

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Bledsoe, Ralph C.: Files
Folder Title: [Drug Abuse Policy - August 1986] (7)
Box: 22

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

August 5, 1986

The Briefing Room

12:04 P.M. EDT

INDEX

SUBJECT

PAGE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Schedule.....	1-5
GOP Leadership	
Secretary Weinberger	
Knights of Columbus	
National Conference/Alcohol-Drugs	
Illinois Trip	
Shultz/Balaguer Inaugural	
U.S.-Soviets/People-to-People.....	2-3
Drug Abuse/Military.....	3

DOMESTIC

Joint Local-National News Conference.....	13
Space Shuttle.....	17

FOREIGN

GATT/South Korea.....	5-8,10
Nicaragua.....	8-9
Arms Control/SDI.....	9,10
Soviets/Grain.....	10-11
Chile/Abrams-Helms.....	11-13
OPEC/Oil.....	15-16
Textiles/Trade.....	17
South Africa/Ambassador.....	17-18
Vice President/Mideast.....	17-20
Drugs.....	20-24

12:53 P.M. EDT

#1852-08/05

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

August 5, 1986

The Briefing Room

12:04 P.M. EDT

MR. SPEAKES: I read a statement from the French press secretary, which I will translate from the French to the English. It says, because of the summer vacation, the Thursday morning press briefings by Press Secretary Dennis Boudoin will not take place until sometime around the end of August. This was announced at the end of July. So I think that would be a worthy example of Franco-American relations to follow.

Q We've always had such good press relations with the French.

MR. SPEAKES: I just never could catch the guy to meet with him.

Today's schedule, the President, as you know, this morning met with the GOP leadership. He met with Secretary Weinberger. I'll have more on both those meetings later.

This afternoon he meets with the Domestic Policy Council to discuss his strategic petroleum reserve. The question before the Council is whether to meet the authorized limit of filling the reserve and, if so, how fast to do so.

At 3:30 p.m. the President will address -- make a satellite address to the Knights of Columbus Convention, and a notice to the press on the technical aspects was made available to you this morning. The Convention takes place in Chicago and the Knights of Columbus has 1.6 million members. The President wants to talk on Contra aid, drugs, and right to life.

It will be available, of course, to television through satellite. It will be piped into the mult here and it will also be on a monitor in this room.

Q He's going to talk on abortion?

MR. SPEAKES: Right to life, yes.

Q Abortion.

MR. SPEAKES: The President has appointed Secretary of State Shultz to represent him as the head of the U.S. delegation to the August 16th inaugural of President Balaguer of the Dominican Republic. In addition to the Secretary the delegation will consist of the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, Lowell C. Kilday, and Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Elliott Abrams.

Also at the invitation of Foreign Minister Hilaire, the Secretary will also visit Haiti to meet with the National Council of Government of President Henri Namphy and other officials.

MORE

#1852-08/05

Q Do you have a release on that for the spellings?

MR. SPEAKES: Kilday is K-I-L-D-A-Y, Hilaire is H-I-L-A-I-R-E, and Henri Namphy is H-E-N-R-I. Last name, N-A-M-P-H-Y.

We are also releasing a statement which concerns the conclusion of a series of talks between the United States and the Soviet Union -- a week-long discussion on expanding cultural, educational, and People-To-People exchanges. These discussions were arranged to implement an agreement between the President and Soviet Leader Gorbachev, which was made at last year's summit.

It was designed to increase cooperation in contacts and expand opportunities for people in respective countries to communicate directly with one another. 13 cooperative programs in the areas of education, higher education, health, sports and culture were agreed upon and about 19 more are under active discussion.

The two heads of delegations held a brief press conference at USIA this morning. If you need further information, Stephen Rhinesmith who is the coordinator of the conference at 485-1548 will be your contact.

MR. SPEAKES: This morning the President received a briefing from Secretary Weinberger on the Defense Department's efforts to curb drug abuse in the military. The Secretary delivered to the President a copy of the worldwide survey of alcohol and non-medical drug use among military personnel. It was a 54 page study. It is the latest in a series that was begun in 1980, repeated in 1982 and again in 1985. It is a final compilation of the 1985 data. When you compare the findings of the three surveys the percentage of men and women in the military who used drugs 30 days prior to testing in 1980 was 27 percent, 1982 was 19 percent and it's 9 percent in 1985 -- two thirds decline.

At 3:00 p.m. today Dr. William Mayer, M-A-Y-E-R, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs will conduct a briefing report for reporters at the Pentagon briefing room. We'll pipe it into this briefing room at 3:00 p.m.

Q Do you have any other copies of the report?

MR. SPEAKES: Do we have any extra copies of the report? We'll get some from Defense and provide them for you.

Q It was put out yesterday, wasn't it?

Q Brief on the report at the Pentagon?

MR. SPEAKES: Tomorrow the President will address the First Annual National Conference on Alcohol and Drug Prevention at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Crystal City, Virginia. The conference is sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, The National Institute on Alcohol and Alcoholism and The National Institute on Drug Abuse. The President will close the four day conference, which is focused on the theme of sharing knowledge for action. There are approximately 600 persons attending the conference. They include professionals and volunteers in the drug prevention area from both the United States and foreign countries. Key leaders of a national voluntary -- of national voluntary and professional associations and state task group members that are sponsored by their state alcohol and drug abuse agencies.

The conference was designed so that the participants could share information and research on the development and implementation of prevention programs on the local level.

The President will speak at 2:00 p.m. Coverage will be open. We'll provide you information about your setup times and other technical information later this afternoon.

The President will travel to Springfield, Illinois on Tuesday, August 12th. He travels first to the state capitol, Springfield, where he will visit the Illinois State Fair and he will speak at the fair. From Springfield, the President travels to Chicago where he will participate in campaign events for Governor Jim Thompson and Judy Koehler, K-O-E-H-L-E-R, who is the Republican candidate for United States Senate. It will include an address to a fundraising luncheon for Governor Thompson.

The events will take place in the O'Hare Exposition Center, which adjoins the O'Hare Hyatt Regency Hotel.

At 7:00 p.m. Central Time, 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time, the President will hold a news conference at the O'Hare Hyatt Regency Hotel.

Q What time again?

MR. SPEAKES: 7:00 p.m., 8:00 p.m. For your information, those -- the White House traveling press corps and the Chicago area-based press will be seated in two sections, and the President will alternate taking questions from the traveling press and the Chicago area press.

After the press conference, the President returns to Washington. We'll have more information tomorrow.

A little bit more on the satellite address from the --

Q It's available for live coverage?

MR. SPEAKES: Absolutely.

The President will -- the Knights of Columbus event is the 104th Annual Convention of the Knights of Columbus. The convention is at the Chicago Hilton Hotel. The audience will be approximately 2200 members of the K of C and their wives, 50 Catholic bishops.

The President last addressed the Knights of Columbus in Hartford, Connecticut in person in 1982.

And the information on the satellite -- be sure to tune in to Transponder 7 and not Transponder 6, or else you'll miss it all.

Q Can I ask you about the Chicago trip? What's the reasoning for it? Thompson wouldn't seem to be in a lot of trouble and conversely Koehler running against Dixon would seem to have no chance. Is there some other purpose than strictly campaigning for these people, such as -- such as to make an appearance in that part of the country, to do the news conference and talk about some other issue?

MR. SPEAKES: What was the modifying word before luncheon?

Q Fundraising.

MR. SPEAKES: Got it.

Q Why would he need funds? I thought he was way ahead.

MR. SPEAKES: Costs money to run, whether you're way ahead or not.

The President this morning met with the GOP Congressional Leadership. He stressed three specific topics in his meeting with the leadership. First of all, the textile bill that the President vetoed, asking them to sustain his veto when the House votes tomorrow -- point out that there are -- the House and the Senate would have to override the veto in order for it to be overridden. If one House fails to override, then it will be sustained.

The second topic was arms control and defense funding, which is being voted on in the Senate and considered in the House this week.

And finally, Contra aid.

The President opened the meeting by stressing that Ambassador Yeutter had been directed to negotiate new agreements to limit imports in the textile field and had done so. He cited the Taiwan and Hong Kong agreements, which will actually reduce imports in 1987 and limit growth after that to one-half of one percent for Taiwan and one percent for Hong Kong.

He also pointed out that yesterday, we had reached an agreement with South Korea. He called these, and I'm quoting from now on, "These are the toughest textile agreements that the United States has ever negotiated. An override of my veto would have the effect of shattering these important agreements and our hopes for broad participation in a new GATT round where we would like to significantly broaden access to foreign markets -- "

Q Can you explain that all?

Q Pick up with the GATT line.

MR. SPEAKES: "-- our hopes for broad participation in the new GATT round where we would like to significantly broaden access to foreign markets for U.S. goods and services."

