented case-by-case lending guidelines in 1982 which gave broad discretion on an individual basis to assist borrowers under financial stress. During 1982, 40,000 of the 268,000 borrowers of FmHA received special consideration in the form of deferrals, reschedulings, the carrying of delinquent accounts or other actions to assist them to continue in operation. Of these 40,000 actions, 20,000 involved subordination of the Government's collateral position to commercial lenders so that the commercial and Farm Credit System could supply credit to their regular customers. USDA intends to continue to aggressively use these authorities through the 1983 lending season.
2. USDA's PIK program will reduce the total credit that is needed for production expenses in the year ahead and will thereby reduce some of the financial lending stress which producers are experiencing.
3. USDA intends to aggressively oppose general moratorium and deferment legislation, new lending schemes and any legislation which would lead to assumption of commercial sector poor lending risk. These types of lending policies are counter-productive in almost all cases to the interest of the individual producer. In addition, they lack the support of the general farming community and represent major budget impacts.
4. USDA will meet with agricultural financial lenders and farm commodity organization leaders on a regular basis during the balance of the lending season to monitor financial conditions and the severity of credit problems. This commitment to ascertain an accurate picture of credit conditions represents the continuation of an effort commenced by Secretary Block over a year ago.
5. USDA expects support from organizations such as the Farm Bureau for the Administration's opposition to general moratorium and deferral legislation. USDA will also undertake a campaign to inform its farm audiences and the media of the substantial actions taken by the Administration to demonstrate compassion and concern to the current problems faced by some producers.
6. USDA has issued guidelines which have been successfully used by the Farmers Home Administration's lending officials in effectively handling disruptive actions by a small number of militant rural residents and farmers in incidents involving farm sales. Similar training efforts in handling these situations will be undertaken by the Farm Credit Administration for its lenders next week. USDA, through the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture, will provide senior staff centralized information concerning farm foreclosure sales, bankruptcies, and loan delinquent rates for the balance of this lending season which ends in late April.

Prospective 1983 Legislative Proposals Affecting FmHA

I Bills which have been introduced in the new session:

- A. H.R. 568 - Sponsor - Evans (Iowa) requires farmers to implement conservation plans as an eligibility prerequisite for FmHA loans to acquire or enlarge farms.
- B. H.R. 589 - Sponsor - Gore (Tennessee) permits FmHA to make emergency loans of up to \$5,000 on the basis of estimated farmer loss.
- C. H.R. 590 - Sponsor - Gore (Tennessee) reduces the disaster emergency loan rate to 5 percent for the amount of loss and the interest rate for other loan purposes to the cost of money instead of prevailing market rates.

II Probable additional legislative proposals which are expected to be introduced:

- A. Sponsor - Daschle (South Dakota) and Dorgan (North Dakota) - A general deferral moratorium bill closely resembling a comparable proposal of the last legislative session known as the Daschle Farm Crisis Bill.
- B. Sponsor - Alexander (Arkansas) - A bill providing for FmHA to guarantee (90 percent) any private farm loan that is considered to be high risk in nature, i.e., delinquent or nearing foreclosure. It further provides FmHA authority to buy up such guaranteed loans.
- C. Sponsor - Cochran (Mississippi) - A 1983 Farm Credit bill expected to be introduced this week. Cochran and others as sponsors are developing a broad based farm credit relief package which is expected to include proposals on deferral moratorium and additional lending authorities and higher loan size limits for FmHA.
- D. Sponsor - Huddleston (Kentucky) - A competing Democratically sponsored general farm bill with major farm credit sections aimed at FmHA as an alternative to the expected Cochran proposal.
- E. Sponsor - Pepper (Florida) - A general economic recovery bill is expected which will incorporate a farm loan repayment moratorium feature.
- F. Sponsor - Sasser (Tennessee) - A two-year loan deferral bill coupled with some modification of the economic emergency loan provision.

