

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Wallison, Peter J.: Files
Folder Title: Drug Policy Program July 1986 –
August 1986 (16)
Box: OA 14008

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/>

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 7/14/86 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ---

SUBJECT: DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL MEETING -- TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1986 --
2:00 P.M. -- ROOSEVELT RM.

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MILLER - ADMIN.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
REGAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POINDEXTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BALL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPEAKES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BARBOUR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BUCHANAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SVAHN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CHEW	<input type="checkbox"/> P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SS	THOMAS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DANIELS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HENKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WALLISON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
KINGON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MASENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please inform Patsy Faoro (x2800) in the Office of Cabinet Affairs if you will attend.

AGENDA: 1. Drug Abuse Policy

RESPONSE:

1986 JUL 19 AM 2:00

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 14, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

FROM:

RALPH C. BLEDSOE
Executive Secretary

Ralph C. Bledsoe

SUBJECT:

Meeting on July 15, 1986

Attached are an agenda and materials for the Domestic Policy Council meeting scheduled for Tuesday, July 15, 1986 at 2:00 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room. The sole agenda item is drug abuse policy.

The meeting will include a presentation by the Drug Abuse Policy Office, and discussion of policy options and issues pertaining to communication, education, health, safety/productivity and law enforcement support in the drug abuse field. A paper describing the options and issues is attached.

This will be an important meeting as it will address several major proposals related to our current extensive drug abuse efforts.

attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 15, 1986

2:00 p.m.

Roosevelt Room

AGENDA

1. Drug Abuse Policy -- Carlton Turner
Deputy Assistant to the President
for Drug Abuse Policy
Office of Policy Development

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 14, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

FROM: CARLTON E. TURNER

SUBJECT: Drug Abuse Policy Opportunities

Issue -- To determine the next major steps in the President's campaign to achieve a drug-free Nation.

Background -- The situation in 1981 was not promising. During the previous two decades, the use of illegal drugs in the United States spread into every segment of our society. The public lacked accurate information about the hazards of some of the most widely used drugs, and government efforts to combat the use of illicit drugs lacked credibility. National programs were directed at a single drug -- heroin -- and on one strategy -- supply reduction. The moral confusion surrounding drug abuse weakened our resolve to stop illegal drugs coming from overseas. The U.S. became a major drug producing country. Drug trafficking and organized crime became the Nation's number one crime problem; and use of illegal drugs expanded, especially among our young people. There was a feeling of inevitability regarding illegal drugs and uncertainty over what was the right thing to do.

The President's Strategy: Early in his Administration, President Reagan launched a major campaign against drug abuse. The objectives were to improve drug law enforcement, strengthen international cooperation, expand drug abuse health functions as a private sector activity, reduce drug abuse in the military, and create a nationwide drug abuse awareness effort to strengthen public attitudes against drugs and get everyone involved. His strategy was published to provide a blueprint for action.

National Leadership: President and Mrs. Reagan have led the Nation and the world in setting the right direction and encouraging both government and the private sector to join in stopping drug abuse. The Vice President is coordinating the complex functions of interdicting drugs at our borders. The Attorney General has taken charge of coordinating the overall drug law enforcement policy and activities.

The Federal Role: The Federal role is to provide national leadership, working as a catalyst in encouraging private sector and local efforts, and to pursue those drug abuse functions which lie beyond the jurisdictions and capabilities of the individual states. Federal drug programs have been reoriented to meet specific regional needs. Initiatives emphasize coordination and cooperation among officials at all levels of government and use of government resources as a catalyst for grassroots action.

The Umbrella of Effective Enforcement: The strong law enforcement effort, including vigorous action against drug production and processing laboratories in source countries, has increased public awareness of the drug abuse problem. Eradication programs and military support have been added to the fight. The Federal budget for drug law enforcement has expanded from \$700 million to \$1.8 billion annually.

The Growth of Private Sector Efforts: Due largely to Mrs. Reagan's leadership and dedication to the youth of America and the world, private sector drug abuse awareness and prevention programs have increased significantly over the past five years. The number of parent groups has grown from 1,000 to 9,000. School-age children have formed over 10,000 "Just Say No" clubs around the country. The advertising industry, television networks, high school coaches, the medical profession, the entertainment industry, law enforcement officers and many others have joined in the national effort. Examples include over 4 million drug awareness comic books which have been distributed to elementary students, sponsored by IBM, The Keebler Company, and the National Federation of Parents. McNeil Pharmaceutical's Pharmacists Against Drug Abuse program is now firmly established across the country.

Discussion - The President's program has been successful in dealing with the drug problem. Compared to 1981, drug use is down in almost all categories. Notable is the success of the U.S. military in reducing use of illegal drugs by over 65 percent through strict policies and testing to identify users. Across the Nation, the private sector is taking a strong stand.

Public attitudes are clearly against use of illegal drugs and drug awareness is at an all-time high. Today, drug use is front page news. Corporations are recognizing the tremendous cost of drugs in the workplace; parents and students are recognizing how illegal drugs in the schools erodes the quality of education. The consequences of drug use are becoming more severe as users turn to more potent drugs and more dangerous forms of abuse. There is increasing concern about the threat that drug abuse poses to public safety and national security. And a new understanding is evident: Drug abuse is not a private matter -- using illegal drugs is irresponsible behavior -- and the costs are paid by society.

There is broad public support for taking strong action to hold users responsible and to stop the use of drugs. Aggressive corporate and school measures to end drug abuse, including use of law enforcement, expulsions and firings, have met with strong support from workers, students and the community. According to a USA Today poll, 77 percent of the Nation's adults would not object to being tested in the workplace for drugs.

We have reached a new plateau with a new set of opportunities. We should pursue the limits of possibility in eliminating drug abuse. The time is right to create a national environment of intolerance for use of illegal drugs.

Issues For Consideration

The President's National Strategy continues to be a sound blueprint for the comprehensive drug abuse program. Several opportunities exist to move toward the goal of a Nation free of illegal drugs in the 1990's. The issues involve communication, education, health, the workplace, and drug law enforcement support.

A. COMMUNICATION

The teamwork of the President and Mrs. Reagan, working together, have brought significant gains in the fight against illegal drugs. Attitudes have changed, awareness has increased and many people are ready to join in the fight. Recent deaths from cocaine use have focused attention on the issue. Yet there appears to be widespread lack of knowledge regarding the government efforts underway. A major Presidential address to the Nation could focus the issue, declaring that the national campaign against drug abuse has entered a new phase. The timing of such a speech is a factor, recognizing that some early discussions have leaked to the press.

OPTION #1 -- Recommend a Presidential address at the earliest possible time; late July or early August, follow-up with implementing action by the Cabinet.

Pros

- Move while public interest and media attention is at a peak. Likely to be most effective.
- Avoids potential criticism of politicizing the drug effort by action near the November elections.

Cons

- Possible suggestions of opportunism, reacting to recent deaths of athletes.

OPTION #2 -- Recommend a Presidential address in September or October, after a number of Federal actions have been taken to strengthen the drug effort and follow up with continuing action by the Cabinet.

Pros

- Allows time for specific actions which can be reported in the speech.

Cons

- More closely aligned with the beginning of the school year, timely for students in high schools and colleges.
- Current high level of interest may dissipate because of the delay.
- Potential for criticism of being political by being closer to election.

B. EDUCATION

The major initiative is to establish a national objective for every educational institution, through college level, to be drug-free. To prevent drug abuse before it starts, drugs must be addressed in early school years and drug abuse prevention must continue throughout the entire school career. Teachers, school administrators, parents and individual students can share the commitment to a drug-free school. School organizations - sports, academic, drama, student government, etc. - and effective student leadership can make the difference. Schools and colleges must make the drug-free policy known and then not tolerate violations of the policy.

ISSUE # 1 -- Develop effective ways to promulgate accurate and credible information on how to achieve a drug-free school. The Secretary of Education is preparing an excellent booklet for national distribution which will respond to this issue.

ISSUE #2 -- Make it mandatory that all schools have a policy of being drug-free and direct the Secretary of Education to explore ways to withhold Federal funding from any educational institution which does not have such a policy.