The President called on Ambassador Yeutter and Secretary Baker to address the subject specifically. Ambassador Yeutter pointed out that if legislation -- if there is a negotiation, then there is not retaliation or compensation for another country. But in the case of legislation, that every dollar -- and this is a quote, "Every dollar that we cut off -- every dollar of trade that we cut off coming into the United States, other countries can also cut us off dollar for dollar."

He said that you might get some psychological benefit by kicking a chair, but if you break your foot in the process, it's not good for you.

Baker --

Q That's Yeutter? I'm sorry?

MR. SPEAKES: Yeutter.

Q That's Yeutter?

Q Yeutter imitating Baker.

MR. SPEAKES: Baker.

Q All of this is Yeutter, or --

MR. SPEAKES: That's --

Q The first part was Reagan.

MR. SPEAKES: Reagan -- this is Yeutter.

Now, this is Baker. Baker said that we would lose the world -- if this bill is overridden, we will lose the world's free trading system as we know it. We will open a full-scale trade war and one that I don't believe we will win. He said agricultural exporters, people in agriculture and exporters will pay dearly if this happens.

Q We would lose the world's free trading system as we know it if this veto is overridden?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. Absolutely.

Q Apocalyptic, isn't it?

Q What was said in response to this?

MR. SPEAKES: He pointed out that the shakes and shingles decision was made by the President, was a -- and resulted in a retaliation by the Canadian government, and he said that that amounted to \$180 million. He said we are talking about billions and billions in this case.

Q Was he -- can I just clarify --

Senator Thurmond, as always, spoke --

Q Was that \$180 million lost?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. I think it totalled \$180 million, or maybe it was \$180 million that we felt we were losing. I'm not sure. We can check on that for you.

Q Was there a response to this by the --

MR. SPEAKES: Senator Thurmond, as always, spoke eloquently and at length on the subject. (Laughter.) Senator Danforth supported the President's position on override -- on sustaining the veto, which is, as he pointed out, he had differed from the President on trade matters in the past. But he supported the position. Senator Lott indicated -- or, Congressman Lott indicated that --

Q Not yet.

MR. SPEAKES: No, Stennis is still there -- that the issue -- the recent steps made by the President in the Multi-Fiber Agreement and other agreements with the various countries that I've mentioned had had an impact on members of Congress, and could be helpful in sustaining the President's position, although many had previously staked out a position and would have difficulty changing their position.

Q Well, what about his position?

Q This is a facetious question. Is -- did Lott indicate that it had changed his position in any way? Because he was not helping you at all --

MR. SPEAKES: Yes -- was not, and he did not say that. He said some of us can't change now. So --

Q Well, Thurmond had said that, in fact, the MFA agreements hurt, and that the Korean and the other agreements made it only worse.

MR. SPEAKES: He said that, and the industry said that, but we don't agree.

Q Okay.

Q And we can assume that when Thurmond spoke eloquently and in length, it was in favor of his well-known position.

MR. SPEAKES: That's right.

Bob.

Q Larry, when Secretary Baker mentioned that the President's shakes and shingles decision had cost the country \$180 million, was he in fact criticizing that decision? It certainly sounds that way.

MR. SPEAKES: Wasn't criticizing. He was indicating that we had made it with the knowledge -- by pressure from individuals who had an interest in the timber industry, and that it did -- that it is not, when we make decisions, unilateral decisions like that, that restrict trade, that it is not without penalty. And that is, you can have retaliation. And we did have retaliation, but that was minor compared to what will happen if you pass a legislative bill like this that destroys free trade.

Q Sorry?

Q Basically, he was saying -- it seems as if he's saying it was a bad decision.

MR. SPEAKES: Don't think he was saying a bad decision. As you may recall, there were other factors present at the time that decision was made.

Q Political -- the pressure that you just referred to

MR. SPEAKES: Robin?

Q Others than just beyond that?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q Do not Baker's comments undermine the President's position in arguing against an override on the textile bill?

MR. SPEAKES: No, no. Baker's comments were that if you make these decisions, then you're subject to retaliation. If you negotiate these things, then you're not subject to retaliation. That's what it amounted to.

Okay, arms control. The President said the actions on defense authorization bill in both chambers in the next few days are, "exceedingly important in the context of events at this critical time in Geneva. Any reductions in SDI funding, restrictions on our strategic modernization program or legislative limits on our

strategic forces are actions that run the risk of reducing prospects for securing an arms control agreement. SDI and strategic modernization are indispensable elements of our defense effort. To cut them further or to tie our hands while the Soviets run free is simply an unacceptable situation."

Q All this sounds familiar.

Q Larry, didn't he say most of this stuff --

MR. SPEAKES: He's said it before, sure.

Q We had all of this last week.

Q Didn't he say mostly everything he's saying here on textiles and on defense word-for-word last week?

MR. SPEAKES: May have.

Q Same card. Same card.

Q Did he get the wrong card?

MR. SPEAKES: Central America. Time is running out for our freedom fighter friends in Nicaragua. (Laughter.)

Do you want this or don't want it?

Q No.

MR. SPEAKES: Okay, no problem.

Q Well, just a moment.

MR. SPEAKES: Go ahead to questions.

Q Hold on a moment. You have a right to make the statements up there --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't care to make them if you don't want them.

Q -- what you want.

MR. SPEAKES: I make them for you.

Q Hold on. We want them. I think people are just pointing out they sound like they're word-for-word with ones you delivered earlier.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, he does say the same thing because this is the same issue. Have to tell them and tell them again, right?

Q Give it to us.

MR. SPEAKES: Time is running out for our freedom fighter friends in Nicaragua. On the first of last month, the humanitarian assistance funds from last year were depleted. The freedom fighters no longer have the funds to buy food or medicine. We cannot delay further in giving these brave fighters what they so desperately need to continue their struggle. It is clear that the friends of the Sandinistas have not forgotten them with the recent arrival in Nicaragua of assault helicopters, patrol boats, and other Soviet-bloc arms.

Q Anyone comment on that?

Q How recent?

MR. SPEAKES: No, it was -- we were running overtime so we didn't.

Q What about the SDI? What response did he get from the --

MR. SPEAKES: Lou, I don't recall any specific response. I think by and large our leadership in both Houses agrees with us on that, so --

Q He spoke today, and those are three issues that are all tough issues for you.

MR. SPEAKES: Right.

Q Was there some kind of evaluation given at this meeting or otherwise for these leaders to the President of what your prospects are on getting your SDI monies, the Contra vote, the textile -- sustaining the textile vote?

MR. SPEAKES: No, the situation on textiles is that it is very close in the House and the President will be meeting with members tomorrow. Is that right, Rusty? Is it tomorrow on the textile vote?

Q He's got phone calls and meetings today, you said, didn't you?

MR. BRASHEAR: The vote is tomorrow.

Q The vote is tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKES: That's right. I guess today -- are the phone calls --

Q Is he going to send a message to the Hill?

MR. SPEAKES: No meeting today. Phone calls today. He has sent a message to the Hill. He has written.

Lou, the second subject was arms control, and that's really sort of an amendment-by-amendment type of an approach and we'll just, you know, fight them one by one.

Q Is there -- there's no White House evaluation of --

MR. SPEAKES: Not -- I mean, it's different on each one, and we'll just have to take them one by one.

And finally --

Q Can you -- on SDI specifically, do you have an analysis of that?

MR. SPEAKES: No, no.

Q Is that on attempting to release more money from the FY 86 budget --

MR. SPEAKES: No, it's the appropriations process.

Q -- or we're talking about '87?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, '87 appropriations.

And finally, on Nicaragua, we can't get an agreement to vote from the Democrats in the Senate on the House-passed bill.

Q On the textiles --

MR. SPEAKES: And Dole is maneuvering on that right now, so that is where they all stand.

Q Textiles -- you said that there is a message that went up. Did it go up today?

MR. SPEAKES: The President wrote a letter some time -- last week, I believe, to all House members.

Q The President put out a letter to Congress this morning on SALT and related --

MR. SPEAKES: Right.

Q -- subjects in which it seemed that he was saying that without SALT the Soviets probably wouldn't be building much more than they already have with SALT. He also gave the numbers of U.S. weapons by 1991 and the number of Soviet weapons, and we're still ahead. And I'm wondering how to explain that in the context of him saying that the Soviets are running free and that our hands are being tied?

MR. SPEAKES: The Soviets are continuing their buildup and have for a long period of time. I think the SALT numbers you saw were not the total equation, but were just selected numbers that have come under that treaty.

Q They were the numbers on the number of nuclear warheads. They were somewhat confusing. Can you tell me what those numbers were? They appeared to be numbers of warheads.