III Administration proposal:

Congress did not complete action on reauthorization of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act in the last session. The Agricultural Credit Subcommittee under Ed Jones is expected to develop a Congressional proposal. The Administration is preparing for transmittal an authorization proposal corresponding to the President's 1984 budget request and certain other minor modifications.

Committee staffs indicate that additional proposals by other members are expected and that it is the House Agriculture Committee's intention to concentrate on credit questions during the early period of this session.



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

January 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

FROM: John R. Block
Secretary of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Appropriate Federal Government Involvement in Distribution of
Commodities to Needy Persons through Food Banks or other
Organizations

I. ORIGINATOR: U.S. Department of Agriculture

II. ACTION FORCING EVENT:

The present level of unemployment has drawn increased media attention to the circumstances of the low-income population. Specifically, a misperception is developing that a significant amount of poverty-related hunger is now present because of increased unemployment and recent changes in federal nutrition assistance programs.

Public perception of this problem is exacerbated by a growing abundance of agricultural commodities. The Administration's payment-in-kind (PIK) program holds great promise for relieving problems in the agricultural economy. However, its "payments" draw increased attention to the abundance of some commodities and perpetuate the false impression that "the government is holding vast stocks of foods while unemployed Americans are going hungry".

Senator Robert Dole introduced a bill on January 26 to require USDA to expand its commodity distribution activities. This bill and similar efforts are expected to receive significant public support.

III. ANALYSIS:

Background

At present, USDA is distributing surplus commodities through charitable institutions for their on-site feeding operations (soup kitchens and the like) at the expense of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).

In addition, USDA is spending over \$16 billion a year for nutrition assistance programs, primarily for the Food Stamp Program, which is designed to supplement a low-income household's food purchasing power.

Issues

Should USDA expand current dairy distribution?

- Extend cheese/butter distribution through calendar year 1984?
- Expand distribution to include non-fat dry milk?

Should USDA expand beyond dairy distribution and allow a nationwide distribution of other surplus commodities for home consumption?

Should USDA give greater support and visibility to the outstanding volunteer work now being done in the distribution of cheese and butter at the local level?

IV. CONCLUSION:

USDA is considering the above and will be looking at other possible alternatives. This issue has been brought before the Cabinet Council for information and with a request for suggestions.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: EDWIN MEESE III
CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE
CABINET COUNCIL ON MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: Abolition of the Federal Regional
Council System

BACKGROUND

In the late 1960's ten Federal Regional Councils were established to coordinate interagency and intergovernmental issues in each of the ten standard Federal Regional headquarters cities. The FRC role has diminished as a result of your emphasis on less federal intervention in the affairs of State and local governments through the use of block grants and deregulatory initiatives.

Agencies now indicate that they can communicate and coordinate on their own more efficiently than through an elaborate field structure such as the FRC system. For much the same reason, the White House approach to intergovernmental issues has been to work directly through the agencies.

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Council on Management and Administration unanimously concurred in the OMB/White House/Agency recommendation that the FRC system be abolished. I believe such a decision should be announced as part of the Administration's continuing drive to eliminate and reduce unnecessary federal structures that no longer serve a productive purpose. Approval of this recommendation will require rescission of the current Executive Order.

DECISION

 Approve ☐ Approve as Amended ☐ Reject ☐ No Action ☐

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

CABINET MEETING AGENDA

February 2, 1983 -- 11:00 a.m.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Combined Federal Campaign | Donald Devine |
| 2. Federal Regional Councils | Edwin Meese III |
| 3. Agricultural Credit Outlook | Frank Naylor |
| 4. Commodity Distribution | Mary Jarratt |

CABINET MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Wednesday, February 2, 1983 -- 11:00 a.m.