ISSUE #3 -- Instruct the Attorney General and the Secretary of Education to inform the heads of all educational institutions, public and private, of the Federal law regarding distributing drugs in or on, or within 1,000 feet of a public or private elementary or secondary schools. In summary, this law provides for penalties up to twice the normal term and second offenders are punishable by a minimum of three years imprisonment or more than life imprisonment and at least three times any special parole term.

ISSUE #4 -- Explore ways to require that drug abuse be taught as part of the health curriculum instead of as a separate subject and seek funding to be made available to schools specifically to purchase new health text books which make this change.

C. HEALTH

Health interests are at a peak. The dangers of drugs are more widely evident than at any time in recent history. Many people are expressing amazement regarding the long-known effects of cocaine on the heart and respiratory systems which can lead to death. Yet even more awareness is needed. There was massive public concern over allegations of negligible amounts of herbicide on marijuana, yet the same level of concern is not evident over the deadly, yet common, application of PCP to marijuana. Additionally, much remains to be done to make appropriate treatment available to those experiencing health damage and addiction. The high correlation between intravenous (IV) drug use and AIDS requires prompt action.

ISSUE #1 -- Develop ways to provide funding assistance to states which implement programs to support specific drug-related health problems-

- Develop mandatory treatment for intravenous (IV) drug users.
- Identify drug users and force them into appropriate treatment.

ISSUE #2 -- Accelerate research in critical areas-

- Drug testing techniques and approaches.
- Highest priority to comprehensive cocaine/coca/coca paste research program. (health, herbicides, detection, etc.)

ISSUE #3 -- Develop means for limited Federal assistance to selected prevention initiatives and provide seed money for promising initiatives.

- ACTION, NIDA or other approaches?

D. SAFETY/PRODUCTIVITY

A relatively few drug users are causing our families and our society to pay a high price for their irresponsibility. Attitude surveys show wide support for identifying users of illegal drugs and for stopping the users and the sellers of illegal drugs. A vocal minority still chooses to argue for drugs as a victimless crime and to point to the Federal government for a solution. In the interests of the American people and their future, leaders must take action.

A drug-free workplace is the right of every worker. Public safety considerations require prompt action to identify, remove and treat individuals who are in jobs where their drug abuse endangers the public safety. Employers must establish a clear policy, ensure that the policy is understood and applied, and include specific rules, procedures for identifying violators and uncompromising discipline consistent with the public trust. As the nation's largest single employer, the Federal government should serve as a model for dealing constructively with drug and alcohol abuse in the workplace. The Military Services have led the way in identifying drug users and moving toward a drug-free force. Several Federal agencies have begun or are planning similar programs.

- ISSUE #1 -- Institute a testing program for pre-employment screening of all applicants for Federal jobs, with a policy that a confirmed positive test for illicit drug use disqualifies the applicant and another application may not be made for one year.
- ISSUE #2 -- Require a comprehensive testing program for all Federal employees in national security positions, safety-related positions, law enforcement officers and support personnel, drug abuse organizations, and any positions designated as sensitive by regulation or by the agency head.
- ISSUE #3 -- Establish a national goal of a 70% reduction in drug users within three years; ask the private sector to help in meeting the goal.
- ISSUE #4 -- Request the Secretary of Defense to explore ways to require Defense contractors to have a policy of a drug-free workplace.
- ISSUE #5 -- Even though overall drug use in the military has been reduced by 67 percent, 8.9 percent still use. Request the Secretary of Defense to intensify efforts to achieve drug-free military service.

Doubt that random testing poss. w/o "suspicion"

Business actions

E. DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT

Strong and visible drug law enforcement is critical to maintaining an atmosphere in which major health programs can effectively separate the user from the drug. The success of drug law enforcement has caused significant changes in the nature of drug trafficking and in trafficking routes. Drug enforcement agencies are responding to the changes. It must be made evident to all that the drug law enforcement is flexible and relentless and will pursue the drug traffickers wherever they move.

As the emphasis turns to the user, it is important that the initiative be viewed as health-oriented with a strict, but caring approach. Law enforcement can make a special contribution to drug abuse prevention and education programs in two ways: by sharing their knowledge and prestige in a caring way, particularly with young people; and by vigorously pursuing the sellers and distributors. The entire criminal justice system must provide prompt and strong punishment to drug dealers.

ISSUE #1 -- Instruct all Law Enforcement Coordinating Committees to request every U.S. Attorney to seek and prosecute violators of 21 U.S.C. 845A (selling illegal drugs on or near school property) to emphasize seriousness of stopping drug pushers. Require special reporting on these cases.

ISSUE #2 -- Expedite the development of a comprehensive Southwest border initiative to enhance ongoing operations, making appropriate use of military support and technology. Include planning to insure flexibility in the use of all law enforcement resources and, if needed, a reorganization of the operating management structure and responsibilities.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE NATION -- National Television

Theme - Proud of Americans, angry at those who are harming Nation. For 5 years Americans have pulled together for a stronger Nation -- economy, terrorism, awareness of drug abuse, etc. Concern that illegal drugs can destroy.

GENERAL OUTLINE -- Accomplishments during past five years; current problems; new initiatives:

1. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE

Clean up Federal workplace, start by screening all new employees and testing those in national security, safety, and law enforcement positions. Establish mechanism to give priority to government contractors with active policy of drug-free workplace. Ask private sector to pursue drug-free workplace.

State primary laws, PLRA

*Can't do anything that don't do for Govt. for private employees
New laws probably necessary for Fed employees*

2. DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Secretary of Education will determine what methods have been effective to rid schools of drugs and will communicate these to other school administrators. Will withhold Federal dollars from those not working toward drug-free school.

What steps for drug-free schools?

3. DRUG TREATMENT

Will make treatment mandatory for intravenous (IV) drug users, the main conduit for AIDS to general population. Will ask Congress for budget to meet treatment needs. Also, will issue E.O. outlining role of Secretary HHS for coordination and expeditious action concerning drug abuse health policy matters.

*How involved?
?*

4. INTERNATIONAL

Will recall U.S. Ambassadors to drug producing countries for briefing and consultation regarding needs. Ask Secretary of Defense to make appropriate resources available for better interdiction and for destruction of illegal refineries.

Posse Committee

5. LAW ENFORCEMENT

Direct Attorney General to intensify efforts in cooperation with Mexico and other nations to stop drugs and money laundering and to prepare any needed legislation to support effort. Ask VP to intensify efforts on SW border to stop cocaine and other drugs.

6. PUBLIC AWARENESS AND PREVENTION

Ask all to join in Mrs. Reagan's drug abuse awareness and prevention campaign. Redouble efforts in all media to stop illegal drugs, make unacceptable to use illegal drugs in our society. Misinformation surrounding cocaine, truth. GOAL: 70% REDUCTION IN DRUG USE WITHIN THREE YEARS.

DRAFT - July 8, 1986

NATIONAL INITIATIVE ON DRUG ABUSE

OBJECTIVES

- Enhance President Reagan's leadership role in the national campaign to prevent drug abuse and drug trafficking.
- Garner public support for new initiatives working toward the Administration's goal of creating a drug-free generation by the 1990s.

STRATEGY

1. Stimulate action and broaden public awareness on drug abuse.
 - Move from uninformed to informed debate.
 - Direct sudden public outrage over drug abuse to support for government and private initiatives against drug use. Focus on drug user, not as victim but as irresponsible member of society.
2. Increase awareness of the successes of the President's national and international drug program.
3. Maintain Executive Branch leadership in undertaking major new initiatives.

THEMES

1. Administration has taken unprecedented actions to stop drug abuse.
2. Drug users are financing our Nation's suicide.
 - Drug abuse is a threat to national security and public safety.
 - Drug abuse costs the American public at least \$60 billion each year in terms of productivity, health care, accidents and crime.
 - Drug abuse is eroding the quality of education and the personal development of our young people.
3. Government must do all in its power to help, but the war on drugs will be won only by the action and commitment of private citizens -- businessmen and workers, students and teachers, parents and volunteers.

