

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 - September 1986] (28)
Box: 24

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

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

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

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 8, 1986

NOTE FOR JIM MURR

FROM: CHUCK KUBIC

Chuck Kubic

SUBJ: House Omnibus Drug Bill

Ralph Bledsoe asked me to send you
a copy of the current draft statement
on the House Omnibus Drug Bill.

Please call if you have any questions.

September 5, 1986
(House)

H.R. - Omnibus Drug Enforcement,
Education, and Control Act of 1986

The Administration supports carefully targeted enforcement, education, treatment, and control initiatives to combat the Nation's drug problem, and a comprehensive review of such initiatives is now nearing completion. This review will result in meaningful proposals, both legislative and administrative, to address the drug problem in a lasting manner.

The House Omnibus Drug Enforcement, Education, and Control Act of 1986 contains many good proposals, but some proposals involve ill-conceived (though well-intended) ideas or ideas that require further study and evaluation. Several proposals, if enacted, would be seriously counter-productive, such as the reduction of United States aid to Mexico's drug eradication program pending the conclusion of the Camarena investigation - a program which benefits the United States as well as Mexico.

We agree that a comprehensive legislative response to the drug problem is appropriate and that as much prudent legislation as possible should be enacted before the end of the present session of Congress. The Administration has over the course of the past two years presented a variety of worthwhile legislative proposals to the Congress and will be presenting additional proposals in the days ahead, all of which have been the subject of careful consideration and study. We believe that the House bill should be amended to include only those proposals that are genuinely worthwhile and that have been the subject of careful study by the Congress. Finally, we believe that restoration of the amounts initially requested in the President's 1987 budget for drug law enforcement activities is the first step in making a cost effective and intellectually honest response to the drug problem.

OMB

September 5, 1986
(House)

H.R. _____ - Omnibus Drug Enforcement,
Education, and Control Act of 1986


The Administration supports carefully targeted enforcement, education, treatment, and control initiatives to combat the Nation's drug problem, and a comprehensive review of such initiatives is now nearing completion. This review will result in meaningful proposals, both legislative and administrative, to address the drug problem in a lasting manner.

Although there are several good proposals contained in H.R. _____ that the Administration could support (e.g., restoration of the amounts initially requested in the President's 1987 budget for drug law enforcement activities) the bill contains many ill-conceived ideas and the Administration opposes the bill. H.R. _____ is a costly and not well integrated compilation of miscellaneous initiatives, many of which could not be implemented in an effective and timely manner. Several proposals, if enacted would be seriously counter-productive, such as the reduction of United States aid to Mexico's drug eradication program pending the conclusion of the Camarena investigation -- a program which benefits the United States as well as Mexico. The drug problem is simply too critical to enact comprehensive legislation without thoroughly considering the effectiveness and workability of proposed initiatives.

We agree that a comprehensive legislative response to the drug problem is needed and that the Congress should pass prudent legislation before the end of the present session. Over the course of the past two years, the Administration has presented a variety of worthwhile legislative proposals to the Congress. The Administration will be presenting additional proposals in the days ahead, all of which have been the subject of careful consideration and study. After presenting its legislative and administrative initiatives, the Administration will work closely with the Congress to enact legislation that is properly targeted, contains the appropriate resources, and can be implemented in a manner to achieve truly lasting results.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
September 11, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR EDWIN MEESE III

FROM: RALPH C. BLEDSOE 
SUBJECT: Cabinet Meeting on Drug Abuse Policy

The Cabinet will meet today at 2:00 p.m. in the Cabinet Room to discuss Drug Abuse Policy. Following the Cabinet photograph, you should lead discussion of the three major decisions the Domestic Policy Council is asking the President to make. They are:

1. Approve submitting the proposed legislative package to support the President's six drug abuse policy goals.
 2. Approve development and implementation of an Executive Order to achieve a drug-free Federal workplace.
 3. Approve implementation of action steps recommended in the Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy Report.
- o You may wish to provide background on the Council's meetings on this issue and the formation of the Working Group, as well as the NDEPB participation and actions.
 - o Carlton Turner can provide further background about the Working Group, its Task Forces, and the report.
 - o Legislation - You or Richard Willard could go through the legislation title by title, pausing for discussion of issues that were raised by Council members. Two or three issues should be resolved by the President in this discussion.
 - The "tone" of Title I. This would assure those who objected to the harshness, that the President's emphasis on voluntarism and treatment will be in the transmittal language.
 - The issue of proposing repeal or modification of the Mansfield Amendment.
 - The issue of whether to include the death penalty for drug traffickers.
 - o You can discuss the legislative strategy if needed, pointing out what Congress has done, and indicate that our proposals have been cleared by OMB and are ready for submittal after the Sunday evening address.