MR. SPEAKES: I'll have to look at it, Ira, to be sure.

Q And one other follow-up on that. The classified version went up in June, the unclassified version in July, and today we have release of that. Would you care to say that that is timed to the defense votes?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q Larry, a great man once said that if you take the king's shilling, you keep your mouth shut once decisions are made. What is the view of Secretary Shultz speaking out so vocally on the grain deal?

MR. SPEAKES: Secretary Shultz -- I think you can probably get the Secretary's personal view today from his spokesman at the

Defense Department as opposed to his view yesterday.

Q What happened?

MR. SPEAKES: The Secretary obviously had strong views on it. The Secretary has spoken on it. The President has made a decision with all the facts in hand and he does not plan to change his decision.

Q But is the President upset at this --

MR. SPEAKES: I doubt it.

Q -- or concerned that the Secretary is speaking out this way?

MR. SPEAKES: I doubt it in either case.

Q Well, the President has said in the past that he expects people once a decision -- he wants vigorous debate before a decision, but after that he expects people to support it. Shultz clearly is not supporting it.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I would judge it's -- the Secretary will -- still holds his strong views but I'm sure he will not -- that he will support the President's decision.

Q Would you expect him to continue to discuss his opposition in public?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. You'll have to see what -- we'll have to wait and see what happens but I don't think the President is that upset with the Secretary.

Q Well, has he spoken to him at all?

MR. SPEAKES: He's spoken to him, yes.

Q About it?

MR. SPEAKES: No, I don't think so.

Q Does the White House support Elliott Abrams in his conflict that he's having with Helms?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm not so sure that -- I don't know anything about a conflict between Helms and Abrams. As far as that investigation is concerned I don't have anything on that. You really have to check with the FBI to see where they're doing an investigation. I don't -- I think the State Department made a statement on it yesterday which indicated that the State Department had not requested an investigation.

Q Does the White House have any view of this investigation? Does it favor the investigation?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, first of all we can't confirm it because we don't normally confirm it. But certainly we don't like security leaks if they occur -- wherever they occur.

Q Yes, but the first question was on Elliott Abrams.

MR. SPEAKES: Yes.

Q Does the President support Abrams --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know anything about Abrams' disagreements with Senator Helms. I honestly don't know what the matter of contention is.

Q Well, in the past the White House has supported Abrams --

MR. SPEAKES: The White House supports Abrams and --

Q -- for instance, on the matter of the U.S. ambassador in Santiago.

MR. SPEAKES: But I do not know what the disagreement is. If you would wish to enlighten me, maybe I could make a guess as to whether the White House supports --

Q Helms accuses Abrams of being out to get him. He and the State Department as a whole -- Helms said on the -- yesterday in public -- we're out to get him and we're trumping up these kinds of accusations.

Q Accusing him of lying and of leaking.

Q And of leaking the fact of it.

MR. SPEAKES: Yes, but once again the State Department made a statement yesterday about who may have -- that they did not instigate an investigation. So that ought to put that to rest.

Q But Abrams -- did Abrams leak it -- is Helms' complaint.

MR. SPEAKES: You mean leak the fact there was an investigation?

Q The fact that there was an investigation, yes.

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know.

Q Helms denies -- I mean, Abrams denies it?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know.

Q Well, if -- the President continues to have confidence in Abram, or rather, in Abrams, isn't that --

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. Yes, he does. And in Senator Helms too. (Laughter.)

Q Helms is not one of Mr. Reagan's appointees.

Q Why are you trying to jump in the middle of this fight, like this? (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: And the people of the great state of North Carolina and their judges.

Q Yes, but Helms is not one of the President's appointees.

MR. SPEAKES: That's true.

Q Yet, unless there's something I don't know and then I --

MR. SPEAKES: No, there's nothing you don't know.

Colonel?

Q What is the President's view of a United States Senator going to Chile where a man named Harry Barnes, who is the President's personal representative and Ambassador of the United States and having the U.S. Senator criticize the Ambassador in that foreign country?

MR. SPEAKES: The President's view is that Ambassador Barnes can take care of himself. (Laughter.)

Q Well, no.

Q -- blowing in the wind.

MR. SPEAKES: -- and that United States Senators are certainly free to speak out whenever and wherever they wish to, and they frequently do.

Q Is it the President's view, Larry, that Ambassador Barnes is reflecting in his actions and words there the President's known views?

MR. SPEAKES: He's reflecting the administration's policy, which reflects the President's views.

Where are we? Johanna?

Q Larry, was this press conference, was the decision to sort of hold the joint, local, national press conference have to do -- what was behind that decision?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, it's not unprecedented. I'd point that out to you.

Q Well, that's not the question.

MR. SPEAKES: Just thought it would be nice to do. As long as we're in the Midwest, we wanted to hold a press conference, and -- before we left for California, and August 12 is about 3 1/2 days before we leave for California and figured we better do it, or try to figure out a way to do it in the remaining 3 1/2 days.

Q Is he up on Chicago sewage problems?

MR. SPEAKES: He is. He will be. Yes.

Q Well, is there some attempt to avoid some questions about South Africa for the national press, as was speculated when an earlier press conference last week was --

MR. SPEAKES: No. Are you impugning the confidence of your colleagues in Chicago?

Q No, I'm not. I'm --

MR. SPEAKES: There are a lot of graduates of the Chicago School of Journalism right here in this room. Right --

Q What?

Q Wallace -- Chris.

MR. SPEAKES: Who else?

Q There is --

MR. SPEAKES: Couple of more?

Q What's the name of that school?

MR. SPEAKES: So I mean, local press are entitled to ask questions, too, and I wouldn't make any issue of it. President Nixon did it extensively, President Ford did it extensively.

Q And look what happened to them.

Q I'm sure it will be fine. (Laughter) -- I'm sure it will be fine. I'm sure we'll get the information from Ronald Reagan about the usual -- you know, who asked the question.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I think -- I tell you what, too -- why don't you commission one of your polling agencies to let the public grade the news men between local and national, and let's do a call-out poll of about 600 people --

Q The L.A. Times did it. And we won. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKES: -- between 8:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight. The national versus local one?

Q Yes.

Q I think they've done credibility, that they trusted networks more.

Q You know the Times -- that he likes.

MR. SPEAKES: I bet they didn't have your name in there. (Laughter.)

Q Nor yours.

MR. SPEAKES: I wasn't in their equation.

Q Whoever wins or loses this poll, what -- when Reagan was running against President Ford, as you well remember -- you were working for President Ford --

MR. SPEAKES: That's true. (Laughter.)

Q -- he held a number of these -- Ford held a number of these throughout the country with the same kind of questions here today. Is this going to be a pattern for the President in this campaign, or do you look for this as something --

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q -- as an isolated event, or as something he's going to do frequently as he goes around the country in the fall?

MR. SPEAKES: No, this just -- it is the regular news conference that we hold every couple of months, and if we're going to be in Chicago, we thought it would be a good opportunity to do it.

Q Have one every month.

MR. SPEAKES: So I would attach no significance to it, other than the change in locality.

Q Hey, what happened to July's press conference?

Q What happened to the once every six week?

Q Would the expanded be on a half-hour?

MR. SPEAKES: No. It will be exactly the same as one held in the East Room. The only thing that's different is it's local, and those gracious members of the Chicago press corps who allow this invasion by the White House press corps would be certainly allowed to ask some questions.

Yes, sir.

Q But there's no suggestion that one of the reasons is that it gives the national press 15 minutes rather than 30.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, you had 15 in here -- you had your 15 in here yesterday.

Q And --

Q We were confined, as you know -- Chicago.

MR. SPEAKES: That's all right. In fact, that was one of the recommendations of the University of Virginia study on press conferences done by your peers that you have --

Q Yes, assuming that they were held regularly.

MR. SPEAKES: -- that you have one-subject press conferences. Might be more productive.

Q Once a week.

Q On a regular basis.

Q Let's file all this. This is too good -- this stuff, I mean --

Q Wait a minute.

Q -- Soviets running wild.

Q Do you have anything on the OPEC --

MR. SPEAKES: I honestly don't understand why anyone would question the motives of the press conference, and I'm excluding Lou from that because his question was, is it going to be a political type of thing that we might do in politics? But everybody else seems to think there's some ulterior motive.

Q Well, that's not true.

Q I asked you a question, and said it's fine. I raise no objections, speaking personally.

MR. SPEAKES: I heard you tell Helen, which I'll be sure it's on the record, you're going to recommend your network not cover it, though.

Q The press conference?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. You said it.

Q If you think for a moment that was a serious suggestion --

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, yes, it was -- very serious.

Q -- then you don't know the difference between funning and serious stuff any more.

MR. SPEAKES: Waiting back here, and then I'll come up.