TIMING: July through October 1986

The window of opportunity is wide open. Public outrage and media attention about drug abuse are at an unprecedented high in the wake of the recent cocaine deaths of Len Bias and Don Rogers. Public focus has shifted from the drug traffickers to the drug users, from the drug user as victim to drug abuse being irresponsible behavior, and from government program to private initiative.

Strong leadership is required to maintain and direct the current momentum into effective public action. There has already been some dissipation in the current situation: the media has begun to refocus the burden of resolution on government and on drug law enforcement, both of which are limited without broad public commitment to stopping the use of drugs.

Key dates:

- July 15, 1986 - Congressional hearings on crack cocaine.
- July 16, 1986 - Tentative hearing by House Subcommittee on Crime on H.J. Res. 631, legislative initiative mandating a White House Conference on Drug Abuse.
- August 16-September 8, 1986 - Congressional Labor Day recess.
- September 1, 1986 - Labor Day and beginning of school year

PROPOSED DRUG ABUSE EVENTS

Major National Events

- RR nationally-televised address to American people/Joint Session of Congress

Purpose: To take full leadership role, heighten national awareness of the multi-faceted drug abuse issue, communicate progress made and outline new offensive against drug abuse.

- RR Signing Ceremony - possible Executive Orders
(1) directing the Secretary of Education to withhold Federal funding from any educational institution which does not have a policy of no drug use; (2) requiring all DOD contractors to have a certified drug-free workplace; and (3) requiring Federal Government to adopt (a) preemployment screening for all positions and (b) screening of all employees -- beginning immediately with those in positions affecting public safety or national security and including all employees within next three years.

Purpose: To ensure the public trust by taking those actions which are the most difficult and the most effective in eliminating drug abuse.

- RR/NR Presentation Ceremony for Certificates of Achievement to six individual and corporate achievers.

Purpose: To highlight accomplishments of established national program against drug abuse and present model for upcoming initiatives.

Specialty Events

- RR/NR briefing for Chief Executive Officers of multi-national corporations. Event would be a dialogue on the subject of drug abuse in the workplace.

Purpose: To highlight priority of drug abuse prevention programs in the workplace, demonstrate support for established programs and encourage other corporations to establish programs of their own.

- RR/NR visit to a plant which has a drug-free environment.

Purpose: To focus on ability of management and labor to work together to eliminate drug abuse in the workplace.

- RR/NR visit to a school which has implemented an effective anti-drug program. Addresses student body, tours town, etc.

Purpose: To focus on ability of community to rid schools of drugs and the relationship of a drug-free school with the quality of education.

- RR/NR meeting with Congressional leaders. Event would be a "listening" session among conservative and liberal drug program spokesmen in Congress.

Purpose: To reaffirm the President's leadership on the issue, demonstrate a listening posture and break ground for new Administration initiatives.

Call to Action

- RR call on union and management to eliminate drug abuse in their ranks and to set an effective policy to deal with the drug users and their health needs.

Purpose: To build a consensus among labor and management for eliminating drug abuse in the workplace.
Possible Labor Day speech.

- RR call on media and private sector to seek every opportunity to assist Mrs. Reagan in publicizing the negative aspects of drug abuse and the positive aspects of saying no to drugs.

Purpose: To expand national prevention/education program and ensure that accurate information is presented in a credible way to all citizens.

- RR/NR Message to School Principals to coincide with Department of Education program kick-off and release of "Schools Without Drugs."

Purpose: To give high priority and visibility to leadership role of school principals in eliminating drug abuse in the schools.

- RR/NR Message to teachers to coincide with release of IBM-sponsored comic books.

Purpose: To emphasize important role of teachers in drug abuse prevention among children.

- RR/NR briefing to commissioners of major sports organizations calling on them as role models for Nation's youth to support drug abuse awareness programs and to be drug free.

Purpose: To recall 1982 RR/NR meeting with representatives of professional sports associations and direct current visibility of the problem of drugs and sports to a call for action in all segments of society.

Enforcement

- RR message to all mayors calling for commitment of at least 10 percent of local police resources specifically to stopping the supply as close to the user as possible by arresting all known drug dealers and making public the names of dealers and users. Presidential call to all judges to hold these drug dealers for a minimum of seven days as a threat to the community.

Purpose: To disrupt the drug traffic as close to the user as possible; to hold drug dealers responsible for their criminal activity which can include murder, attempted murder and assault.

- RR call on all levels of government to aggressively enforce laws and regulations prohibiting possession, use, sale or transfer of any illicit drug in any public building. Direct immediate dismissal of any employee of the Federal government committing this criminal offense.

Purpose: To disrupt the drug traffic as close to the user as possible; to hold individuals involved in drug offenses responsible for their criminal activity.

Press Events

- RR/NR informal chat with selected editorial writers.
- RR Op-ed for Wall Street Journal: the national cost of drug abuse.
- RR/NR exclusive interview with appropriate weekly news magazine.

- RR/NR Parade Magazine article.
- Regional press luncheon.
- Weekly briefing of regional press.
- Establish media action committee.

Legislative Events

- RR call on all states asking them to pass the model paraphernalia law within two years and asking Congress to remove 25 percent of the ADM block grant money from any state which does not comply with such requirement and make it illegal to manufacture or possess drug paraphernalia.
- Legislative package to Congress requesting rescheduling of butyl nitrite, and legislation requiring all IV drug users to enter treatment.

Government Events

- RR Signing Ceremony for Executive Order altering current policy board chaired by the Attorney General to include drug abuse health issues or creating Cabinet-level drug abuse health policy board.

Purpose: To enhance Cabinet-level drug abuse policy participation on the health side.

- RR directive to Secretary of HHS to develop ways to provide funding assistance to states which implement programs (a) making treatment mandatory for IV drug users, (b) meeting the treatment needs of indigent people, and (c) identifying other drug users and forcing them into treatment.
- Briefing for Cabinet on drug abuse issues and programs.
- Briefing for White House Senior Staff concerning drug abuse issues and programs. (ACTION: DAPO)
- RR/NR address to national meeting of drug abuse health care professionals.
- Distribution of materials to U.S. Attorneys, calling on each to promulgate the drug abuse issue and strategy in the local media and with community groups.

International Events

- RR/NR discussion with other leaders.
- NR host briefing of the wives of foreign ambassadors assigned in Washington.
- Recall of U.S. Ambassadors for White House Briefing on drug abuse.
- Cabinet/Senior Staff briefing of Foreign Press.

Cabinet/Senior Staff Events

- Briefing for national press with Regan, Weinberger, Meese, Bowen, Brock, Dole, Bennett, Turner on appropriate aspects of drug abuse problem and what must be done to solve it.
- Shultz major domestic address on international impact of drug abuse.
- Meese and appropriate Department of Justice officials visibility for domestic eradication program and other enforcement initiatives.
- Weinberger address on DOD initiatives to end drug abuse in the military and by the civilian workforce.
- Bowen major addresses on the drug abuse issue.
- Brock as spokesman on drug abuse in workplace.
- Bennett major addresses on drug abuse in the schools and spearhead major Department of Education initiative.