The Cabinet -- All Members *

- * Kenneth Dam, Acting Secretary of State, for Secretary Shultz
- * Timothy McNamar, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, for Secretary Regan
- * Paul Thayer, Deputy Secretary of Defense, for Secretary Weinberger
- * Donald Hovde, Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, for Secretary Pierce
- * Darrell Trent, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, for Secretary Dole
- * Martha O. Hesse, Acting Secretary of Energy, for Secretary Hodel
- * Joseph Wright, Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, for Director Stockman
- * David Macdonald, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative
 - James A. Baker
 - Richard Darman
 - Kenneth Duberstein
 - Fred Fielding
 - Craig Fuller
 - David Gergen
 - Edwin Harper
 - Richard Williamson
 - Lee Atwater
 - Red Cavaney
 - H. P. Goldfield
 - Fred Bush

For Presentation:

- Item #1 - Donald Devine, Director, Office of Personnel Management
- Item #3 - Frank Naylor, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Small Community and Rural Development
- Item #4 - Mary Jarratt, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

January 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

FROM: John R. Block
Secretary of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Agricultural Credit Outlook

BACKGROUND

During the past 60 days, the news media have extensively reported on a number of farm sales which have been disrupted by a small group of farmers and rural residents. The reports suggest that the Federal Government is actively forcing out of business small family farmers through foreclosures and withdrawal of necessary operating credit.

Beginning in 1970, there has been a rapid increase in the total outstanding farm debt from \$54.5 billion to an estimated \$215 billion in 1983. As farmers expanded their operations and invested heavily in capital equipment, the lending community made credit readily available. This credit availability relied heavily on the rapidly inflating values of real estate which continued to rise during the decade before leveling off -- and beginning to show slight declines -- in 1981 and 1982. During this period, many lenders did not adequately supervise their loans. They frequently neglected to determine whether adequate repayment ability existed as producers expanded. In some regions of the country, principally the South and Southeast, changing cropping patterns and consecutive years of poor weather put further pressure on lenders for liberal lending standards to accommodate the financial needs of agricultural producers.

Beginning in 1977, the commercial and Farm Credit System lenders found it necessary to begin to review agricultural loan standards more carefully. However, at this same point, the Congress passed the Economic Emergency Act which provided unusually liberal lending standards for the Farmers Home Administration. This Act, coupled with a similar program in the Small Business Administration, produced a massive runup in Federal farm lending, substantial amounts of which were of poor quality and counter-productive to the best interests of the individual producer.

Thus, as the agricultural community entered the 1980's, marked by rapidly escalating interest rates and high inflation, the accumulation of large agricultural surpluses and depressed agricultural commodity prices, a small

but significant number of agricultural producers found themselves under major economic stress. Although actual numbers of foreclosures remain small, as a percentage they have more than doubled between 1981 and 1982 and appear to be holding at about 1982 levels or slightly higher as we move into the 1983 lending season.

Currently, delinquent accounts held by commercial and Farm Credit System lenders range from 2.5 to 3.9 percent of their portfolios. At the same time, the delinquent accounts of USDA's Farmers Home Administration, the lender of last resort, currently make up 24 percent of its portfolio of 268,000 borrowers. During 1982, completed foreclosures for the Farm Credit System, the largest agricultural lender, totaled approximately 1,200 while the Farmers Home Administration had 844. Commercial and Farm Credit System lenders are genuinely concerned about the trend they are experiencing. For example, the Farm Credit System's Production Credit Associations which provide short term credit to farmers, report that loan losses increased from \$22 million in 1981 to \$156 million in 1982. The 1982 figure represents 75 percent of the total losses which had been experienced by that System in its entire history prior to 1982. While the Farm Credit System anticipates a leveling off of this trend in 1983, commercial and Farm Credit System lenders have tightened their agricultural lending standards to require adequate repayment ability in addition to adequate security. This has placed additional pressure on the Government lending agency, Farmers Home Administration, to accommodate commercial lenders or assume additional agricultural loans directly. As a result, the total market share of Government agricultural lending by FmHA and CCC has risen dramatically through 1982 and will continue to rise in 1983. In total, the Government through FmHA and CCC will provide an all-time record level of short term credit to the farming community of approximately \$16 billion in 1983.