Q OPEC recently -- I think just this afternoon -- formally agreed to reduce their production of oil in order to boost prices.

MR. SPEAKES: Right.

Q And that's already --

MR. SPEAKES: Our view is that we've long felt and continue to believe that the free market and the laws of supply and demand should determine oil price and oil supply levels. This administration, as you know, has worked to deregulate U.S. domestic oil production and remove restrictions on international markets.

Q Would this affect the SPR decision today? I mean, might that recalculate the market forces?

MR. SPEAKES: That's right. It depends on what -- I don't think anybody is yet in the position to predict what this will do for the price of oil.

Q It's already driven up the spot price.

Q Was that a decisionmaking meeting today?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. Rusty, do you know whether -- I judge we won't have an announcement at the conclusion of the meeting, but there are a number of options being put before the President.

Q Is that meeting called as a result of the movement on the --

MR. SPEAKES: No. They've been debating this for an eternity.

Q Do you view this is as a -- good news or bad news for the United States economy?

MR. SPEAKES: The -- it remains to be seen.

Q It depends on whether you're George Bush.
(Laughter.)

Q The dollars are going to go up faster than the gallons again.

MR. SPEAKES: -- whatever that means, if anything remains to be seen. Right?

Q Yes, thanks.

Q It's good for Houston, Pete.

MR. SPEAKES: Saul has a new subject. Do we have more OPEC persons?

Q Yes.

MR. SPEAKES: Okay.

Q How can you criticize OPEC when you're doing the same thing on textiles? You're cartelizing textile trade, which is what OPEC is doing with oil.

MR. SPEAKES: But we're restricting the productions of textiles?

Q You're certainly restricting the import of textiles.

MR. SPEAKES: No, no, no. We're working with --

Q Boasting about it.

MR. SPEAKES: Boasting about it? They seem to be agreed upon. Did we agree with the OPEC folks that we wanted to restrict the production of oil or increase the production of oil? No.

Q But you're boasting that you've got all these bilateral and multilateral agreements in recent days --

MR. SPEAKES: The difference is agreement -- negotiation and agreement, Leo. That's apples and oranges if I ever saw apples and oranges.

Q Is a free trade on textiles?

MR. SPEAKES: Pardon?

Q Are you advocating free trade --

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, Leo, you're just doing your thing.

Go ahead.

Q Can we expect to have a readout after the meeting this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKES: -- meeting? I don't think so, Kathy. I guess we'll just wait and if we have a decision we will announce it. But I bet there's not one today.

Bob?

Q South African ambassador? How fast are you going, and when will -- (laughter) --

MR. SPEAKES: When we have something to announce, we'll announce. We don't have anything to announce today.

Q What about mid-year economic review -- that new data?

MR. SPEAKES: Probably Thursday.

Q What?

MR. SPEAKES: Probably Thursday.

Q Shuttle?

MR. SPEAKES: Shuttle? Meeting Thursday. Don't know when the decision will be.

Q Larry, Vice President Bush finished his trip today. What's he accomplished in this trip from the White House point of view, if anything?

MR. SPEAKES: I think, Lou, it was a very timely mission on the part of the White House. The White House worked very carefully with the Vice President in preparation for the trip. In fact, Assistant Secretary Murphy is accompanying him on the trip and he's been very active in the discussions. We believe that it is helpful at any time that a ranking U.S. official -- and certainly the Vice President is the second ranking U.S. official -- visits the region and participates in discussion between those who have -- stand in positions to be of influence. We think the Vice President's talks have been productive, they've been helpful, and they can certainly -- may prove in the long run to have assisted the peace process there in the Middle East. It's simply a matter of discussions and if the United States can be helpful then we want to be. And we believe the Vice President has been helpful in all the countries he's visited.

Q Do you disagree with a senior official identified, in fact, in one of the news magazines this week as suggesting that the sole purpose was politics?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think the senior official was pinpointed. He was identified by group, but not by -- not pinpointed.

Q He was identified in an article.

Q -- said it was the Chief of Staff.

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, in the article?

Q Donald T. Regan.

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. I don't think the Chief of Staff would have that reaction if you asked him about it.

Q (Laughter.) Why did he take eight Jewish leaders with him then and a TV crew and everything else for internal politics? I mean, do you really think it should have been combined with a foreign policy trip?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, another great man who won all but one state took a campaign crew with him on two foreign trips.

Q Well, I'm not asking you that.

MR. SPEAKES: So, I think the President's there --

Q Was he on a foreign policy mission, or was he on a political trip?

MR. SPEAKES: He was on a foreign policy mission.

Q And Larry, the Egyptian government asked the Vice President to have Murphy stay for a couple more days to follow-up on the Taba issue.

Q Did you leave the campaign film crew with Murphy?
(Laughter.)

Q Do you have anything else on commonwealth nations?

MR. SPEAKES: Commonwealth nations? No.

Q It's been suggested over there that that puts more pressure -- Mulroney said, you know, that now it's up to Reagan to act now that Thatcher hasn't.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I don't know that Thatcher has acted.

Q Has not acted.

MR. SPEAKES: Has not acted -- you're right.

Q Because Mulroney --

MR. SPEAKES: Well, Crocker is returning -- be back tonight and meet with Secretary of State late today and that -- the information that he's learned on his week-long stay in Europe will be factored into our deliberations and we'll continue to profit by his trip and to decide what we do with our policy if we do anything to change it.

Q You don't think it's possible to work in tandem with Margaret Thatcher?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes.

Q Did this come up this morning at the leadership meeting -- the South African sanctions?

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q Larry, on that same subject -- Lugar said this morning that the President could probably prevent a final passage of sanctions if he extended or -- the Executive Order -- extended and enlarged the Executive Order or at least timed something to occur before September 9th, September 8th. Can you tell us what kind of

timetable there might be, even on his --

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q -- timetable for putting together Crocker and Thatcher and everything --

MR. SPEAKES: All of the above -- the Ambassador and whatever? No.

Q -- toward the end of this month?

MR. SPEAKES: Saul, we don't have a specific timetable. I think our deliberations within the administration will be governed by all of the above -- the consultations, the South African actions, the situation there, and the President's judgment. So, as to whether -- there's no timetable. The other factor being when the Executive Order expires September 8th or 9th, then we will have to make a decision whether to extend it or add to it or whatever. So there's no specific timetable between then and now -- now and then.

Q Is the President planning to get into specifics tomorrow on drugs?

MR. SPEAKES: At the thing?

Q At the speech?

MR. SPEAKES: Not much more specific than he did yesterday. He may have another item or two to add. But I don't anticipate -- I anticipate these specifics will come as decisions or recommendations are made to him by that Domestic Policy Council and he makes a decision on those recommendations.

Q What's the time frame for that, if you've got an idea?

MR. SPEAKES: I would guess that you will begin to see a flow of actions that will take place beginning in September on through the time period to the end of the Congress. But you will also see other actions where the President attempts to mobilize the private sector as he's done so effectively in so many other issues with meetings of labor leaders, industry and business, sports figures, entertainment figures -- those types will be visiting with the President.

Q You're guiding us to not -- before September -- for things like --

MR. SPEAKES: That's right.

Q -- drug testing or these questions of --

MR. SPEAKES: That's right. There are a lot of discussions that need to take place, including

the legal aspects of many of these things -- consultations with state and local leaders as to what's the best way to proceed, the OMB working on the dollar figures as to what we can spend and should spend on this.

Q Is the President going to make --

MR. SPEAKES: Analyzing present legislation on the Hill, deciding what we will push in that area.

Q Is he going to make specific proposals to President de la Madrid when he meets with him, on the border question? Also, exactly how much detail has already been worked out on this border operation? The New York Times has an article that made it sound --

MR. SPEAKES: A considerable amount of detail has been worked out on the law enforcement aspects of the Southwest Border -- what do they call them? Southwest Border --

MS. BRISLEY: Interdiction?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't know.

MR. SPEAKES: I don't -- I'm trying to think of the project there, the law enforcement project. But there's considerable detail, and I would expect an announcement within the next several days regarding additional steps being taken in the southwest border area. So there is a specific --

Q Is he going to talk to de la Madrid -- specifically propose some kind of a joint action and --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. I haven't really gotten into the de la Madrid visit to know exactly how much detail we will discuss, but certainly, the drug problem will be discussed.

Q In terms of the drug plan, we should consider it now a fait accompli, shouldn't we, that those in sensitive and safety, national security, health, are already under this plan and testing will begin, even before September?

MR. SPEAKES: No. Here's the situation. Testing has begun in all of those areas that Carlton named -- the sensitive areas of safety and law enforcement and national security. I would think between now and the President's return after Labor Day that we will -- there will be a considerable amount of discussion that will have taken place here in Washington, and at that time, sometime in September, I would think that the President would issue some formal directive to Cabinet officers and agency heads.