Ongoing Events

- White House briefings for select business leaders, consumer groups, labor organizations, educational associations, etc. (ACTION: Public Liaison, DAPO)
- Fact sheets/speech inserts for surrogates. Mailings of supportive editorials and other advocacy materials. (ACTION: Public Affairs, DAPO)

DRAFT/July 8, 1986

SCHEDULE OF POSSIBLE DRUG ABUSE EVENT OPPORTUNITIES

<u>DATE</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
7/8-11/86	North American Christian Convention	Indiana
7/11-18/86	Association of Trial Lawyers of America	New York, NY
7/14-19/86	National Law Enforcement Explorer Conference	Seattle, WA
7/15/86	RR Address to Republican Fundraiser	Washington, DC
7/15/86	Fourth National Conference of Hospital-Medical Public Policy Issues	Washington, DC
7/16/86	Texans War on Drugs	Texas
7/18/86	NR meets with sports commissioners. (T)	Washington, DC
7/27-31/86	Youth to Youth National Conference	Ohio
8/3-6/86	First National Conference on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, "Sharing Knowledge for Action"	Washington, DC
8/22-26/86	American Psychological Association	Washington, DC
8/14/86	Congressional Picnic	Washington, DC
8/16-9/7/86	RR to Ranch/Congress recess	National
8/17-21/86	White House Conference On Small Business	Washington, DC
8/24-26/86	National Governors Conference	Hilton Head, NC
8/26-30/86	Toastmasters, International	Nevada
9/1/86	Labor Day & Beginning School Year	Nat'l Holiday
9/8/86	RR/Congress return	Washington, DC
9/11-13/86	Radio-Television News Directors Association	Texas

<u>DATE</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
ca. 9/15/86	Department of Education program kick-off and release of "Schools Without Drugs."	National
9/18/86	Capital Cities/ABC Conference: "Drugs in the U.S.A."	New York, NY
9/18-21/86	Concerned Women for America	Washington, DC
9/23-26/86	National Conference of Editorial Writers	South Carolina
9/29-10/2/86	American Academy of Family Physicians	Washington, DC
10/4/86	Congress recess/Campaign	National
10/22-26/86	American Business Women's Association	Kansas
11/23-24/86	Tennessee Statewide Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee (LECC) meeting on drug education and enforcement	Nashville, TN
11/2-6/86	American Pharmaceutical Association	Louisiana
11/2-6/86	National Association of Convenience Stores	Louisiana
11/4/86	Election Day	National
11/6-11/86	National Association of Realtors	New York, NY
11/16-19/86	American Heart Association	California
11/12-15/86	Society of Professional Journalists (Sigma Delta Chi)	Georgia
11/16-19/86	Southern Newspaper Publishers Association	Florida
11/17-19/86	TV Bureau of Advertising	California

Perennials

National Chamber of Commerce
National Press Club

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 8, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE

FROM: ROBERT M. KRUGER *Rmk*

SUBJECT: Drug Testing Programs in Government Agencies

Peter Wallison, Jay Stephens and I met on Wednesday, July 2 with representatives of three federal agencies to discuss the use of drug testing programs by government employers. In attendance were James Knapp, Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, Jim Byrnes, Acting General Counsel of the Office of Personnel Management and Robert Gilliat, Assistant General Counsel for Personnel and Health Policy at the Department of Defense. This memorandum records my notes and recollections of the meeting.

Each agency representative sketched a broad picture of those drug testing programs within the federal government with which he was familiar and provided an overview of the legal questions that those programs have raised. There is no federal or state constitutional provision or law directly prohibiting use of drug detection or urine screening. Privacy and due process rights, primarily under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments, and protections under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, comprise the two main sources of law constraining governmental action in this area.

Addressing the Rehabilitation Act, Mr. Byrnes explained that handicapped individuals working for employers receiving financial assistance are protected from discrimination on the basis of their handicap. The Act defines "handicapped individuals" to include persons disabled from drug or alcohol use. Mr. Byrnes noted that the Act does not require employers to retain individuals whose current use of alcohol or drugs prevents them from performing their jobs properly or presents a threat to property or safety. According to Mr. Byrnes, these requirements create the anomalous situation where an employer can discharge an employee for using drugs but must offer rehabilitation to employees actually handicapped from drug use. Mr. Byrnes promised to provide copies of the guidelines that OPM issues to interpret the Act's requirements.

Drug testing of federal government employees on a wide scale is, at present, conducted chiefly by the Department of Defense. Mr. Byrnes believes that certain security-sensitive positions within the Department of Energy, such as guards at nuclear power

plants, may be subject to testing. Mr. Knapp said that limited programs were being initiated or were currently under consideration at the FBI and the DEA (mandatory urine analysis program for all new employees became effective June 3), the U.S. Customs Service (new program for non-employee applicants and employees seeking promotions implemented June 30), the Secret Service (awaiting guidance), the Bureau of Prisons (new applicants for law enforcement positions) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (testing new border patrol agents for almost one year). The U.S. Marshal Service and the IRS have no testing program to date.

Mr. Gilliat outlined programs currently in use at the Department of Defense. As a general matter, Mr. Gilliat observed that DOD believes that, legally, it has more flexibility in implementing programs for new applicants and for critically sensitive positions than for current employees or for non-sensitive positions. DOD has been testing throughout the uniformed services on a "neutral", unannounced basis since 1983. Under the Army program, a preliminary urinalysis test, which detects the presence of a variety of drugs, is conducted. A confirming test will follow if the preliminary test indicates the presence of certain controlled substances. In both cases, specimens are analyzed by outside laboratories. DOD is now putting a drug abuse testing program into place for civilian employees. Apparently, civilian testing may be confined to those jobs deemed sufficiently critical to the DOD or the protection of public safety to warrant screening for drugs as a job related requirement. Mr. Gilliat was unable to provide hard evidence of the affect of drug testing on drug use.

Mr. Gilliat noted that there has been opposition to the testing in both military and civilian ranks. He provided us with a copy of a recent opinion by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dismissing a suit brought by the National Federation of Federal Employees to stop civilian drug testing. The decision has been appealed. Mr. Knapp advised that a recent decision in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa struck down a drug testing program for state corrections employees on constitutional grounds. That decision is also on appeal.

The Iowa decision illustrates that much of the controversy in this area will revolve around the means of testing for drug use, not the employment action taken upon a finding of substance abuse. Requiring a person to provide a urine sample or any bodily fluid has been deemed a search or seizure with the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. The constitutional prohibition, of course, is against unreasonable searches or seizures. Three Federal courts have upheld the

constitutionality of urinalysis testing of civilian government employees finding reasonableness, inter alia, in the governmental interest in protecting the public where the employee's job involves hazardous activities.

All of the agency representatives at the meeting mentioned the reliability of drug tests and the economic and related costs of such testing as issues which deserve to be studied. (Preliminary tests often cost about \$10 per specimen; confirming tests cost over \$100 per specimen.) Asked about restrictions on an employer's ability to discharge an employee who tests "positive" for substance abuse, Mr. Byrnes acknowledged that in addition to the afore-mentioned protections under the Rehabilitation Act, the Merit Systems Protections Board has determined that there must be a nexus between what an employee does in his job and the indication of use of drugs. In other words, an indication of drug use may not in itself, establish a violation of law, an impairment in ability or a nexus with the requirements of an employee's position. The authority to dismiss or take an adverse personnel action on an employee based on his or her violation of law is contained in 5 U.S.C. chapter 75.

In this regard, Mr. Knapp observed that federal law enforcement officials are charged with enforcing U.S. drug laws. Moreover, there are obvious and serious public safety concerns surrounding their work. He also noted that pre-employment urinalysis is a natural concomitant to the already extensive pre-employment screening done in the security clearance procedure.

The reliability of testing procedures raise Fifth Amendment procedural due process issues. Also implicated under this heading are opportunities to dispute the results of drug tests, the need for corroborating evidence of malperformance, the reliability of the chain of custody governing specimens and the confidentiality of test results.