- o Executive Order - The second topic, the Executive Order can also be discussed by you or Richard Willard. You might give an overview of the 7 sections, and then review the two issues the Council could not resolve:
 - Whether to authorize agencies the discretion to test all job applicants, or only to test applicants for sensitive positions. The President had previously expressed a preference to only test for sensitive positions, but several agencies have asked for reconsideration.
 - Options for defining sensitive positions. Three options are offered: to include all nine specific categories of positions, include a list of fewer categories, or only include a general statement.

- o Other Drug Abuse Policy Initiatives. The third topic, other initiatives proposed in the Working Group report, will be handled by Carlton Turner. He will indicate the major initiatives under each of the six goals, and describe the specific action steps recommended by the Working Group.

These include a number of Executive Branch actions to strengthen Federal programs, and to work with the private sector to support the President and Mrs. Reagan's drug prevention efforts.

- o At the end of the meeting, you might re-emphasize the overall theme: holding drug user's accountable for their actions, and seeking a drug-free America.

cc Alfred H. Kingon
Becky N. Dunlop

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 11, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL
SUBJECT: Drug Abuse Policy Initiatives

Issue: What initiatives should be in the Administration's Drug Abuse Policy package?

Background: On August 4, 1986, you announced six new goals to build upon past accomplishments to curb drug abuse, and to lead Americans toward a drug-free society. Your six goals are:

- o Drug-Free Workplaces
- o Drug-Free Schools
- o Expand Drug Treatment and Research
- o Improve International Cooperation
- o Strengthen Law Enforcement
- o Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

The Domestic Policy Council established a Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy to develop legislation and other action steps to implement initiatives in support of the goals. The Working Group, in conjunction with the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board (NDEPB), has recommended comprehensive legislative proposals, an Executive Order for a drug-free Federal workforce, and other specific actions. These were reviewed by the Domestic Policy Council, and are described in the Working Group report.

Legislation - The Administration's legislative initiative is a comprehensive proposal with a separate title keyed to each of your six goals. It was discussed by the Domestic Policy Council, and is a coordinated, balanced package supporting the attack on both drug supply and demand. The proposed legislation would redirect FY 87 outlays by approximately \$300 million, and bring total annual spending on drug abuse programs to about \$2.8 billion. Senate Republicans are waiting for details of our proposal before proceeding with a bill of their own.

There is some disagreement among Council members on the tone of Title I, Drug-Free Workplaces, of the proposed legislation. A few feel it is too harsh and that it may draw negative publicity. Other Council members feel that it and the Executive Order will strengthen our ability and that of government contractors and private industry to make workplaces drug-free, and that we can make your intent quite clear in transmittal documents.

Two other issues require your clarification. First, whether our legislation should include Justice's recommendation for repeal of the Mansfield Amendment, which prohibits Federal officers from participating in drug arrests in foreign countries; or, State's recommendation to modify it to lift restrictions only in countries with special treaties.

Mansfield Amendment:

_____ Seek to Repeal _____ Seek to Modify

Second, the proposed legislation does not prescribe the death penalty for major traffickers. While you have previously opposed this under certain conditions, some Council members feel a stronger position may now be needed because of Congressional proposals calling for the death penalty.

Death Penalty for Major Drug Traffickers:

_____ Include _____ Do Not Include

Executive Order - The Council also discussed a draft Executive Order which focuses on achieving a drug-free Federal workplace, and complements Title I of the proposed Administration legislation. Our legislative proposal amends appropriate laws to make it clear that there is no Federal statutory bar to drug testing in the workplace or in educational institutions. The draft Executive Order sets an example by balancing intolerance of illegal drug use with fair treatment of individual employees. It stresses voluntary compliance and treatment for employees seeking help. Drug screening guidelines are established for the Executive Branch, allowing flexibility by department and agency heads. The Order authorizes testing of Federal employees holding sensitive positions that affect safety and security, and permits corrective administrative action if employees do not accept a "helping hand."

Two issues require your clarification. First, the proposed Executive Order authorizes mandatory testing of applicants for sensitive jobs. While you have previously indicated a preference for testing only applicants for sensitive positions, some departments, including Defense, have asked for reconsideration to allow them the flexibility to test all job applicants.

Authorize Agencies the discretion to test applicants for:

_____ All Positions _____ Sensitive Positions Only

Second, Justice proposes that the Executive Order list nine categories of sensitive positions to support legal defense of mandatory testing. Other Council members argue that we could reduce political resistance by not specifying categories of

employees such as Senior Executives, Schedule C employees, the uniformed services, and air traffic controllers; or, by only making a general reference to positions involving safety and security, or which require a high degree of trust and confidence.