Although the actual number of producers facing serious financial difficulty is small, there is a public perception enhanced by the media that the problem is more widespread and serious than the record would support. This perception has led Congress four times in the last 18 months to attempt to pass some form of loan deferral legislation. These bills have had one common thread: they would allow, at the request of the farmer, a moratorium on loan repayments to FmHA for a period certain. USDA has aggressively opposed this type of legislative action. The Farm Bureau and leaders in various commodity organizations have indicated that the farming community strongly supports the position that each farmer's situation should be evaluated individually and that a general moratorium should not be granted. In the next few weeks, at least eight significant legislative proposals on agricultural credit can be expected to be introduced. Congressional Agricultural Committee leaders in the Congress, particularly the House, have indicated that they will concentrate their Congressional attention on the credit question during the next few months. Attachment 1 summarizes the most significant proposals being brought forward by Congress.

The major media outlets indicate significant continuing attention to this issue which will probably occur during the next 60 days, including segments being developed for "60 Minutes" and the major weekly news magazines.

USDA PLANNED ACTIONS

1. USDA implemented case-by-case lending guidelines in 1982 which gave broad discretion on an individual basis to assist borrowers under financial stress. During 1982, 40,000 of the 268,000 borrowers of FmHA received special consideration in the form of deferrals, reschedulings, the carrying of delinquent accounts or other actions to assist them to continue in operation. Of these 40,000 actions, 20,000 involved subordination of the Government's collateral position to commercial lenders so that the commercial and Farm Credit System could supply credit to their regular customers. USDA intends to continue to aggressively use these authorities through the 1983 lending season.
2. USDA's PIK program will reduce the total credit that is needed for production expenses in the year ahead and will thereby reduce some of the financial lending stress which producers are experiencing.
3. USDA intends to aggressively oppose general moratorium and deferment legislation, new lending schemes and any legislation which would lead to assumption of commercial sector poor lending risk. These types of lending policies are counter-productive in almost all cases to the interest of the individual producer. In addition, they lack the support of the general farming community and represent major budget impacts.
4. USDA will meet with agricultural financial lenders and farm commodity organization leaders on a regular basis during the balance of the lending season to monitor financial conditions and the severity of credit problems. This commitment to ascertain an accurate picture of credit conditions represents the continuation of an effort commenced by Secretary Block over a year ago.
5. USDA expects support from organizations such as the Farm Bureau for the Administration's opposition to general moratorium and deferral legislation. USDA will also undertake a campaign to inform its farm audiences and the media of the substantial actions taken by the Administration to demonstrate compassion and concern to the current problems faced by some producers.
6. USDA has issued guidelines which have been successfully used by the Farmers Home Administration's lending officials in effectively handling disruptive actions by a small number of militant rural residents and farmers in incidents involving farm sales. Similar training efforts in handling these situations will be undertaken by the Farm Credit Administration for its lenders next week. USDA, through the Cabinet Council on Food and Agriculture, will provide senior staff centralized information concerning farm foreclosure sales, bankruptcies, and loan delinquent rates for the balance of this lending season which ends in late April.