As Carlton explained yesterday, it would allow discretion, Cabinet discretion or discretion by the agency head, as to which areas fall under the criteria of sensitive areas under the broad guidelines established by the President.

Q Didn't he say everyone with a security clearance?

MR. SPEAKES: No. He indicated that that was what we favored.

Q A lot of people.

MR. SPEAKES: And that's what the President has indicated along those lines.

Q Will the agency heads be free to then decide who within that category should be tested?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know. I think those are the kind of details that are going to have to be worked out.

Q Larry, to follow up on another part of that, is it your understanding that the President has agreed that he and Cabinet officers will take drug tests or was he saying, if they think it will be helpful, then they would?

MR. SPEAKES: If they think it would be helpful, they would.

Q So it's still conditional?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. But I don't think there's any reservation on the part of any Cabinet officer that has been expressed anywhere.

Q How about Shultz?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't see any reservation there. You might ask his spokesman. If your colleagues -- if your counterparts at State are alert, they may ask that question today.

Q They won't comment at State -- or they didn't yesterday. Are there any today?

MR. SPEAKES: They might.

Q I just wondered if we are going to have a text of this K of C talk today?

MR. SPEAKES: We should.

Q What time?

MR. SPEAKES: I'd say shortly before it is delivered. Okay, let's see if we can do it about 2:30 p.m. See where Jeanne stands on getting something.

Q Back for a moment on drugs. Yesterday Turner said that there had been some discussion in the Cabinet and some disagreement over tactics. Is he talking about disagreement over testing?

MR. SPEAKES: I think he was just talking about general tactics in a number of areas, but certainly there are views on testing. The President's statement in the Newsweek interview set policy in that area and I think everybody has fallen into line behind that -- about the mandatory and the voluntary and the different criteria.

Q But in the discussion -- in the Cabinet discussion

MR. SPEAKES: The Cabinet discussion yesterday, no. The Cabinet Council discussion in the last week or ten days, yes. Some people wanted mandatory testing. I don't think it was ever fleshed out into an argument one way or the other that was very specific. But some people said, well, we ought to test everybody if we're going to do it right, and others said, well, you've got legal problems. It was that kind of discussion.

Q Larry, a point of clarification. Dr. Turner said that the administration believed testing should be mandatory for people holding security clearances. Now the federal government has 2.5 million people in that category.

MR. SPEAKES: It's 2.2, Plante.

Q And in addition there are 1.5 million civilian employees of contractors who hold clearances. Should that testing extend to them as well?

MR. SPEAKES: Don't think that we have gone into any specifics about the testing of those who are contractors -- employees of contractors. However, as he mentioned, there is the idea of writing into DOD contracts that a contractor, to bid on a government project, should have an active drug testing program. That is one of the proposals.

MR. PLANTE: You're sure it's not 2.5 when you add everybody else in -- you and Regan and all those guys?

MR. SPEAKES: I'm just citing you. I'm just citing you last night. Didn't you have 2.2?

MR. PLANTE: No, I said over two and a half.

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, I see. I'm sorry, I misread you.

Q Larry, Dr. Turner said that he didn't have any concern about false positives on the drug test, but that concern has been raised, at least in some of the reports. The figure, I think,

was perhaps 1 in 20 is a false positive.

MR. SPEAKES: False positives, though, they customarily retest before there is any action taken, and there is research, some of which -- that we would like to fund that would improve drug testing and lessen the margin of error in drug testing.

Q Well, would a false positive that -- if that person is retested, does that positive still show up on his or her record?

MR. SPEAKES: I doubt it, or if it did, it would show that it was false.

Q Well, they don't know it's false, right?

MR. SPEAKES: But what would happen if you took a test and it said it was -- that you took drugs, and you say, oh, my goodness, I haven't taken any drugs. Then you go back and take the test again. This time it would say you didn't take any drugs and they'd say, well, maybe we had a false positive. John's okay.

Go ahead. Leo.

Q What's the dates of the de la Madrid visit?

MR. SPEAKES: De la Madrid visit, Dan, is it next week?

MR. HOWARD: 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th.

MR. SPEAKES: 13th, 14th, and 15th Dan says.

MR. HOWARD: The 14th is the --

MR. SPEAKES: De la Madrid can stay -- the 14th is our big day here. The 15th he can stay in town and meet with other folks.

MR. ROUSSEL: The 13th is our --

MR. SPEAKES: The 13th's the big day? Okay.

Q When do we get back from Chicago?

MR. SPEAKES: When do we get back? About 11:00 p.m. that night.

Pat?

Q Larry, on the Hill today, the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader and a host of other Congressmen appealed to the television networks to take the lead in an anti-drug campaign similar to the one they did on alcohol abuse. The President didn't mention that. Does he plan to pick up on it, incorporate that in his own approach?

MR. SPEAKES: I hereby appeal to television networks, all of whom led with it last night, by the way.

Q Yes, and how about the newspapers?

MR. SPEAKES: The newspapers had it on the inside, Lou, and Bernie -- Bernie left. He put it on the back page, Bernie did. Lou got it up on page six.

There is a very active program that we may be dealing with maybe before week's end -- the American Advertising Association has a several million dollar advertising program that they are making available to advertisers and they will use those promo spots.

Q -- have a filing break and then come on back.

Q No, let's not come back.

MR. SPEAKES: Let's go -- we ain't coming back. We go, we're gone.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

12:53 P.M. EDT

#1852-08/05

Ralph Bledsoe
rm 200

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
ALBERT R. BRASHEAR

August 7, 1986

The Briefing Room

9:26 A.M. EDT

INDEX

SUBJECT

PAGE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Schedule 1
 Vice President/Lunch
 William Lucas/Photo
 Economic Policy Council
 OIRA Briefing

FOREIGN

Arms Control/SDI 3-6
Foreign Service/Todman 10-11
VP Advance 13
Israel/Spying 16
Drugs/Ambassadors 18

DOMESTIC

NASA/Shuttle 1
22nd Amendment 12-13, 17
Federal Budget 14, 16
Lucas/Michigan Campaign 18

9:56 A.M. EDT

#1854-08/07

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
ALBERT R. BRASHEAR

August 7, 1986

The Briefing Room

9:26 A.M. EDT

MR. BRASHEAR: Okay, the --

Q Are we in USA Today for sure?

MR. BRASHEAR: What?

Q Did we make USA Today?

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, we made USA Today.

Q I haven't seen it yet. He's still a mean little dog.

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, you made it and I made it -- that's correct.

Q I see.

The President's schedule for today -- at noon he will have lunch with the Vice President. At 1:00 p.m. he will have a photo with William Lucas who is the -- what's his position?

MR. PETROSKEY: Republican gubernatorial candidate.

Q County in Michigan.

Q Wayne County.

MR. BRASHEAR: I know that -- Republican gubernatorial candidate in Michigan -- the Wayne County Executive. Is that right?

Q Executive, yes.

MR. BRASHEAR: Okay.

And at 2:00 p.m. the President will attend a meeting of his Economic Policy Council meeting and that's on space privatization. I will tell you for your guidance, we don't expect any decision to be reached in there today. The President is expected to take whatever recommendations he might get from his council under advisement. And all of that will fit in the larger context of the larger decision that he has to make on space, including a fourth orbiter and a mix of ELVs and shuttle flights, etcetera.

Q When do you look for that decision -- the largest decision?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't know. We're still saying several days as far as I know -- as Larry did, and then I'll stick by Larry's definition of several days.

Q Yesterday you said there was no decision on petroleum.

MR. BRASHEAR: In the morning I had not heard of it and

MORE

#1854-08/07

I checked as soon as that was over and was told the decision had been made and we put a piece of paper out -- I'm sorry.

Q I'm not quite clear what's happening on this story.

Q Well this -- the paper said the decision was made the day before.

MR. BRASHEAR: I know, and I said when Larry asked me, he said, has there been a decision, and I said, not that I know of and nobody had informed me -- that's all. But, I apologize for that.

Also, at the conclusion of this briefing we will be releasing copies of the President's memo to the Congress transmitting his regulatory program. And this is the second in an annual series which began last year as part of our effort to improve the management of regulatory activity within the executive branch.

And at 11:00 a.m. this morning there will be a briefing in room 248 of the EOB and that will be conducted by Jim Miller and Wendy Gramm who is the administrator of OIRA, which is the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Copies of this report -- you can get them later this morning at GPO bookstores and apparently we will not have copies here. I think that's probably all on that.

Q You're not going to have any copies here?

MR. PETROSKEY: We have one copy right here.

MR. BRASHEAR: We've just got one copy if you want to come and look at it but --

Q Could you Xerox it? Could you mimeograph it?