Options for definition of sensitive positions:

- _____ Include specific categories
- _____ Fewer, more general categories
- _____ General description only

Other Initiatives - Additional drug policy initiatives for each goal are outlined below, and are presented in detail in the Working Group report.

Goal #1 - Drug-Free Workplaces

- o Accelerate development of a drug-free Federal workplace.
- o Work with government contractors, and private sector management and labor leaders to fight drug abuse in the workplace.
- o Encourage States and local governments and their contractors to pursue drug-free workplaces.
- o Communicate accurate and credible information about elimination of drug abuse in the workplace.

Goal #2 - Drug-Free Schools

- o Issue Schools Without Drugs to communicate accurate and credible information on how to achieve drug-free schools.
- o Encourage all schools to establish a policy of being drug free through grants administered under the proposed Zero Tolerance Act, and through anti-drug activities developed by communities and student leaders.
- o Ensure that Federal laws against distributing drugs in or near schools are extended and enforced in cooperation with local authorities.

Goal #3 - Expand Drug Abuse Treatment and Research

- o Encourage States and communities to develop programs to treat specific drug-related health problems through new demonstration grants and elimination of unnecessary restrictions imposed under current block grant programs.
- o Expand drug abuse research in health-related areas, including drug testing.

- o Strengthen medical and health programs aimed at drug abuse prevention by establishing a Center for Substance Abuse Prevention within HHS.
- o Support efforts to achieve a drug-free Federal workplace.

Goal #4 - Improve International Cooperation

- o Convene a conference for U.S. Ambassadors in October to convey an international sense of urgency and to discuss increased regional cooperation.
- o Repeal the Mansfield Amendment to allow Federal officers to participate in drug arrests in foreign countries, seek authorization to confiscate U.S. property of drug dealers who violate foreign laws, and amend immigration requirements to allow deportation of alien drug traffickers.

Goal #5 - Strengthen Law Enforcement

- o Continue to execute Operation Alliance to increase cooperative drug law enforcement along the United States - Mexican border.
- o Seek legislation addressing such areas as penalties for large-scale domestic drug trafficking, punishments for possession of controlled substances, increased penalties for leaders of major drug rings, import/export violations, juvenile drug trafficking, and clandestine drug manufacturing.
- o Strengthen money laundering enforcement and penalties.
- o Seek to restore appropriate level of FY 1987 funding for law enforcement agents, prosecutors, and prison facilities.

Goal #6 - Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

- o Encourage all Americans to join the First Lady's drug abuse awareness and prevention campaign through a nationally televised address, letters soliciting fortune 500 support, a series of White House briefings, a "presidential Honor Role" for significant contributors, national drug prevention poster and essay contests, and major media campaigns to reinforce positive peer pressure and to make drug use socially unacceptable.
- o Encourage corporations, service organizations, and the media to develop drug prevention programs.
- o Ensure that every American has access to accurate and effective information about drug abuse and strategies for eliminating drugs from our society.

- o Propose legislation to facilitate private sector support and use of drug abuse material developed for foreign audiences.
- o Reduce illegal drug activity in Public Housing Authorities.

Data collected by HHS indicates that your drug abuse policy goals are right on target. An estimated 67 percent of all cocaine users have only minimal demand and will respond to social unacceptance, awareness and prevention efforts, and strict no-drug use policies in schools and workplaces, including drug testing where appropriate. Polls indicate that the public will also respond favorably to strong leadership from the Federal government, and will accept a firm, yet fair, drug prevention program which attacks both supply and demand in our workplaces, in our schools, and throughout our society.

Recommendations: The Domestic Policy Council recommends that you approve the following initiatives for inclusion in your Drug Abuse Policy package: 1) the proposed six-part legislative package, 2) the Executive Order supporting a drug-free Federal workforce, and 3) action steps supporting the major policy initiatives in the Drug Abuse Policy Working Group report.


 Ralph C. Bledsoe
 Executive Secretary

Decisions:

I. Submit the proposed legislative package consistent with the above direction, to support the Administration's six drug abuse policy goals.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

II. Develop and implement an Executive Order consistent with the above features and direction, to achieve a drug-free Federal workforce.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

III. Implement the action steps recommended by the Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy and the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board, consistent with the major initiatives listed above.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Approve as Modified

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 11, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL
SUBJECT: Drug Abuse Policy Initiatives

Issue: What initiatives should be in the Administration's Drug Abuse Policy package?