Prospective 1983 Legislative Proposals Affecting FmHA

- I Bills which have been introduced in the new session:
- A. H.R. 568 - Sponsor - Evans (Iowa) requires farmers to implement conservation plans as an eligibility prerequisite for FmHA loans to acquire or enlarge farms.
 - B. H.R. 589 - Sponsor - Gore (Tennessee) permits FmHA to make emergency loans of up to \$5,000 on the basis of estimated farmer loss.
 - C. H.R. 590 - Sponsor - Gore (Tennessee) reduces the disaster emergency loan rate to 5 percent for the amount of loss and the interest rate for other loan purposes to the cost of money instead of prevailing market rates.
- II Probable additional legislative proposals which are expected to be introduced:
- A. Sponsor - Daschle (South Dakota) and Dorgan (North Dakota) - A general deferral moratorium bill closely resembling a comparable proposal of the last legislative session known as the Daschle Farm Crisis Bill.
 - B. Sponsor - Alexander (Arkansas) - A bill providing for FmHA to guarantee (90 percent) any private farm loan that is considered to be high risk in nature, i.e., delinquent or nearing foreclosure. It further provides FmHA authority to buy up such guaranteed loans.
 - C. Sponsor - Cochran (Mississippi) - A 1983 Farm Credit bill expected to be introduced this week. Cochran and others as sponsors are developing a broad based farm credit relief package which is expected to include proposals on deferral moratorium and additional lending authorities and higher loan size limits for FmHA.
 - D. Sponsor - Huddleston (Kentucky) - A competing Democratically sponsored general farm bill with major farm credit sections aimed at FmHA as an alternative to the expected Cochran proposal.
 - E. Sponsor - Pepper (Florida) - A general economic recovery bill is expected which will incorporate a farm loan repayment moratorium feature.
 - F. Sponsor - Sasser (Tennessee) - A two-year loan deferral bill coupled with some modification of the economic emergency loan provision.

III Administration proposal:

Congress did not complete action on reauthorization of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act in the last session. The Agricultural Credit Subcommittee under Ed Jones is expected to develop a Congressional proposal. The Administration is preparing for transmittal an authorization proposal corresponding to the President's 1984 budget request and certain other minor modifications.

Committee staffs indicate that additional proposals by other members are expected and that it is the House Agriculture Committee's intention to concentrate on credit questions during the early period of this session.



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

January 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET COUNCIL ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

FROM: John R. Block
Secretary of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Appropriate Federal Government Involvement in Distribution of
Commodities to Needy Persons through Food Banks or other
Organizations

I. ORIGINATOR: U.S. Department of Agriculture

II. ACTION FORCING EVENT:

The present level of unemployment has drawn increased media attention to the circumstances of the low-income population. Specifically, a misperception is developing that a significant amount of poverty-related hunger is now present because of increased unemployment and recent changes in federal nutrition assistance programs.

Public perception of this problem is exacerbated by a growing abundance of agricultural commodities. The Administration's payment-in-kind (PIK) program holds great promise for relieving problems in the agricultural economy. However, its "payments" draw increased attention to the abundance of some commodities and perpetuate the false impression that "the government is holding vast stocks of foods while unemployed Americans are going hungry".

Senator Robert Dole introduced a bill on January 26 to require USDA to expand its commodity distribution activities. This bill and similar efforts are expected to receive significant public support.

III. ANALYSIS:

Background

At present, USDA is distributing surplus commodities through charitable institutions for their on-site feeding operations (soup kitchens and the like) at the expense of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).

In addition, USDA is spending over \$16 billion a year for nutrition assistance programs, primarily for the Food Stamp Program, which is designed to supplement a low-income household's food purchasing power.

Issues

Should USDA expand current dairy distribution?

- Extend cheese/butter distribution through calendar year 1984?
- Expand distribution to include non-fat dry milk?

Should USDA expand beyond dairy distribution and allow a nationwide distribution of other surplus commodities for home consumption?

Should USDA give greater support and visibility to the outstanding volunteer work now being done in the distribution of cheese and butter at the local level?

IV. CONCLUSION:

USDA is considering the above and will be looking at other possible alternatives. This issue has been brought before the Cabinet Council for information and with a request for suggestions.