Q You can take notes -- report back to the committee

MR. BRASHEAR: It's about -- I think each of you can Xerox it -- your own -- if Sam can find a Xerox machine working.

Q Yes, there'll be copies in there.

Q Could we use your Xerox machine?

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, right.

Q David Gergen got the Xerox machine out of here, you know.

MR. BRASHEAR: I've heard that story. I've heard that story. It's part of the lore of this --

Q Well, yes, but Speakes promised to look into getting a Xerox machine down here that we could all use and he claimed to have gotten --

Q Is that still under review?

MR. BRASHEAR: I think that's still under review and we would still like to be able to accomodate you on that, yes.

Q I just want the record to show that this is --

Q Still under --

Q Still under review.

Q Gergen was always blamed for that. Now we've got to review our --

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, I know.

Q Blow-dryer.

Q A blow what?

Q Blow-dryer.

Q Blow-dryer, I see.

Q Are you --

MR. ROUSSEL: It's still under review.

Q I'm sorry. I'm just finishing up.

MR. BRASHEAR: That's all I've got.

Q Are you -- I'm a little confused about what the President said yesterday on SDI. I mean, here The Washington Times says he pledges to deploy it and not trade it away and The Washington Post's headline is "Reagan SDI Talk Leaves Conservatives Uneasy."

Q Well, there you go again.

Q What is Reagan trying to tell us?

Q There is no --

MR. BRASHEAR: I think he's trying to tell you what he has said all along and that is that SDI is not negotiable. I mean, his statement yesterday was certainly nothing new.

Q Wait a minute.

Q Then why did he make it?

Q Again? Why wasn't it --

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm not talking how others would interpret it. I am just saying what the President has said.

Q Well, I just point that up because one or both of these may be right when it -- but I don't -- I'm not quite clear what you want us to think about Reagan's position on SDI.

MR. BRASHEAR: The President's position, we think, is clear that we intend to go ahead with research and we intend to deploy it and, as he said at the end of his statement yesterday, we do not intend for any delay between that point at which we have perfected it, if in fact we can, and when we deploy it.

Q But if it is not a subject of negotiation, how can Mr. Reagan say that, since unless the third term amendment is abolished, including him, he's not going to be the President? How can he say he's going to deploy anything?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, that is his intent, for right now -- it will be up to those who follow him, but clearly that's the policy that he would like to leave behind him when he leaves office.

Q Is it fair to interpret his remarks yesterday as saying there is nothing in his letter to Gorbachev that mentions any kind of a delay --

MR. BRASHEAR: I will continue saying, as we --

Q -- or a time element?

MR. BRASHEAR: -- as we have all along that we're not commenting on that letter.

Q But that -- you have let hang out there for three weeks now stories saying that he did ask for a delay.

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't think we've let anything hang out there.

Q Or propose a delay.

MR. BRASHEAR: I mean, we didn't write any of those stories and we didn't invite speculation as to what might be in the letters and might not. And --

Q Well, do you agree that he denied yesterday that there is anything in the letter that calls for a delay or that proposes a delay?

MR. BRASHEAR: He said yesterday -- he said I'm the one who's read the letter, I believe, in his remarks -- he said I wrote the letter and I've read it and --

Q He wrote the letter? Do you really want to say that?

MR. BRASHEAR: -- and I will --

Q And he read it. (Laughter.)

MR. BRASHEAR: And I'll leave you with what he said in his remarks yesterday in Room 450 as to what is negotiable and what is not negotiable.

Q Isn't it clear that some of the remarks concerning the fact that conservatives may be uneasy has to do with the fact that some of the Senators yesterday trying to push the President to go -- to place the emphasis on point defense in order to get more immediate results and that he, in fact, in the remarks that he made in his speech, resisted that and said he wants to go with the more full-umbrellaed population defense for the SDI?

MR. BRASHEAR: Dan, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think it's always been our position that we would resist efforts to try and implement an early point defense out of it because, among other things, it eats a pretty large chunk of your research budget.

Q That's not Mr. Perle's position.

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm talking about our position here.

Q Well, who are they? Who are Perle and Weinberger, chopped liver, as the President once said of someone else?

MR. BRASHEAR: They are members of this administration. That's correct.

Sheilah?

Q On this question of no delay --

Q Hold on, Sam. (Laughter.)

Q What is the President's view of when he's going to have these conversations -- when the U.S. is going to have these conversations about sharing it -- that would be during the research phase?

MR. BRASHEAR: When we would have conversations with the Soviets about sharing? Well, I think it would be once our research phase is over, but --

Q But you say there's going to be no delay after deployment?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, I mean, how long a delay you're talking about -- I think that's a term of our -- about how long you consider a delay. Obviously, the President

at the end of the research period, before it is, in fact, over, he could be discussing it with the Soviets -- or whomever is President, actually, could be discussing it with the Soviets at that time. And that doesn't mean that there would be a delay then at the actual end of the research phase.

Q Abram has said -- Abrahamson has said that it would

MR. BRASHEAR: Is that clear?

Q No. (Laughter.)

Q -- take ten years -- ten years to have a system. Does the President agree with that?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't know about what estimates we've put it at how long it would be.

MR. HOWARD: It's not over until the fat lady sings. You don't know what you've got until you go through the --

Q Well, isn't he operating on Abrahamson's timetable and so forth, or does he have his own?

Q His own.

MR. HOWARD: We're operating at the leading edge of technology and no one can predict precisely when a total -- the effective system will be available.

Q Pushing the envelope.

MR. BRASHEAR: Thanks, Chris. You have the right stuff.

Yes, Ira. (Laughter.)

Q Well, Abrahamson has said ten years.

Q Did you see what happened to your comment about --

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, I saw that.

Q Is there some contention about the ten years?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm sorry -- Ira you had a question.

Q Is it -- I'd like to ask Dan --

MR. HOWARD: He's the briefer.

Q Then would you ask Dan this question? (Laughter.)

Q Wait a minute, that's --

MR. BRASHEAR: Thanks, Ira.

Q Is it true that what the President was denying -- is it fair to say that the President was denying yesterday -- was that there would be any delay in the research and testing as opposed to deployment? He didn't -- one way of reading --

Q We can't hear you back here. It must be a big secret.

MR. HOWARD: I think we have to stand by the President's words. He said, "Let me reassure you right here and now that our response to demands that we cut off or delay research and testing or close shop is no way."

Q Nobody is -- nobody with any part in this is suggesting delaying research and testing. They're talking about delaying deployment.

MR. BRASHEAR: The President said --

Q So is -- by not denying that, does that confirm it?

MR. BRASHEAR: The President said then, at the end of his remarks -- I thought I wrote it down --

Q As if in an afterthought -- wandering off.

Q -- research is complete, yes, we're going to deploy.

MR. BRASHEAR: Say it again -- excuse me.

Q His very last statement is, "When the time has come and the research is complete, yes, we are going to deploy."

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes. I think that's pretty specific, Ira.

Q That doesn't preclude a delay in deployment though.

Q That's right.

Q I guess what people are asking is will he deploy some before the research is complete? I know that doesn't make much sense but --

MR. BRASHEAR: I think that addresses the question of a point plan and we've already talked about that. The President is opposed to that.

Q He said in the speech he was opposed to it.

MR. BRASHEAR: That's right.

Q Well, see, we all have our positions and we don't know what to make of this.

MR. BRASHEAR: Barry?

Q I think he proposed something in that letter.

Q When was this decision to send a team over to Moscow

--

Q Well, senior officials here seem to think so.

Q We can't hear the question.

MR. BRASHEAR: The decision was made --

Q Can we have a little quiet, please?

Q There's five people talking all at once.

MR. BRASHEAR: Could we hold it down just a little bit? The question was when was a decision made to send a team of experts to the Soviet Union? And the question arose -- I mean the decision arose after the Soviets and the Americans had a work plan and it was their offer, and the decision was made after that.

Q And that was when? Wasn't that last --

MR. BRASHEAR: That was made, Barry, during the visit --

Q Bessmyrtnykh.

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, Bessmyrtnykh. How's that?

Q How could it be then that both Nitze and Perle would leave the country on vacation? From what I can see they left after that meeting took place and now they're being recalled, in fact, to go to Moscow.

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, I would imagine first of all you make a decision to participate and then after you've made that then the selection process -- you decide who's going to attend.

Q Can you explain exactly what that delegation -- those talks are expected to achieve?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, we think that it will -- that it will be a continuation of discussions of those issues in the broader context and our statement yesterday made it clear that this meeting is intended to support both the NST negotiations as well as the September 19th and 20th meeting of Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. And we view the September meeting as part of the progress which we expect to lead to a summit meeting in the U.S. as agreed to by the two leaders in Geneva last November.