Background: On August 4, 1986, you announced six new goals to build upon past accomplishments to curb drug abuse, and to lead Americans toward a drug-free society. Your six goals are:

- o Drug-Free Workplaces
- o Drug-Free Schools
- o Expand Drug Treatment and Research
- o Improve International Cooperation
- o Strengthen Law Enforcement
- o Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

The Domestic Policy Council established a Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy to develop legislation and other action steps to implement initiatives in support of the goals. The Working Group, in conjunction with the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board (NDEPB), has recommended comprehensive legislative proposals, an Executive Order for a drug-free Federal workforce, and other specific actions. These were reviewed by the Domestic Policy Council, and are described in the Working Group report.

Legislation - The Administration's legislative initiative is a comprehensive proposal with a separate title keyed to each of your six goals. It was discussed by the Domestic Policy Council, and is a coordinated, balanced package supporting the attack on both drug supply and demand. The proposed legislation would redirect FY 87 outlays by approximately \$300 million, and bring total annual spending on drug abuse programs to about \$2.8 billion. Senate Republicans are waiting for details of our proposal before proceeding with a bill of their own.

There is some disagreement among Council members on the tone of Title I, Drug-Free Workplaces, of the proposed legislation. A few feel it is too harsh and that it may draw negative publicity. Other Council members feel that it and the Executive Order will strengthen our ability and that of government contractors and private industry to make workplaces drug-free, and that we can make your intent quite clear in transmittal documents.

Two other issues require your clarification. First, whether our legislation should include Justice's recommendation for repeal of the Mansfield Amendment, which prohibits Federal officers from participating in drug arrests in foreign countries; or, State's recommendation to modify it to lift restrictions only in countries with special treaties.

Mansfield Amendment:

_____ Seek to Repeal _____ Seek to Modify

Second, the proposed legislation does not prescribe the death penalty for major traffickers. While you have previously opposed this under certain conditions, some Council members feel a stronger position may now be needed because of Congressional proposals calling for the death penalty.

Death Penalty for Major Drug Traffickers:

_____ Include _____ Do Not Include

Executive Order - The Council also discussed a draft Executive Order which focuses on achieving a drug-free Federal workplace, and complements Title I of the proposed Administration legislation. Our legislative proposal amends appropriate laws to make it clear that there is no Federal statutory bar to drug testing in the workplace or in educational institutions. The draft Executive Order sets an example by balancing intolerance of illegal drug use with fair treatment of individual employees. It stresses voluntary compliance and treatment for employees seeking help. Drug screening guidelines are established for the Executive Branch, allowing flexibility by department and agency heads. The Order authorizes testing of Federal employees holding sensitive positions that affect safety and security, and permits corrective administrative action if employees do not accept a "helping hand."

Two issues require your clarification. First, the proposed Executive Order authorizes mandatory testing of applicants for sensitive jobs. While you have previously indicated a preference for testing only applicants for sensitive positions, some departments, including Defense, have asked for reconsideration to allow them the flexibility to test all job applicants.

Authorize Agencies the discretion to test applicants for:

_____ All Positions _____ Sensitive Positions Only

Second, Justice proposes that the Executive Order list nine categories of sensitive positions to support legal defense of mandatory testing. Other Council members argue that we could reduce political resistance by not specifying categories of

employees such as Senior Executives, Schedule C employees, the uniformed services, and air traffic controllers; or, by only making a general reference to positions involving safety and security, or which require a high degree of trust and confidence.

Options for definition of sensitive positions:

- Include specific categories
- Fewer, more general categories
- General description only

Other Initiatives - Additional drug policy initiatives for each goal are outlined below, and are presented in detail in the Working Group report.

Goal #1 - Drug-Free Workplaces

- o Accelerate development of a drug-free Federal workplace.
- o Work with government contractors, and private sector management and labor leaders to fight drug abuse in the workplace.
- o Encourage States and local governments and their contractors to pursue drug-free workplaces.
- o Communicate accurate and credible information about elimination of drug abuse in the workplace.

Goal #2 - Drug-Free Schools

- o Issue Schools Without Drugs to communicate accurate and credible information on how to achieve drug-free schools.
- o Encourage all schools to establish a policy of being drug free through grants administered under the proposed Zero Tolerance Act, and through anti-drug activities developed by communities and student leaders.
- o Ensure that Federal laws against distributing drugs in or near schools are extended and enforced in cooperation with local authorities.

Goal #3 - Expand Drug Abuse Treatment and Research

- o Encourage States and communities to develop programs to treat specific drug-related health problems through new demonstration grants and elimination of unnecessary restrictions imposed under current block grant programs.
- o Expand drug abuse research in health-related areas, including drug testing.

- o Strengthen medical and health programs aimed at drug abuse prevention by establishing a Center for Substance Abuse Prevention within HHS.
- o Support efforts to achieve a drug-free Federal workplace.