ACTION ITEMS

Major address by the President in August 1986 declaring that the national campaign against drug abuse has entered a new phase and announcing the following:

1. Executive Order requiring all DOD contractors to have a certified drug-free workplace.
2. Executive Order requiring Federal Government to adopt (a) pre-employment screening for all positions and (b) screening of all employees--beginning immediately with those in positions affecting public safety or national security and including all employees within next three years.
3. Executive Order directing the Secretary of Education to withhold Federal funding from any educational institution which does not have a policy of no drug use.
4. Presidential call on union and management to eliminate drug abuse in their ranks and to set an effective policy to deal with the drug users and their health needs.
5. Presidential establishment of Cabinet-level policy board for drug abuse prevention and health issues, to be headed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. (National Drug Abuse Health Policy Board--NDAHBP)
6. Directive to Secretary of HHS to develop ways to provide funding assistance to states which implement programs (a) making treatment mandatory for IV drug users, (b) meeting the treatment needs of indigent people, and (c) identifying other drug users and forcing them into treatment before their drug use destroys their financial independence.
7. Presidential call to all mayors to commit at least 10 percent of their police resources specifically to stopping the supply as close to the user as possible by arresting all known drug dealers and making public the names of dealers and users. Presidential call to all judges to hold these drug dealers for a minimum of 7 days as a threat to the community.
8. Call on all levels of government to aggressively enforce laws and regulations prohibiting possession, use, sale or transfer of any illicit drug in any public building. Direct immediate dismissal of any employee of the Federal government committing this criminal offense.
9. Call on all states asking them to pass the model paraphernalia law within two years and asking Congress to remove 25 percent of the ADM block grant money from any state which does not comply with such requirement and make it illegal to manufacture or possess drug paraphernalia.
10. Call on the media and private sector to seek every opportunity to assist Mrs. Reagan in publicizing the negative aspects of drug abuse and the positive aspects of saying no to drugs.

NIDA Unit Finds Urine Test Merit

By Judy E. Fox

WASHINGTON—A consensus panel convened by the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) concluded urine screening can be an effective tool in the early identification of employees with drug problems.

However, at a press conference announcing the panel's findings, Dr. Donald Ian Macdonald, acting assistant secretary for health in the Department of Health and Human Services and director of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration which administers NIDA, said he does not support mandatory urinalysis screening of *all* employees in any workforce—federal or private.

(Recently the suggestion by a presidentially-appointed commission that all federal employees be screened for drugs provoked immediate protests from union officials and federal employees, as well as some members of Congress.)

Dr. Macdonald emphasized that the NIDA panel is not coming "from a police standpoint" and observed that individual rights must be taken into account in any workplace drug abuse prevention program.

He added that "in balance you always have to consider the rights of individuals as measured...against the rights of a larger society." Dr. Macdonald suggested that the federal government, as well as private employers, base urine screening policies on job sensitivity.

"When you are considering options relating to air traffic control you may be talking about an entirely different set of safety issues than when you're talking about drug use in other areas....If somebody is in critical or sensitive areas we do need to be concerned about this possibility...."

"I think that the federal drug strategy—which is a few years old now—points out that there are differences of risk, differences of safety, differences of confidentiality and security. So it really is a case by case business.

"Just to say in a Gramm-Rudman year that you would screen all federal employees—I can't tell you how much it would cost to screen just the 135,000 employees in HHS. In all of these things we talk about cost-benefit ratios," Dr. Macdonald said.

J. Michael Walsh, PhD, chief of the clinical and behavioral pharmacology branch in NIDA's division of clinical research, noted that there currently are several different kinds of drug screening policies already in effect in many of America's private companies.

"There has evolved really over the last four years a continuum of policies which go from pre-employment screening only, to what's called a 'for cause' or 'incident-driven' policy which essentially does nothing until something happens—an accident, a fight, or some bizarre behavior....Then on the other end of the continuum seems to be the type of policy which is focused on random screening.

"I would suggest that it's only a very small percentage of the workforce where random screening would be recommended," Dr. Walsh said.

The NIDA consensus panel, in a draft statement on health and safety issues related to drug use in the workplace, asserted that if a workplace screening policy is established, rationale for the tests should be stated to all employees included under that policy.

"The rationale should link testing to performance/safety/security criteria. The programs should...be performed on the identified employe group throughout the year to establish the true pattern of drug abuse if it exists. If the urine test is positive and confirmed, rehabilitative help should be offered.

"If the employe refuses rehabilitation and his job involves safety/security concerns, management must be informed and appropriate administrative action taken.

"This may include probation, suspension or dismissal. If the employe volunteers a problem without performance/safety/security considerations, management should not be notified because of medical confidentiality. Even when (such) considerations are involved, communication to management concerning suggested restrictions or administrative procedures should maintain privacy to the extent possible," the panel said.

It emphasized also that screening programs should be integrated with programs for employe assistance, rehabilitation and treatment. Because the drug tests involve interpreting biological tests and differentiating drug use in impairment from other types of impairment, the panel asserted, the drug screening program should be under direct medical supervision or have available technical interpretive assistance from a responsible medical resource.

HHS secretary Dr. Otis Bowen, in a message read at the press conference, said drug abuse may be the most common health hazard in the workplace today.

According to the panel, ADAMHA estimates that alcohol and drug abuse cost nearly \$100 billion in lost productivity each year.

But while the NIDA consensus panel urged all employers to develop some sort of formal workplace drug abuse prevention program, it did not outline the specific form such programs should take. "What we're doing is asking the companies to consider a policy to look at these issues. There is such a wide range of individual situations that we do not intend to...make references on how IBM, for instance, should become involved...."

"We think that each company should develop its own policy...." Dr. Macdonald explained.

The process for developing workplace drug prevention programs should include input from all aspects of an organization, including labor relations, union, legal, medical, security and employe assistance staff, the panel said. It added that the resulting policy should state clearly actions to be anticipated in response to drug use and once policy is established, it should be strictly adhered to and closely monitored to ensure it is administered fairly and consistently.

Dr. Bowen in his prepared statement related also that NIDA has launched a multi-media "Cocaine Abuse Prevention Campaign," aimed at countering cocaine's increasing popularity.

A NIDA study of drug use among high school seniors found seniors in the class of 1985 used cocaine at unprecedented levels: 17 per cent said they had tried the drug, 13 per cent said they used the drug in the last year, and 7 per cent said they had used cocaine in the past month. The study found cocaine use in 1985 was up in among virtually all the subgroups of seniors examined

MANDATORY DRUG TESTING:
A NATION DIVIDED . . . OR IS IT?

Prepared by
POPULUS, Inc. and Decision/Making/Information

June, 1986

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

Mandatory drug testing in the work place is a controversial, contemporary topic which is drawing increasing national attention. The focus of the issue is employer rights versus individual rights. Many Americans take a strong stance either for or against policies of mandatory drug testing, while others feel such testing may be imperative for some and not so critical for others. The debate spills over into ethical, legal, philosophical, and economic arenas and raises basic constitutional issues. Very few question the illegality of the sale and use of such drugs as marijuana, cocaine, and heroin, but many question the right of employers to require testing of employees for the presence of these drugs in their bodies.

To better understand the mandatory drug testing controversy, POPULUS, Inc., in conjunction with Decision/Making/Information, has undertaken a multifaceted, national research project during May and June, 1986. The objectives of this project are to:

- Uncover the issues surrounding mandatory drug testing;
- Investigate corporate personnel policy on the issue; and
- Understand attitudes and opinions among the American people.

The project will include:

- A national probability study among 1050 adults;
- Individual interviews among key representatives of major corporations, including critical and non-critical industries, educational institutions, sports organizations, as well as legislators;
- A series of in depth interviews among blue collar and white collar adults, representing a wide variety of occupations.

This document is a preliminary report of the national survey results and the findings from the depth interviews with blue and white collar employees.

STUDY DESIGN

This report contains the results of a telephone survey of 1,050 adult Americans, aged 17 and older, living in the continental United States, and the findings of personal interviews with twenty adult Americans who reside in New York and Connecticut.

Survey responses were gathered between May 15 and 18, 1986. All respondents interviewed were part of a random sample generated by Decision/Making/Information. In general, random samples such as this yield results projectable to the entire universe of adults (aged 17 and older) living throughout the United States within +/- 3.0 percentage points in 95 out of 100 cases.

Personal interviews were conducted by POPULUS, Inc. on June 3, 1986, in two groups of ten persons each. The topic was discussed in a conversational and in-depth manner among people of all ages and backgrounds. This sample is not intended to be strictly representative or projectable.

The analysis and conclusions presented in this report have been prepared by POPULUS, Inc., which was also responsible for the overall design and implementation of the study.

MANDATORY DRUG TESTING:
A NATION DIVIDED . . . OR IS IT?