Q If I can follow-up, though -- I mean, you do have the NST talks due to resume anyway in Geneva -- I think, what -- September 16?

MR. BRASHEAR: Mid-September, yes.

Q So what's the point of these? Is it in effect to give a jump start to those talks -- not to wait a full month, another month until -- to being discussing those issues?

MR. BRASHEAR: As he said, it intends to support them, that's correct, and it is a part of the work plan of the continuation of steps that would lead, we hope, to a summit this year.

Q Rusty, do we have any indication that the Soviets have ready a formal response and are prepared to get down to brass tacks to the President's letter to Gorbachev and the recent correspondence regarding the arms negotiations -- the specifics?

MR. BRASHEAR: I just -- I don't know that. I mean, we'll have to wait and see.

Q Well, in fact, does the U.S. have a formal response, I mean, beyond the letter which is only two and a half pages, apparently? Does it have a full, detailed diplomatic response yet to the Gorbachev proposal of June?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm not going to comment on that now.

Lou?

Q When Bessmyrtnykh was here, the President said he'd accepted the Soviet work plan and to accelerate plans for the summit. Was this meeting part of the work plan at the time -- when the administration was accepting that, was this particular meeting in Moscow envisioned as part of that?

MR. BRASHEAR: The meeting was. I'm not sure if the place and exact date were. I'm not sure if it was spelled out that specifically.

Dan?

MR. HOWARD: The work plan calls for meetings of experts at various levels leading up to the summit. This is one of those experts talks, but -- as differentiated from the regular negotiating session at NST which will take place in mid-September in Geneva. The --

Q I don't understand that.

MR. HOWARD: The meeting -- this meeting of experts was proposed, but the timing was not yet worked out. The timing has now been worked out and the meeting's going to take place. You may expect additional experts-level meetings leading up to the summit.

Q But when this meeting was proposed it was not proposed with these players specifically, was it? When did you decide to send these players?

MR. HOWARD: The Soviets, obviously, do not designate who constitutes our delegation.

Q Right. So when did you decide to send these players -- to call Perle back and to make sure that Nitze and Perle were both there?

MR. BRASHEAR: At some point before we announced it. I don't think it's pertinent.

Q Yes, well --

Q How does this high level team differentiate -- why is that different from a negotiating team when you've had other expert meetings or talked about them?

MR. BRASHEAR: These meetings are experts meetings and they are not set up to negotiate.

Q But what you have in other meetings -- I presume in the past when you send experts, you send somewhat lower-level people who are, as these gentlemen are, quite versed --

MR. HOWARD: Are you denying that these people are experts, Ira?

Q No, no I'm not at all. I'm suggesting they're higher than experts and I'm wondering what the difference is in this high level a team between an experts meeting and a negotiations --

MR. BRASHEAR: As a part of the work plan we set forth some meetings which we intend only to be discussions between experts and there are other meetings at which we'd expect there to be negotiations. And --

Q Well, what does the word expert mean in this little --

MR. BRASHEAR: Ira, I'm not going to try and define what an expert is here, but I think it's clear that these people all are.

Q The last time it was discussed, the implication was that these are the people who do the nitty-gritty, who know the exact details, who work on the scientific --

Q The Nitze-gritty. (Laughter.)

Q -- aspects of these and not negotiators, like you've now said negotiators. So does the word expert not have the same meaning?

MR. BRASHEAR: If you want, Ira, I suppose you could assume that it connotes that there are no negotiations expected, therefore it's an experts meeting. But that doesn't mean that experts can't also attend negotiation sessions.

Q But why are they meeting? To lay out an agenda?

MR. BRASHEAR: To discuss -- we've already talked about

that, as we said in there -- a variety of issues which we think are relevant.

Q But discuss them to what end?

MR. BRASHEAR: But they will be supportive. We think that they will be supportive towards the later meeting between Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, as well as the subsequent NST meetings which will again resume in Geneva in mid-September.

Q Is the President distressed that Ambassador Todman has withdrawn his name from consideration to be the Ambassador to South Africa?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't think that we need to comment on our selection process until we have an actual candidate.

Q Well, when did it become practice for members of the Foreign Service under consideration to hold public news conferences to say that they were withdrawing? I thought if you were a member of the Foreign Service you did what you were asked to.

MR. BRASHEAR: Never been a member of the Foreign Service and I'm not going to comment on what are their rules of etiquette and what they are not. I'll leave that to State and let them talk about that.

Q Two people whose names have been widely suggested by senior officials as being under consideration who have gotten up extensively on their own and held news conferences to withdraw. How long can this go on? (Laughter.)

Q Until they run out of high ranking, black diplomats. (Laughter.)

MR. BRASHEAR: Sam, it -- I suppose that theoretically it could go on as long as we continue to deliberate what we think is a very important choice that the President will eventually make.

Q Well, I mean --

Q Should I -- yes, go ahead.

Q Isn't Sam's question not -- a relevant question? It isn't about the selection process. It was a question about what the White House view is of what Todman has done. I mean, it isn't asking a question about who you're picking.

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm not going to comment on how Mr. Todman wants to discuss whether he is a candidate, whether he is not a candidate. I mean, I don't think that we should express any viewpoint on that.

Q Then it doesn't concern the White House at all? I mean, you're not concerned by it?

MR. BRASHEAR: That's correct, so far as -- and I'm not even aware of exactly what he's going to say and I don't think I should express any

view yet until we find out what he has said.

Q Was he offered the job?

Q I think he said it. I may be misinformed.

Q Was he offered the job?

Q I think he has.

MR. BRASHEAR: The last I heard right before I came down here is he was prepared to say something, but he had not yet made any announcement. So we'll just have to wait and see what he has to say.

Q Okay.

Q Third term?

MR. BRASHEAR: Ira, let's let someone else come up if we could.

Q If we could stay on the Todman thing for just a moment, it's been known for several days, at least, that he was going to be doing this. Has this in any way slowed down the -- the White House knew that Todman, several days ago, was no longer interested in the job, that he was withdrawing his name.

MR. BRASHEAR: Again, Frank, I'm not going to comment on a selection process, okay?

Q I -- make a mistake. (Laughter.)

Q Oh.

MR. BRASHEAR: Why don't you at least stand while you're doing it?

Q In any case -- (laughter) --

Q Will you take questions? Private seminars?

Q My question is, does Todman's withdrawal from this contest in any manner set back the White House effort to name a new ambassador to South Africa?

MR. BRASHEAR: Will Todman's statement set back any efforts? Is that what you said?

Q No, no, no, no. Is Todman's lack of interest --

MR. BRASHEAR: Sorry.

Q -- in being ambassador.

MR. BRASHEAR: We have never -- we have never stated that we were in fact considering Mr. Todman. So I don't think -- and we would not under any circumstances. We just don't discuss the selection process of ambassadors or other officials. And so I don't -- I think it's pointless to go over this.

Q Well, why would he hold a news conference? Isn't that bizarre?

Q Yes.

Q When do you expect to name a new ambassador to South Africa?

Q If he's never been offered the job --

MR. BRASHEAR: As soon as we find the person whom we think is qualified for the assignment.

Q The President said, "the man."

Q Lucas -- (laughter) --

Q Wallace is taking his name out.

Q I'm taking my name out too right now.

Q Is the President going to the rally in Lafayette Park?

MR. BRASHEAR: Why? Because you're not a man? I don't understand. (Laughter.)

Q Is the President going to the rally in Lafayette Park?

Q As long as everybody who hasn't been offered the job is taking their names out.

Q Will you have anything to do with the rally in Lafayette Park?

MR. BRASHEAR: The one concerning the repeal of the 22nd Amendment?

Q Yes.

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't think we're going to be involved in that. The President's views are pretty well stated, that since he has been in office, he has changed his mind with regard to how appropriate it is to have a -- that amendment. He thinks it is -- that it's not really helpful to the democratic process -- if the American people would like to have someone serve more than two terms, they should have the right. But he has also said -- and please make sure you point this out in your stories -- he has said over and over that he does not think if that were to happen, if there were to be a repeal of the 22nd Amendment, that it should apply to him, or for that matter, to any -- well, I think he's also said that whichever President is serving at the time that the amendment might be repealed.

Q Well, how long has he held these views? Do you know?

MR. BRASHEAR: He first mentioned it right about the time that I first came here, which was April of '85.

Q I know. But has he only expressed them while being President, or did he have a view before?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, he has said that -- before that he has always thought that the 22nd Amendment was proper. I mean, he has said over and over, Helen, that this represented the change of position on his part, so I think we can assume --

Q It was a change in position?

MR. BRASHEAR: That's what he said.

Q Oh, okay.

Q Well --

Q Since he's been President?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, he has not said, "Since I've been

President, I've changed my mind." He doesn't say it necessarily because he was President it changed his mind, but, yes, the change in his thought process did occur while he was serving as President.