Goal #4 - Improve International Cooperation

- o Convene a conference for U.S. Ambassadors in October to convey an international sense of urgency and to discuss increased regional cooperation.
- o Repeal the Mansfield Amendment to allow Federal officers to participate in drug arrests in foreign countries, seek authorization to confiscate U.S. property of drug dealers who violate foreign laws, and amend immigration requirements to allow deportation of alien drug traffickers.

Goal #5 - Strengthen Law Enforcement

- o Continue to execute Operation Alliance to increase cooperative drug law enforcement along the United States - Mexican border.
- o Seek legislation addressing such areas as penalties for large-scale domestic drug trafficking, punishments for possession of controlled substances, increased penalties for leaders of major drug rings, import/export violations, juvenile drug trafficking, and clandestine drug manufacturing.
- o Strengthen money laundering enforcement and penalties.
- o Seek to restore appropriate level of FY 1987 funding for law enforcement agents, prosecutors, and prison facilities.

Goal #6 - Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

- o Encourage all Americans to join the First Lady's drug abuse awareness and prevention campaign through a nationally televised address, letters soliciting fortune 500 support, a series of White House briefings, a "presidential Honor Role" for significant contributors, national drug prevention poster and essay contests, and major media campaigns to reinforce positive peer pressure and to make drug use socially unacceptable.
- o Encourage corporations, service organizations, and the media to develop drug prevention programs.
- o Ensure that every American has access to accurate and effective information about drug abuse and strategies for eliminating drugs from our society.

- o Propose legislation to facilitate private sector support and use of drug abuse material developed for foreign audiences.
- o Reduce illegal drug activity in Public Housing Authorities.

Data collected by HHS indicates that your drug abuse policy goals are right on target. An estimated 67 percent of all cocaine users have only minimal demand and will respond to social unacceptance, awareness and prevention efforts, and strict no-drug use policies in schools and workplaces, including drug testing where appropriate. Polls indicate that the public will also respond favorably to strong leadership from the Federal government, and will accept a firm, yet fair, drug prevention program which attacks both supply and demand in our workplaces, in our schools, and throughout our society.

Recommendations: The Domestic Policy Council recommends that you approve the following initiatives for inclusion in your Drug Abuse Policy package: 1) the proposed six-part legislative package, 2) the Executive Order supporting a drug-free Federal workforce, and 3) action steps supporting the major policy initiatives in the Drug Abuse Policy Working Group report.

Edwin Meese III
 Edwin Meese III
 Chairman, Pro Tempore

Decisions:

I. Submit the proposed legislative package consistent with the above direction, to support the Administration's six drug abuse policy goals.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

II. Develop and implement an Executive Order consistent with the above features and direction, to achieve a drug-free Federal workforce.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

III. Implement the action steps recommended by the Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy and the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board, consistent with the major initiatives listed above.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Approve as Modified

DRAFT

September 11, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

SUBJECT: Drug Abuse Policy Initiatives

Issue: What initiatives should be in the Administration's Drug Abuse Policy package?

Background: On August 4, 1986, you announced six new goals to build upon past accomplishments to curb drug abuse, and to lead Americans toward a drug-free society. Your six goals are:

- o Drug-Free Workplaces
- o Drug-Free Schools
- o Expand Drug Treatment and Research
- o Improve International Cooperation
- o Strengthen Law Enforcement
- o Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

The Domestic Policy Council established a Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy to develop legislation and other action steps to implement initiatives in support of the goals. The Working Group, in conjunction with the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board (NDEPB), has recommended comprehensive legislative proposals, an Executive Order for a drug-free Federal workforce, and other specific actions. These were reviewed by the Domestic Policy Council, and are described in the Working Group report.

Legislation - The Administration's legislative initiative is a comprehensive proposal with a separate title keyed to each of your six goals. It was discussed by the Domestic Policy Council, and is a coordinated, balanced package supporting the attack on both drug supply and demand. The proposed legislation would redirect FY 87 outlays by approximately \$300 million, and bring total annual spending on drug abuse programs to about \$2.8 billion. Senate Republicans are waiting for details of our proposal before proceeding with a bill of their own.

Two issues require your clarification. First, whether our proposed legislation should call for repeal of the Mansfield Amendment, which prohibits Federal officers from participating in drug arrests in foreign countries, or modify it to lift restrictions only in countries with special treaties.

Mansfield Amendment:

_____ Seek to Repeal _____ Seek to Modify

First, Title I of the legislation would amend certain laws in order to make it easier to dismiss Federal employees who are found to use drugs, and to limit the government's obligation to offer these employees rehabilitative services.

These new provisions probably would not be used until the opportunity for counseling and rehabilitation required under the Executive Order had been made available, but the presence of these provisions might be seen as inconsistent with your past statements that the purpose of your program is to persuade rather than punish Federal employees who use drugs.