Without a doubt, the American people agree that our society is faced with a severe drug abuse problem. Recognized as no longer just in the streets, drugs abound in the work place and in schools. Americans are concerned about the pervasive use of marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin, as well as alcohol and the abuse of prescription drugs, by the adult population and, perhaps more so, by the youth of this country. Drug abuse has a detrimental impact on the quality of life as much as it does on the economy. As consumers, as individuals, employees, employers, and as taxpayers, every American "ends up paying for it."

As the problem grows worse, people get more frustrated about the solutions. Importation of illegal drugs continues to flourish, more crops are harvested domestically. And, federal, state, and local governments seem helpless at stopping the flow from producer to distributor to dealer to citizens.

Nature of the Support for Mandatory Drug Testing

What should be done about America's drug problem? In a national survey of Americans, half (50%) think that mandatory drug testing by employers is at least part of the solution; half (49%) think such a program is inappropriate and a violation of constitutional and personal rights.

In the aggregate, this split may not be surprising; and it is not surprising that the demographic pattern of response suggests that some groups of Americans are more supportive of such a policy than others. Additional insight into this issue comes from why Americans feel the way they do.

First, the demographic facts of who is more likely to be for and against mandatory drug testing in the work place:

- Women (52%) are more likely than men (46%) to oppose mandatory drug testing in the work place.

- Younger people (60%), especially those 25 to 34, are much more likely to be opposed. Other research has shown this group is also more likely to use illicit drugs but they strongly oppose testing on constitutional grounds. Those over 55 (64%) are strongly in favor of mandatory drug testing.

- Non-white Americans (58%) are more opposed, again perhaps because of higher incidence of drug use as well as a greater fear of potential discrimination through a policy of mandatory drug testing by employers.

- The more education one has, the more likely one is to be against mandatory drug testing. This may be due to a greater sensitivity to the constitutional issues involved.

- Those in professional (60%) and white collar occupations (54%) are disinclined to the initiation of such a policy, as are those who are unemployed (56%). The former may see such testing as unnecessary; the latter may fear a drug-free requirement as a condition of employment.

- Sixty percent of those who consider themselves Liberals are against drug testing and 57% of Conservatives are for it. Liberals appear more influenced by the threat to personal rights and privacy, and Conservatives view testing as an effective solution to an employee and social problem.

- One-third of union members are strongly opposed to mandatory drug testing, another third are somewhat opposed. This most likely reflects the adversarial relationship between management and union members and intensifies the rank and file's fear of employer leverage.

● Southerners and people residing in the Pacific region of the country are likely to support a drug testing policy while others tend to be against, especially those living in New England and the Mountain states.

Where do Americans draw the line?

The cross-pressure between what is "right" or the "American way" and what is an effective deterrent is great. When confronted with evidence that mandatory drug testing by employers can work, either by deterrence or a weeding out process, people begin to take this proposal seriously. There is evidence to suggest that the divided public meets, however uneasily, on some common ground.

In conversations with individual Americans, most express the belief that employers have the right to protect their profitability, product or service quality, and ensure the safety of all their employees. It is considered reasonable, therefore, that an employer require job applicants to submit to a drug test as part of the employment screening process. Just as a criminal record, and mental and physical health may affect qualification for employment, the use of illegal drugs may seriously affect one's ability. If the applicant does not like this requirement, people feel the person is "free to look elsewhere" for a job.

Americans have great respect for a contractual agreement between an employee and an employer. If that contract specifies that the employee is not to use illicit drugs, then the employer has grounds on which to dismiss the employee. Even in those job situations in which there is no formal or explicit contract, people sense and respect a mutual, implied "contract" to perform to one's fullest ability.

People agree that on-the-job use of drugs is "against the rules," yet how the employer defines use is controversial. Although they agree that visible evidence of being "high" or "out of it" constitutes "probable cause" for disciplinary action, some are reluctant to allow employers to use a screening process that can monitor off-the-job behavior as well.

Some view the use of illegal drugs on one's own time as one's own business as long as the person does not show up to work while under the influence. People of this opinion regard testing for drug use in the work place is an invasion of privacy due to the incriminating residue effect of such commonly used "recreational" drugs as marijuana and cocaine.

Others believe that the use of illegal drugs at any time effects one's ability, attitudes, and behavior all the time, including in the work place. Additionally, because drug use breaks the law and seriously compromises the user, their employers, co-workers, and the country as a whole suffer. Thus, for those of this opinion, employer testing for drug use is deemed highly appropriate.

People feel that it is only fair that, if an employer initiates a drug testing program, everyone, from the top person all the way down, should be screened. The drug problem is not just a blue collar phenomenon but exists among white collar workers and is present in the boardroom. This viewpoint of the public is simple: "If it's fair for me, it's fair for all."

People feel that such a screening program is not necessary in every business or industry. Those who support drug testing are likely to consider it most critical for those persons in jobs directly related to public safety and welfare, and for those who are role models in our society. It is also considered an appropriate measure for those companies that have an existing drug abuse problem among employees.

Who Should be Tested?

When asked whether certain occupational or demographic groups should be subjected to mandatory drug testing, a consensus begins to emerge.

There is general agreement that people who are responsible for the physical safety of others should be tested. There is substantial public support for the testing of airline pilots (88%), air traffic controllers (88%), police and other law enforcement agents (85%), physicians and surgeons (82%), bus drivers (81%), military personnel (75%), and employees of pharmaceutical companies (75%).

There is also substantial support for testing those who are role models for the American public as well as those who have responsibility in governing and guiding the country, particularly the youth. Thus the public supports drug testing for teachers (74%), elected state and local officials (70%), and professional athletes (68%).

Although there is great concern about drug use among the nation's youth, there is no consensus as to the appropriateness of mandatory drug testing in the schools. The support for testing college students (47%), high school students (54%), junior high students (53%), and grade school students (50%) divides along the same lines as people's attitudes about the issue in general.

When questioned as to whether they support drug testing for themselves and their fellow workers, sixty percent say yes, significantly more than the percentage that support drug testing on an abstract basis.

Among those who support the idea of mandatory drug testing, a few (13%) oppose it for themselves and their fellow workers. This may be due to their employment situation, such as in a small or family-run business or on a farm, where such testing is seen as out of place.

Among those who oppose mandatory drug testing in general, about one-third (32%) feel they and their fellow workers should be tested. This apparent contradiction is caused by the pressure these people feel from two directions: They are concerned about violations of personal rights, yet they see the effects of drug use in their daily work environment. They feel "ripped off" or "cheated" when a fellow worker, under the influence of drugs, is not performing as expected and is not doing his or her fair share of the job. They are also sensitive to the fact that the employer is getting "ripped off."

How Should a Testing Program be Implemented?

In order to maintain goodwill and ensure employee cooperation, everyone agrees that employers should give ample notice of the initiation of a mandatory drug testing program. It is only fair to give those employees who may use drugs time to "clean up their act" or find a new job before they are tested.

Equally important as advance warning is the dissemination of complete information on the administration and enforcement of the drug testing program. The public wants assurance that any program is fair and non-discriminating. Using the program as an excuse to fire or harass an employee is seen as a serious potential abuse. Such misuse is also the precursor of what opponents to mandatory drug testing see as the undermining of the basic rights of each American and the beginning of an authoritarian or dictatorial government.

Many perceive the commonly used urine test as unreliable. People would feel more confident if drug testing were administered by qualified medical professionals and positive results were verified with at least one, if not two, retests. The opportunity for the employee to appeal adverse findings is regarded as important as well.

Many feel that employers have a social obligation to help rehabilitate those employees identified as drug abusers, either directly through company sponsored programs or indirectly with counseling and guidance to other services. Firing these people and turning them loose in the community will only make the problem worse for the individual as well as society in general. If, however, the use of drugs specifically violates an employment contract, this would be grounds for immediate dismissal, or certainly suspending the employee until the situation is rectified.

Table I

Mandatory Drug Testing: Issue Stance

Question: Recently there has been a lot of talk about mandatory drug testing of employees and other professionals. I would like to read you the opinions of two imaginary people; let's call them Miller and Brown. After I read you both opinions, please tell me whether you feel just like Miller, somewhat like Miller, somewhat like Brown, or just like Brown.