United States
**Office of
Personnel Management**

Washington, D.C. 20415

In Reply Refer To:

Your Reference:

January 31, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Donald J. Devine 
Director
Office of Personnel Management

Subject: OPTIONS FOR REFORM OF THE COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN (CFC)

I. ACTION FORCING EVENTS

- * The timely action cycle for the 1983 CFC began December 1, 1982. We are already two months behind
- * Employee pressure is building for nationwide boycotts next year if advocacy groups are included

II. BACKGROUND

- * Employee boycotts of the CFC were averted this year by strong efforts by responsible Union leaders and local Federal officials on the basis of Administration pledges to reform the next CFC; aversion will not be possible in the coming year
- * In the 1982 CFC, even with boycotts and employee resistance, overall employee participation declined slightly and contributions increased slightly
- * The overwhelming majority of employees give to health and welfare charities, while a small minority of employees give to advocacy groups
- * Many more advocacy groups seek admission to the 1983 CFC
- * Unions, Federal Executive Boards, and managers all strongly favor focusing the CFC on health and welfare charities, while "non-traditional" advocates favor no exclusions

III. OPTIONS

Option 1. Continue the Status Quo.

Description: Retain the Executive Order as is. Advocacy groups, as well as health and welfare agencies, may continue to solicit through the CFC.

- Advantages:
- * Avoids lawsuits over exclusion
 - * Gives appearance of freedom-of-choice
 - * Pleases advocacy and other non-traditional agencies
- Disadvantages:
- * Presidential pledge unfulfilled
 - * Many new advocacy groups will join: National Association for Advancement of White People has applied
 - * Unions and employees will boycott
 - * Federal managers will resist administering CFC
 - * Displeases health and welfare charities, United Ways, and Washington Post
 - * Fails to focus Government support on health and welfare needs and programs that lessen the the burdens of Government
 - * Raises charge that taxpayers pay for fundraising for advocacy groups.

Option 2. Limit Eligibility to Health and Welfare Charities

Description: Participation in the CFC would be limited to health and welfare charities.

- Advantages:
- * President fulfills pledge
 - * Boycotts averted
 - * Legally defensible
 - * CFC focuses on lessening burdens of Government, building safety net
 - * Unions will strongly support
 - * Local officials and Washington Post support
 - * Health and welfare agencies strongly support
 - * Government resources not used to fund advocacy groups
 - * Lawsuits by advocacy groups on "clean" legal issue of focus on health and welfare
- Disadvantages:
- * Advocacy groups will sue
 - * Appearance of less freedom-of-choice
 - * Some media will oppose

Option 3. Limit Full Eligibility to Health and Welfare Charities; Permit Write-in Gifts to Other Philanthropies.

Description: National eligibility in the CFC solicitation would be limited to health and welfare charities. Local donors would be permitted, however, to earmark gifts to any nonprofit human service agency (including organizations not participating in the CFC and therefore not listed in brochures) by a write-in mechanism on the donor card.

- Advantages:
- * President arguably fulfills pledge
 - * Employees have more freedom-of-choice
 - * Unions might not boycott
 - * Probably satisfies health and welfare agencies
- Disadvantages:
- * Advocacy groups will sue on stronger legal grounds than with Option 2, colorably claiming that they are admitted but with 2d class 1st Amendment rights
 - * Administratively burdensome
 - * Still displeases advocacy groups, with some support, for not being equally open to all
 - * Government resources still subsidize fundraising for advocacy groups

IV. RECOMMENDATION

The status quo is untenable and the President is on record saying so. Under either Option 2 or Option 3 the legal bullet must be bitten; Option 2 presents the cleaner legal position. Option 3 generates new legal exposure by "admitting" advocacy groups sub silentio while denying them the right to "speak" through CFC brochures. The key distinction between this half-step and Option 1 is that here advocacy groups are not allowed to "speak." Simple exclusion of non-health-and-welfare groups may be easier to defend than admission with unequal status. Option 3 also raises many questions of administration that might cost more than it will gain cosmetically. Accordingly, I recommend Option 2.

V. DECISION

(Draft Executive Orders for Options 2 and 3 are attached).