Insert material on Executive Order

Three

Title I of legislation - include in legislative package - exclude from package

Second, the proposed legislation does not prescribe the death penalty for major traffickers. Some Council members feel a stronger position may be needed because of Congressional action.

Death Penalty for Major Drug Traffickers:

_____ Include _____ Do Not Include

has drafted an
Executive Order - The Council ~~also discussed a draft~~ Executive Order which focuses on achieving a drug-free Federal workplace, and complements Title I in the proposed Administration legislation. ~~Our legislative proposal amends appropriate laws to make it clear that there is no Federal statutory bar to drug testing in the workplace or in educational institutions.~~ The draft Executive Order sets an example by balancing intolerance of illegal drug use with fair treatment of individual employees. It stresses voluntary compliance and treatment for employees seeking help. Drug screening guidelines are established for the Executive Branch, allowing flexibility by department and agency heads. The Order authorizes testing of Federal employees holding sensitive positions that affect safety and security, and permits ~~corrective administrative action~~ if employees do not accept a "helping hand."

Which categories of employees will be subject to mandatory testing -

This will reduce the total number of sensitive positions to less than one million

Two issues require your clarification. First, the proposed Executive Order authorizes mandatory testing of applicants for sensitive jobs. Some departments, including Defense, prefer the flexibility to test all job applicants.

Disciplinary action, including dismissal,

Only would like to be able

Authorize Agencies the discretion to test applicants for:

All Positions

Sensitive Positions Only

Law enforcement, leaving it to the agency heads and OPM guidelines to establish exactly
Second, to ~~provide specific support for legal defense of mandatory testing,~~ the proposed Executive Order lists nine categories of sensitive positions. ~~Options are:~~ to not specify Senior Executives, Schedule C employees, the military, and air traffic controllers as special categories; or, to only make a general reference to positions involving safety and security, or which require a high degree of trust and confidence. ~~The argument favoring either of the two options is that we could reduce political resistance by minimizing identification of the number of affected employees.~~

This is in accord with your decision of August 1986. However,

IP Alternatives

These categories include 1.2 million employees, about half the government's civilian work force. This large number may leave the impression that there will be much more drug testing, including many more employees, than is likely to occur.

Options for definition of sensitive positions:

- _____ Specific categories as currently proposed
- _____ Fewer, more general categories
- _____ General description only

Those who favor listing all categories of employees in sensitive positions believe that such a listing will help the government's litigative position.

leave the impression that there will be much more drug testing, including many more employees, than is likely to occur.

Other Initiatives - Additional initiatives with action steps for each goal are presented in detail in the Working Group report.

Goal #1 - Drug-Free Workplaces

- o Accelerate development of a drug-free Federal workplace.
- o Work with government contractors, and private sector management and labor leaders to fight drug abuse in the workplace.
- o Encourage States and local governments and their contractors to pursue drug-free workplaces.
- o Communicate accurate and credible information about elimination of drug abuse in the workplace.

Goal #2 - Drug-Free Schools

- o Issue Schools Without Drugs to communicate accurate and credible information on how to achieve drug-free schools.
- o Encourage all schools to establish a policy of being drug free through grants administered under the proposed Zero Tolerance Act, and through anti-drug activities developed by communities and student leaders.
- o Ensure that Federal laws against distributing drugs in or near schools are extended and enforced in cooperation with local authorities.

Goal #3 - Expand Drug Abuse Treatment and Research

- o Encourage States and communities to develop programs to treat specific drug-related health problems through new demonstration grants and elimination of unnecessary restrictions imposed under current block grant programs.
- o Expand drug abuse research in health-related areas, including drug testing.
- o Strengthen medical and health programs aimed at drug abuse prevention by establishing a Center for Substance Abuse Prevention within HHS.
- o Support efforts to achieve a drug-free Federal workplace.

Goal #4 - Improve International Cooperation

- o Convene a conference for U.S. Ambassadors in October to convey an international sense of urgency and to discuss increased regional cooperation.

- o Repeal the Mansfield Amendment to allow Federal officers to participate in drug arrests in foreign countries, seek authorization to confiscate U.S. property of drug dealers who violate foreign laws, and amend immigration requirements to allow deportation of alien drug traffickers.

Goal #5 - Strengthen Law Enforcement

- o Continue to execute Operation Alliance to increase cooperative drug law enforcement along the United States - Mexican border.
- o Seek legislation addressing such areas as penalties for large-scale domestic drug trafficking, punishments for possession of controlled substances, increased penalties for leaders of major drug rings, import/export violations, juvenile drug trafficking, and clandestine drug manufacturing.
- o Strengthen money laundering enforcement and penalties.
- o Seek to restore appropriate level of FY 1987 funding for law enforcement agents, prosecutors, and prison facilities.