Miller says that employers should be allowed to require their employees to submit to drug tests at any time or risk losing their jobs. This is the best way to ensure the safety of everyone and deal with the increasing drug problem in the United States.

Brown say that while there is a serious drug problem, allowing employers to test employees for drug use on a random basis is a violation of constitutional and personal rights. Federal and state governments should concentrate on the elimination of illegal drugs by restricting the importation and distribution of these drugs.

Is your opinion ... just like Miller ... somewhat like Miller ... somewhat like Brown ... or just like Brown?

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Difference Miller- Brown (%)</u>	<u>Total Miller (%)</u>	<u>Total Brown (%)</u>	<u>Just Like Miller (%)</u>	<u>Somewhat Like Miller (%)</u>	<u>Somewhat Like Brown (%)</u>	<u>Just Like Brown (%)</u>
<u>Aggregate</u>	1050	1	50	49	28	23	21	28
<u>Issue Stance</u>								
Permit	526	100	100	-	55	45	-	-
Dont Perm	514	-100	-	100	-	-	43	57
<u>Test Me & Fellow Workers</u>								
Yes	630	46	73	26	41	32	14	13
No	417	-67	16	83	8	8	32	51
<u>Sex</u>								
Male	525	7	53	46	31	22	16	30
Female	525	- 5	47	52	24	23	26	26
<u>Age</u>								
17-24	179	- 8	45	53	21	24	29	24
25-34	263	-21	39	60	17	22	23	37
35-44	193	1	50	50	33	18	22	28
45-54	129	- 4	48	52	29	19	22	29
55-64	133	34	67	33	37	30	17	16
65+	151	25	62	36	37	25	9	28
<u>Ethnicity</u>								
White	777	8	54	46	30	24	20	26
Black	116	-16	41	57	24	17	17	40
Other	137	-23	37	60	18	19	27	33

Table I, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Issue Stance

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Difference Miller- Brown (%)</u>	<u>Total Miller (%)</u>	<u>Total Brown (%)</u>	<u>Just Like Miller (%)</u>	<u>Somewhat Like Miller (%)</u>	<u>Somewhat Like Brown (%)</u>	<u>Just Like Brown (%)</u>
<u>Aggregate</u>	1050	1	50	49	28	23	21	28
<u>Education</u>								
Some HS	294	17	58	40	33	25	15	25
HS Grad	399	2	51	49	30	21	21	27
Some Coll	179	-10	45	55	17	27	24	30
Coll Grad	126	-20	40	60	22	17	24	35
Post Grad	52	-9	46	54	23	23	28	26
<u>Occupation</u>								
Prof	168	-20	40	60	20	20	24	36
Whi Coll	204	-9	45	54	24	21	27	27
Blu Coll	274	2	50	49	29	21	17	31
Retired	175	24	61	38	33	28	11	27
Unempl	59	-12	44	56	34	10	28	28
Homemaker	118	10	55	45	32	23	27	18
<u>Religion</u>								
Catholic	259	3	51	47	28	22	19	28
Protestnt	421	2	51	48	28	23	23	26
Baptist	242	9	54	46	30	25	18	28
None	102	-24	38	62	19	19	24	38
<u>Ideology</u>								
Conserv	584	14	57	43	31	26	19	23
Moderate	97	2	50	48	23	26	17	31
Liberal	363	-21	39	60	23	16	25	35
<u>Income</u>								
<\$15K	274	3	51	48	22	29	16	32
\$15-30K	344	1	50	50	30	20	21	29
\$30-40K	172	1	51	49	30	21	25	25
>\$40K	193	-3	48	51	27	21	25	27
<u>Status</u>								
Lower End	231	23	61	38	32	29	15	23
Middle Cl	261	*	50	50	28	22	24	26
Intellign	74	-11	45	55	28	17	22	34
High Incm	164	*	50	50	28	22	23	27
<u>Union</u>								
Member	215	-25	37	62	25	12	24	38
Non-memb	833	8	54	46	28	25	20	26

Table I, continued
Mandatory Drug Testing: Issue Stance

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Difference</u> <u>Miller-</u> <u>Brown</u> (%)	<u>Total</u> <u>Miller</u> (%)	<u>Total</u> <u>Brown</u> (%)	<u>Just</u> <u>Like</u> <u>Miller</u> (%)	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Like</u> <u>Miller</u> (%)	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Like</u> <u>Brown</u> (%)	<u>Just</u> <u>Like</u> <u>Brown</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	1	50	49	28	23	21	28
<u>Marital Status</u>								
Married	640	4	52	47	30	22	20	27
Single	259	- 9	44	54	22	23	24	30
Div/Sep	97	- 3	49	51	26	23	19	32
<u>Region</u>								
New Engl	57	-28	36	64	24	12	19	44
Mid Atlan	198	-13	43	57	27	16	23	34
Gr Lakes	220	- 5	47	53	25	23	25	28
Farm Belt	61	- 9	46	54	28	18	27	27
Mountain	53	-30	33	63	8	25	25	38
Pacific	122	23	60	37	35	25	19	17
Outer Sth	226	19	59	40	32	27	18	22
Deep Sth	114	14	57	43	28	29	13	30

Table II

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

Question: I am going to read you a list of jobs, and I would like you to tell me whether you, yourself, would support mandatory drug testing of persons in each of these jobs.

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Elected Stt/Local Officials</u> (%)	<u>Air Traffic Contrllrs</u> (%)	<u>Grade School Students</u> (%)	<u>Empl'ees Governmt Contract</u> (%)	<u>Pharmaceu-tical Co. Employees</u> (%)	<u>Truck Drivers</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	70	88	50	67	75	72
<u>Issue Stance</u>							
Permit	526	92	98	67	92	94	92
Dont Perm	514	48	78	32	42	55	53
<u>Test Me & Fellow Workers</u>							
Yes	630	92	98	72	91	95	93
No	417	37	72	16	30	44	41
<u>Sex</u>							
Male	525	71	87	47	66	71	70
Female	525	69	88	52	68	78	75
<u>Age</u>							
17-24	179	72	87	41	63	74	63
25-34	263	63	81	41	55	66	62
35-44	193	60	85	44	60	68	71
45-54	129	72	90	57	67	75	74
55-64	133	82	92	59	84	86	86
65+	151	81	97	70	86	89	90
<u>Ethnicity</u>							
White	777	69	87	48	66	74	73
Black	116	79	91	62	74	79	75
Other	137	71	86	46	62	72	68
<u>Education</u>							
Some HS	294	84	94	62	81	78	80
HS Grad	399	73	88	53	69	81	72
Some Coll	179	61	85	39	59	70	71
Coll Grad	126	50	81	31	45	60	62
Post Grad	52	49	79	36	47	54	61
<u>Occupation</u>							
Prof	168	53	76	37	48	58	61
Whi Coll	204	67	89	43	63	72	72
Blu Coll	274	77	89	53	67	74	69
Retired	175	81	97	66	85	91	89
Unempl	59	69	82	63	72	75	63
Homemaker	118	71	87	46	72	80	76

Table II, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Elected Stt/Local Officials</u> (%)	<u>Air Traffic Contrllrs</u> (%)	<u>Grade School Students</u> (%)	<u>Empl'ees Governmt Contract</u> (%)	<u>Pharmaceu- tical Co. Employees</u> (%)	<u>Truck Drivers</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	70	88	50	67	75	72
<u>Religion</u>							
Catholic	259	71	91	50	69	76	73
Protestnt	421	68	87	51	67	76	75
Baptist	242	84	93	57	76	80	76
None	102	50	75	31	41	58	52
<u>Ideology</u>							
Conserv	584	74	90	54	72	79	78
Moderate	97	59	88	51	61	73	68
Liberal	363	68	84	42	59	68	64
<u>Income</u>							
<\$15K	274	76	92	60	76	82	78
\$15-30K	344	72	88	50	72	76	74
\$30-40K	172	67	88	45	59	70	73
>\$40K	193	59	82	38	56	65	64
<u>Status</u>							
Lower End	231	81	93	57	79	81	79
Middle Cl	261	68	88	49	67	78	74
Intelligen	74	48	82	36	51	57	64
High Incm	164	58	80	37	54	63	63
<u>Union</u>							
Member	215	66	85	40	58	67	63
Non-memb	833	71	89	52	69	77	75
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Married	640	70	87	51	68	76	72
Single	259	68	86	40	61	68	68
Div/Sep	97	75	93	55	69	78	76
<u>Region</u>							
New Engl	57	60	87	41	59	63	72
Mid Atlan	198	63	84	45	61	71	66
Gr Lakes	220	70	89	49	67	76	74
Farm Belt	61	71	87	52	64	77	77
Mountain	53	66	84	45	65	72	74
Pacific	122	67	90	44	63	75	67
Outer Sth	226	78	90	57	74	78	72
Deep Sth	114	77	89	58	72	75	82