Option 1 _____

Option 2 _____

Option 3 _____

Draft

Executive Order

CHARITABLE FUND-RAISING

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, and in order to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order 12353 is amended as follows:

(a) In Section 1 delete "such national" and "and such other national voluntary agencies as may be appropriate".

(b) In Section 2 insert "(a)" after the Section number and add the following new subsections:

"(b) In establishing those criteria, the Director shall be guided by the following principles and policies:

"(1) The objectives of the Combined Federal Campaign are to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare; to provide a convenient channel through which Federal public servants may contribute to these efforts; to minimize or eliminate disruption of the Federal workplace and costs to Federal taxpayers that such fund-raising may entail; and to avoid the reality and appearance of the use of Federal resources in aid of fund-raising for political activity or advocacy of public policy, lobbying or philanthropy of any kind that does not directly serve needs of human health and welfare.

"(2) To meet these objectives, eligibility for participation in the Combined Federal Campaign shall be limited to voluntary, charitable, health and welfare agencies that provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services to individuals or their families. Such direct health and welfare services must be available to Federal employees in the local campaign solicitation area, unless they are rendered to needy persons overseas. Such services must benefit human beings, whether children, youth, adults, the aged, the ill and infirm, or the mentally or physically handicapped. Such services must consist of care, research or education in the fields of human health or social adjustment and rehabilitation; relief of victims of natural disasters and other emergencies; or assistance to those who are impoverished and in need.

"(3) Agencies that seek to influence the outcomes of elections or the determination of public policy through political activity or advocacy, lobbying, or litigation on behalf of parties other than themselves shall not be deemed charitable health and welfare agencies and shall not be eligible to participate in the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(4) International organizations that provide health and welfare services overseas, and that meet the eligibility criteria except for the local services criterion, shall be eligible to participate in each local solicitation area of the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(5) Local voluntary, charitable, health and welfare agencies that are not affiliated with a national agency or federation but that satisfy the eligibility criteria set forth in this Order and by the Director, shall be permitted to participate in the Combined Federal Campaign in the local solicitation areas in which they provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services."

Section 2. All rules, regulations, and directives continued or issued under Executive Order No. 12353 shall continue in full force and effect until revoked or modified under the provisions of this Order.

Draft

Executive Order

CHARITABLE FUND-RAISING

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, and in order to lessen the burdens of government and of local communities in meeting needs of human health and welfare, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Executive Order 12353 is amended as follows:

(a) In Section 1 delete "such national" and "and such other national voluntary agencies as may be appropriate".

(b) In Section 2 insert "(a)" after the Section number and add the following new subsections:

"(b) In establishing those criteria, the Director shall be guided by the following principles and policies:

"(1) Eligibility for participation in the Combined Federal Campaign shall be limited to voluntary, charitable agencies whose principal purpose is to provide or substantially support direct health and welfare services to individuals and families; provided, however, that, subject to such regulations as the Director may prescribe, Federal employees and members of the uniformed services shall be permitted to designate gifts to voluntary human-service agencies not participating in the Combined Federal Campaign.

"(2) Where required by this Order, direct health and welfare services must be available to Federal employees in the local campaign solicitation area, unless they are rendered to needy persons overseas. Such services must benefit human beings, whether children, youth, adults, the aged, the ill and infirm, or the mentally or physically handicapped. Such services must consist of care, research or education in the fields of human health or social adjustment and rehabilitation; relief of victims of natural disasters and other emergencies; or assistance to those who are impoverished and in need.

"(3) International organizations that provide health and welfare services overseas, and that meet the eligibility criteria except for the local services criterion, shall be eligible to participate in each local solicitation area of the Combined Federal Campaign."

(c) In Section 6, in the first sentence thereof, delete "such" and the period, and add "including voluntary human-service agencies not participating in the Combined Federal Campaign."