Goal #6 - Increase Public Awareness and Prevention

- o Encourage all Americans to join the First Lady's drug abuse awareness and prevention campaign through a nationally televised address, letters soliciting fortune 500 support, a series of White House briefings, a "presidential Honor Role" for significant contributors, national drug prevention poster and essay contests, and major media campaigns to reinforce positive peer pressure and to make drug use socially unacceptable.
- o Encourage corporations, service organizations, and the media to develop drug prevention programs.
- o Ensure that every American has access to accurate and effective information about drug abuse and strategies for eliminating drugs from our society.
- o Propose legislation to facilitate private sector support and use of drug abuse material developed for foreign audiences.
- o Reduce illegal drug activity in Public Housing Authorities.

Data collected by HHS indicates that your drug abuse policy goals are right on target. An estimated 67 percent of all cocaine users have only minimal demand and will respond to social unacceptance, awareness and prevention efforts, and strict no-drug use policies in schools and workplaces, including drug testing where appropriate. Polls indicate that the public will also respond favorably to strong leadership from the Federal

government, and will accept a firm, yet fair, drug prevention program which attacks both supply and demand in our workplaces, in our schools, and throughout our society.

Recommendations: The Domestic Policy Council recommends that you approve the following initiatives for inclusion in your Drug Abuse Policy package: 1) the proposed six-part legislative package, 2) the Executive Order supporting a drug-free Federal workforce, and 3) action steps supporting the major policy initiatives in the Drug Abuse Policy Working Group report.

Edwin Meese III
Chairman, Pro Tempore

Decisions:

I. Submit the proposed legislative package in support of the Administration's six drug abuse policy goals.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

II. Develop and implement an Executive Order consistent with the above features, to achieve a drug-free Federal workforce.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Further Discussion

III. Implement the action steps recommended by the Working Group on Drug Abuse Policy and the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board, consistent with the major initiatives listed above.

_____ Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Approve as Modified



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

September 11, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: CAROL CRAWFORD
DEBBIE STEELMAN
JIM MURR
JACK CARLEY
JOHN COONEY
GORDON WHEELER
BARRY CLENDENIN
RICH JACOB
JOHN GLAUDEMANS
TODD GRAMS
PENNY JACOBS
FRANK KALDER
DAVID HUNN

FROM: JOE WRIGHT *JWR*

SUBJECT: Schedule of Activities for Preparation of
Materials on Drug Legislation and Executive
Order

We have a very short time frame in order to get the Drug Legislation and Executive Order prepared -- with a long list of deliverables. In order to make sure that everybody understands the responsibilities, requirements and the time frames -- I have summarized the major items below and have asked Steve Tupper to make sure that these schedules are met. Unless otherwise notified -- you can expect that there will be a release of both the legislative package and the Executive Order next Monday following the President and Mrs. Reagan's speech on Sunday. The key deliverables are:

- . "Theme paper" -- prepared by OPD for the Sunday speech -- to be ready by Friday noon -- no OMB responsibility. Debbie Steelman will review if it comes over.
- . Legislative transmittal letter -- to be prepared by OMB (Debbie Steelman) -- to be ready for West Wing clearance on Friday at 9:30 AM.
- . Legislative package -- to be prepared by DOJ (Rich Willard) and presented to David Chew on Friday at 9:30 AM -- cleared by OMB Friday COB.

- . Legislative fact sheets -- to be prepared by DOJ (Rich Willard) by Thursday noon, presented to David Chew at 9:30 AM on Friday, and cleared by OMB on Friday COB.
- . Issue fact sheet on existing and proposed programs -- to be prepared by OMB (Carol Crawford) by Friday 9:30 AM in draft and Friday COB in final. These fact sheets are to describe, by major policy priority (or title), the existing efforts by category of what is being done -- and the additional efforts that we are proposing.
- . Executive Order -- to be prepared by DOJ (Rich Willard) by Thursday noon and cleared by OMB (John Cooney) by Friday 9:30 AM.
- . Executive Order fact sheets -- to be prepared by DOJ (Rich Willard) by Thursday noon and cleared by OMB (John Cooney) by Friday 9:30 AM.
- . Budget amendments package -- to be prepared by (Debbie Steelman) by Friday COB -- to be submitted to the Congress sometime mid-next week, after the legislative proposal is sent up.

There was also supposed to be an analysis of the House bill versus the Administration's legislative package, prepared in table form, where each of the major provisions are compared -- I talked to Rich Willard and he said that DOJ is not preparing this at this time -- OMB will have to take this one on and should stay at only the "macro level" to be finished by Friday COB -- Debbie Steelman should work with Justice on this effort.

cc: Jim Miller
David Chew

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL
TITLE I -- DRUG-FREE FEDERAL WORKPLACE

1986 Programs

Civilian employees and applicants in sensitive positions are currently tested for illegal drug use in about 20 civilian agencies, and the armed forces test virtually all members and all applicants at an annual cost of \$50 million.