Table II, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>College Students</u> (%)	<u>Bus Drivers</u> (%)	<u>Police & Law Enforcers</u> (%)	<u>Profess'l Athletes</u> (%)	<u>Teachers</u> (%)	<u>Airline Pilots</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	47	81	85	68	74	88
<u>Issue Stance</u>							
Permit	526	68	97	97	88	96	98
Dont Perm	514	25	65	72	48	52	79
<u>Test Me & Fellow Workers</u>							
Yes	630	73	98	98	89	95	98
No	417	7	57	65	37	42	74
<u>Sex</u>							
Male	525	47	79	85	69	72	88
Female	525	46	83	85	67	75	88
<u>Age</u>							
17-24	179	34	81	88	68	68	88
25-34	263	34	73	79	55	66	81
35-44	193	39	76	82	63	70	85
45-54	129	50	85	85	72	78	91
55-64	133	62	90	91	82	87	95
65+	151	76	92	89	81	83	97
<u>Ethnicity</u>							
White	777	46	81	84	67	74	88
Black	116	51	82	86	80	74	89
Other	137	45	82	84	67	69	86
<u>Education</u>							
Some HS	294	60	91	91	78	83	95
HS Grad	399	50	82	87	70	77	88
Some Coll	179	33	76	80	57	67	84
Coll Grad	126	27	70	74	53	60	82
Post Grad	52	36	68	70	63	56	79
<u>Occupation</u>							
Prof	168	33	69	73	52	56	76
Whi Coll	204	39	79	84	65	72	89
Blu Coll	274	43	82	85	67	75	89
Retired	175	72	93	91	81	85	97
Unempl	59	60	77	82	70	71	81
Homemaker	118	46	85	90	76	81	91

Table II, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>College Students</u> (%)	<u>Bus Drivers</u> (%)	<u>Police & Law Enforcers</u> (%)	<u>Profess'l Athletes</u> (%)	<u>Teachers</u> (%)	<u>Airline Pilots</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	47	81	85	68	74	88
<u>Religion</u>							
Catholic	259	44	85	86	68	75	90
Protestnt	421	52	81	84	71	75	87
Baptist	242	52	85	92	75	80	94
None	102	21	64	70	44	55	76
<u>Ideology</u>							
Conserv	584	51	85	87	74	77	90
Moderate	97	42	79	81	59	72	86
Liberal	363	41	76	81	61	68	85
<u>Income</u>							
<\$15K	274	59	86	88	72	77	92
\$15-30K	344	48	82	85	71	78	89
\$30-40K	172	39	82	84	69	70	89
>\$40K	193	34	72	80	58	68	83
<u>Status</u>							
Lower End	231	57	89	90	74	84	94
Middle Cl	261	44	82	87	67	75	89
Intelligen	74	32	72	70	56	58	82
High Incm	164	34	71	79	58	66	82
<u>Union</u>							
Member	215	34	75	79	61	67	85
Non-memb	833	50	83	86	70	76	89
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Married	640	49	81	84	70	74	88
Single	259	34	78	84	64	68	87
Div/Sep	97	49	88	89	66	84	92
<u>Region</u>							
New Engl	57	44	83	85	63	70	87
Mid Atlan	198	39	73	81	61	69	85
Gr Lakes	220	50	85	85	68	76	88
Farm Belt	61	47	83	80	71	78	87
Mountain	53	43	77	89	76	78	88
Pacific	122	43	84	86	60	70	90
Outer Sth	226	49	83	86	73	72	89
Deep Sth	114	55	83	87	75	82	91

Table II, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Rock Musicians</u> (%)	<u>Junior Hi School Students</u> (%)	<u>High School Students</u> (%)	<u>Military Personnel</u> (%)	<u>Physicians & Surgeons</u> (%)	<u>You & Your Fellow Workers</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	41	53	54	75	82	60
<u>Issue Stance</u>							
Permit	526	58	73	73	96	96	87
Dont Perm	514	23	33	34	54	67	32
<u>Test Me & Fellow Workers</u>							
Yes	630	62	79	80	97	98	100
No	417	9	14	14	42	57	-
<u>Sex</u>							
Male	525	39	52	52	77	79	60
Female	525	42	54	55	74	84	60
<u>Age</u>							
17-24	179	35	44	44	81	84	54
25-34	263	26	46	45	64	78	49
35-44	193	32	47	47	70	73	57
45-54	129	48	55	55	78	81	61
55-64	133	54	63	68	83	88	72
65+	151	66	75	75	87	90	78
<u>Ethnicity</u>							
White	777	40	52	52	74	81	59
Black	116	40	70	69	84	87	68
Other	137	44	44	48	73	78	61
<u>Education</u>							
Some HS	294	51	64	66	82	90	70
HS Grad	399	45	57	56	77	84	63
Some Coll	179	30	44	45	69	77	52
Coll Grad	126	26	35	36	66	71	43
Post Grad	52	26	38	38	65	63	48
<u>Occupation</u>							
Prof	168	29	40	43	67	70	48
Whi Coll	204	33	48	48	73	77	54
Blu Coll	274	38	55	53	75	83	59
Retired	175	62	71	73	87	92	77
Unempl	59	59	60	58	80	83	78
Homemaker	118	40	53	54	73	84	55

Table II, continued

Mandatory Drug Testing: Support in Favor of Selected Occupations

	<u>BASE</u>	<u>Rock, Musicians</u> (%)	<u>Junior Hi School Students</u> (%)	<u>High School Students</u> (%)	<u>Military Personnel</u> (%)	<u>Physi- cians & Surgeons</u> (%)	<u>You & Your Fellow Workers</u> (%)
Aggregate	1050	41	53	54	75	82	60
<u>Religion</u>							
Catholic	259	33	49	52	78	85	56
Protestnt	421	47	56	57	76	80	65
Baptist	242	48	64	61	80	88	63
None	102	17	31	32	60	65	41
<u>Ideology</u>							
Conserv	584	43	57	57	80	84	65
Moderate	97	42	51	53	73	81	62
Liberal	363	36	48	48	69	78	51
<u>Income</u>							
<\$15K	274	49	63	64	82	87	69
\$15-30K	344	43	54	54	75	82	62
\$30-40K	172	34	46	46	69	79	54
>\$40K	193	29	44	42	70	73	49
<u>Status</u>							
Lower End	231	50	61	62	83	90	70
Middle Cl	261	40	52	50	73	83	56
Intellign	74	28	37	39	62	70	50
High Incm	164	30	42	41	69	71	48
<u>Union</u>							
Member	215	33	42	43	66	77	49
Non-memb	833	43	56	56	78	83	63
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Married	640	44	54	55	73	81	61
Single	259	32	44	44	78	82	54
Div/Sep	97	29	60	59	75	86	59
<u>Region</u>							
New Engl	57	41	52	53	79	79	44
Mid Atlan	198	34	44	44	68	80	49
Gr Lakes	220	42	55	56	77	83	64
Farm Belt	61	41	56	56	70	82	60
Mountain	53	37	48	52	69	85	62
Pacific	122	39	45	47	76	80	62
Outer Sth	226	42	59	57	79	82	65
Deep Sth	114	49	66	65	78	81	68