Q To follow up on this --

Q Rusty?

MR. BRASHEAR: Sarah, you're next.

Q Did I understand you to say that he said that he did not think that if they extended it that it should apply to the President who was sitting at the time they extended it?

Q Yes.

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, I believe that is what he has said.

Q I didn't get that in his last speech or two when he was discussing that.

MR. BRASHEAR: No, he has spoken on it several times.

Q When he was discussing this, he said he didn't think he would seek to extend it for himself, but are you sure he said that he did not think that any president --

MR. BRASHEAR: Sarah, we can check that for you. It's my recollection, but, again, I'll check that for you and we'll talk about it later.

Q While I have the floor -- (Laughter.)

Q She has a statement that she would like to make.

Q Is there any doubt?

Q Is the White House going to do anything to punish these advance people for Bush who gave this country such a peculiar image in the Middle East -- these advance men?

MR. BRASHEAR: No.

Q You're not going to do anything about it?

MR. BRASHEAR: No.

Q You're just going to let them go on with the President as advance men in the future?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't think we're going to do anything about it.

If you want to talk about unusual punishment for unusual acts, I was handed this morning a UPI story out of New York where a City Councilman from the Bronx has suggested that drug dealers be caged as animals or chained to the bodies of dead addicts as punishment for selling illegal narcotics.

I won't read the entire story, but what was interesting was, he said that convicted drug dealers should be put in cages, abandoned subway cars -- which is what I liked, abandoned subway cars -- or chained to lightposts or fences at the locations where they are apprehended.

And, again, let me make sure there is no connection between this and Sarah's question. (Laughter.) We do not hope to recommend this as punishment for any advance men who might have strayed from whatever course he was set to pursue.

Q Is Mr. Reagan distressed that he now has a budget deficit projected for this year of \$230.2 billion?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, as our mid-session review pointed out, absolutely -- what, excuse me?

Q Record -- peacetime record. That may be a wartime record, too.

MR. BRASHEAR: That is correct.

Q Well, is he distressed?

MR. BRASHEAR: Yes, we have said over and over that we are distressed by --

Q No, no, not we -- excuse me, but Ronald Reagan -- is he distressed?

MR. BRASHEAR: I have not had a chance to ask the President since the mid-session review came out if he is concerned, but certainly the President has been on record many times before as saying he is opposed to high deficits.

Q Well, he is the biggest spending President in our history.

Q Does he remember that he was going to balance the budget? (Laughter.)

MR. BRASHEAR: I would -- there are several reasons, which Jim Miller went over at some length yesterday, as to the reasons why we think the FY 86 budget has reached such perilous heights, and if you'd like, we can go over some of that. But I think it was covered pretty exhaustively yesterday.

Q Why was the Congressional meeting cancelled today -- bipartisan?

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't know. I have no idea. Might have been a scheduling problem. I really don't know.

Q Is the President doing something else during that time period?

MR. BRASHEAR: He is meeting with senior staff.

Q I don't want to be facetious, but are you planning on announcing any news today? Is there anything you guys have to say about -- that you --

MR. BRASHEAR: We'll see. There might be a little bit of news at noon.

Q What was the question?

MR. BRASHEAR: The question was, are we -- and he indicated he was not trying to be facetious -- the questioner asked if we intended to make any news today or announce anything. Lou asked that. And I responded that we might have an announcement to make at noon today that might make some news.

Q Big, little, medium?

Q Domestic or foreign?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'll let you all determine that. I would not call it. I'm really not here to characterize how big a story is. That's you all's job.

Q Cameras or not for cameras?

MR. BRASHEAR: Not for cameras.

Q Foreign or domestic?

Q It's either not big or not good, one or the other.

MR. BRASHEAR: All or nothing, foreign or domestic.

Q Will the President be in the briefing room?

Q Bigger than a breadbox?

MR. BRASHEAR: Smaller than a breadbox, bigger than a breadbox? I don't know. Tall?

Q Is the President reading The Washington Post series on the Israeli infiltration of our government?

MR. BRASHEAR: The question was, is the President reading The Washington Post series on Israeli infiltration of our government? And I do not know.

Q Rusty --

MR. BRASHEAR: Saul?

Q Back on the deficit for a minute.

Q Is that a question or a statement?

Q -- reading -- looking at the last year's mid-session review, you're, on the deficit for this year, off by about \$57 billion. I wonder what the --

MR. BRASHEAR: As compared to the mid-session review last year?

Q Yes. \$173 billion is what --

MR. BRASHEAR: \$172 billion was the --

Q -- the mid-session review last year.

MR. BRASHEAR: And that was also the CBO figure.

Q I'm suggesting --

MR. BRASHEAR: I mean the CBR -- excuse me -- that was the Congressional budget resolution figure.

Q I'm simply trying to figure out what then kind of confidence can we put in the mid-session review this year --

Q Same kind.

Q -- that calls for 4.2 percent growth and a deficit for next year of --

MR. BRASHEAR: Both Director Miller, when talking about deficits, and Chairman Sprinkel of the CEA have said over and over, as I believe the people at CBO would tell you also, and any economist, that forecasting is not a sure thing, never has been.

Q Well, as you know, the CBO has a much larger budget deficit figure --

MR. BRASHEAR: That's correct. Their deficit figure is higher. We tend to think that -- can we have order in here. Someone's interested in this --

Q We can't hear on the front row here. (Laughter.)

Q Great line, it's a great line.

MR. BRASHEAR: One of the reasons --

Q I'm afraid I simply can't participate in jocular -- in this crap.

Q Ohhh.

Q Why don't you let people ask questions and answer

questions and see what the hell goes on in this place?

MR. BRASHEAR: I would agree.

Q I withdraw my remark about civility made two weeks ago.

MR. BRASHEAR: Ira?

Q Third term -- the people who are sponsoring this rally and promoting it with flyers and advertising and news media announcements are all saying that this is a chance to fire the first shot to get Reagan a third term, to win one more for the Gipper, et cetera. It's clearly aimed at reelecting Reagan. First of all, how does the White House or the President feel about that? And, number two, would he be of a mind to tell them not to do it on that basis?

MR. BRASHEAR: The President has said over and over that he, under no circumstances, intends to seek a third term. And I don't -- I mean I don't know how more plainly he could say it.

Q Well, I understand what he has said in his speeches and in interviews, but I -- is it not curious that people who are long-time Reagan supporters are promoting a rally in his front yard suggesting that the purpose of repealing the amendment is to give him a third term? Might he not tell them not to do it?

MR. BRASHEAR: It is not curious and I do not know if he intends to tell them that or not. But he has -- as I said, he has said it on many occasions. I'm sure that the President is flattered by those who support him, but he has no intention, Ira, under any circumstances, to seek a third term.

Q So he --

Q Let me follow, if I may -- just one more on this. When you began the subject, you said I don't think the White House is going to get involved. Was there some point at which the White House was involved in talking to these -- this coalition?

MR. BRASHEAR: No. Under no circumstances that I'm aware of.

Bob?

Q Why is the President meeting with Lucas? He met with him about a year ago.

Q What?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, he just won a primary. He is now our party's -- the President's party's candidate for election to governor in Michigan, which is a major state in this nation. It's a big race. He indicated he would like to meet with the President and the President is very happy to do so.

Q Is that normal for primary winners to have a meeting --

MR. BRASHEAR: It's not unusual.

Q He intends to go into Michigan to campaign? First time since he's nominated.

Q Has it been determined which U.S. ambassadors will be called back in September for the consultations on drugs?

MR. BRASHEAR: Still looking at a final list. I'm told that the number will probably be somewhere between 15 and 20, but we don't know exactly which ambassadors that would be yet.

Sarah?

Q When can we expect some action on that proposal of his to add to enforcement personnel?

Q Are you just leaving normally, or are you making a protest?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm sorry. Add to enforcement personnel?

Q Yes, he said something about in the future, we will be making the decisions on adding to personnel enforcement against drugs. When do you think we'll expect them --

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, all the decisions on the President's war on drugs will be coming out as they're made. And I really can't tell you when it would happen. I don't have a good feel for what that date would be, Sarah.

Yes?

Q What's this ambassador meeting going to do, Rusty?

MR. BRASHEAR: I'm sorry. Excuse me?

Q Ambassador's meeting on drugs.

MR. BRASHEAR: I don't know what the exact remarks would be, but as the President indicated, he would talk to them about strengthening our efforts in working with other countries to help stop the flow of illicit drugs into this country.

And --

Q What might they include?

MR. BRASHEAR: Well, we'll just have to wait and see. I don't have -- I can't say exactly what --

Q I can't find anything else.

THE PRESS: Thank you.