Section 2. All rules, regulations, and directives continued or issued under Executive Order No. 12353 shall continue in full force and effect until revoked or modified under the provisions of this Order.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: EDWIN MEESE III
CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE
CABINET COUNCIL ON MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: Abolition of the Federal Regional
Council System

BACKGROUND

In the late 1960's ten Federal Regional Councils were established to coordinate interagency and intergovernmental issues in each of the ten standard Federal Regional headquarters cities. The FRC role has diminished as a result of your emphasis on less federal intervention in the affairs of State and local governments through the use of block grants and deregulatory initiatives.

Agencies now indicate that they can communicate and coordinate on their own more efficiently than through an elaborate field structure such as the FRC system. For much the same reason, the White House approach to intergovernmental issues has been to work directly through the agencies.

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Council on Management and Administration unanimously concurred in the OMB/White House/Agency recommendation that the FRC system be abolished. I believe such a decision should be announced as part of the Administration's continuing drive to eliminate and reduce unnecessary federal structures that no longer serve a productive purpose. Approval of this recommendation will require rescission of the current Executive Order.

DECISION

____ Approve ____ Approve as Amended ____ Reject ____ No Action

C

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: KEN DUBERSTEIN *Ken D.*
SUBJECT: February 2 Dinner guests

On Wednesday evening, you have invited three Senators and three Congressmen to join you for a relaxed, off-the-record dinner. The format is similar to your recent evening with Lee Iacocca, George Will, et al. Although you are well acquainted with these members, I want to provide you with some descriptive material on each which may come in handy.

Senator Henry Jackson (D-Washington) - called Scoop by everybody. Has served in the Senate since 1953 and was just reelected to his fifth term. Ran unsuccessfully for the Democratic nomination for President in 1976. Very pro-Israel. Just became senior Democrat on the Armed Services Committee (when Stennis switched to Appropriations). Previously served for many years as senior Democrat on the Energy Committee. Was very helpful to us last December on working out a compromise on the MX and is pushing the MX Commission (although he is not a member) to develop a bi-partisan solution to the basing problem.

Senator Russell Long (D-Louisiana) - long time head of the Finance Committee until we took control of the Senate and Bob Dole became chairman. Russell now serves as the panel's senior Democrat. Been in the Senate since 1948 and is known as a great storyteller and master of the tax code. Participated as a member of the Gang of 17 during last year's budget negotiations. Has just returned from the Caribbean and is now working closely with Bill Brock to overcome his objections to the Caribbean Basin Initiative. Has voted with us on many of the key votes on the economic recovery program.

Senator Paul Laxalt (R-Nevada) - nothing to add here except that Paul has just become Chairman of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on State, Justice and Commerce. He also has recently been outspoken on the need for more defense cuts and a Republican jobs program.

Congressman Dan Rostenkowski (D-Chicago, Illinois)- chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which began hearings today on Social Security. He promised to have a bill on the House floor early in March. Will also push again for CBI (he travelled to five Caribbean countries in November) but opposes tuition tax credits as too costly in this time of budget deficits and enterprise zones (doesn't want to pass anything with Jack Kemp's name on it). Just endorsed Dick Daley for Mayor of Chicago in the bitter February primary with incumbent mayor Jane Byrne. You spoke with Danny's wife, Laverne, when you called them on Christmas Eve in Chicago and have met his daughter Stacy (who has a serious kidney ailment) last summer.

Congressman Dick Cheney (R-Wyoming) - Dick served as White House Chief of Staff under President Ford when Don Rumsfeld became Secretary of Defense. Just reelected to his third term, Dick is a member of the House Republican leadership, serving as Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. Strong proponent of the MX and willingly accepted basing in his home state. Up and comer in the House.

Congressman Jake Pickle (D-Austin, Texas) - chairs the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security. Favors raising the retirement age gradually as a way to solve the long-term problem. Very down-to-earth, good sense of humor, great story-teller. Well regarded by his colleagues although more conservative than the mainstream Democrats. Voted with us on a few of the key votes on the economic recovery program.

Have a good evening.