Current law requires a nexus (i.e., connection) between illegal drug use and job performance before a Federal employer may take disciplinary action against an employee using illegal drugs.

Current law does not preclude illegal drug users or alcoholics from being classified as handicapped individuals.

Employee assistance programs provide drug and alcohol counselling and referral, training of supervisors, and information dissemination on illegal drug use; total annual cost is \$12 million.

Major carriers, except Blue Cross-Blue Shield, provide some form of drug and alcohol rehabilitation in their coverage of Federal employees.

Current Level: \$62 million

1987 Initiatives

- o Requires all agency heads to establish voluntary drug testing programs and mandatory testing of all civilian employees in sensitive positions (as determined by agency heads); total annual cost is \$100 million.
- o Requires employees who are found using illegal drugs to participate in employee assistance Programs or face separation.
- o Removes nexus from law so that only proof of illegal drug use is required before disciplinary action is taken.
- o Eliminates illegal drug use and alcoholism as bases for classifying handicapped individuals.
- o Expands and enhances Employee Assistance Programs to an annual cost of \$18 million.
- o Increases Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage to include drug and alcohol rehabilitation and expands similar coverage offered by other carriers.

Proposed Funding: \$118 million

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL
TITLE II -- DRUG FREE SCHOOLS

1986 Programs

Five regional training centers, funded under contract by the Department of Education, train school personnel on effective strategies to prevent drug abuse in the schools.

The Department of Education will publish a booklet, Schools Without Drugs, in mid-September to inform parents, school officials, and students about drug abuse prevention. It will be mailed to all elementary and secondary schools and made available to the public free of charge.

Current Level: \$3 Million

1987 Initiatives

- o Authorizes a new \$80 million competitive grant program to states to assist local school districts develop innovative strategies for combating drug abuse among their students.
- o Provides \$20 million to support regional training centers, to disseminate information about drug abuse, and to fund demonstration projects in schools.
- o Makes it legal under Federal law for schools to conduct drug testing and to discipline students who use illegal drugs.
- o Encourages cooperation among schools, parents, law enforcement officials, and communities to prevent drug abuse in schools and provides greater Federal leadership in this area. Example: letters to school officials on drug prevention strategies and application of Federal drug laws.

Proposed Funding: \$100 Million

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL
TITLE III -- SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

1986 Programs

Several Federal agencies work to prevent drug abuse. The Department of Health and Human Services funds State and local treatment services, supports research into the causes and prevention of drug abuse and directs efforts to prevent drug abuse. The Department of Defense, Veterans Administration and other agencies fund employee treatment programs.

Current Level: \$ 292 Million

1987 Initiatives

- o Provides communities with an additional \$69 million to develop community-based treatment services.
- o Informs communities of effective strategies to prevent drug abuse, at an additional cost of \$27 million.
- o Gives States \$100 million to assist them to build their treatment capacities through one-time grants.
- o Provides \$34 million to redouble research efforts on the prevention of drug abuse.
- o Expands prevention efforts in the critical Southwest Border area by \$3 million.
- o Gives States more flexibility to direct funds where they are most needed.

Proposed Funding: \$ 543 Million

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL
TITLE IV AND V -- INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

1986 Programs

Drug interdiction, which aims to physically interdict the shipment of drugs prior to their entry into the U.S. is performed primarily by the Coast Guard and Customs Service, with supporting assistance provided by Department of Defense.

Currently, criminal drug investigations conducted by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), FBI and IRS, target high-level drug traffickers.

Intelligence activities conducted by the DEA, FBI Customs Service, Coast Guard and others directly contribute to the effectiveness of investigations, interdiction and international programs.

Incarcerated drug offenders account for approximately one-third of all Federal prisoners.

Federal prosecutions conducted by Justice Department attorneys focus on mid- and high-level traffickers.

Federal criminal justice grants are awarded for a variety of activities that include prevention, prosecution, research and other programs.

State Department funds programs targeted for foreign crop control and eradication efforts while DEA's foreign program places agents and analysts overseas.

1987 Initiatives

- o Adds \$448 million for interdiction efforts, providing 5 radar balloons for use along Southwest border, 12 additional aircraft and helicopters, an advanced \$10 million intelligence center for the Customs Service, and as yet unspecified items for the Southeast border.
- o Provides the Drug Enforcement Administration with \$33 million to hire 40 more agents and to purchase sophisticated computer equipment and voice privacy radios.
- o Increases drug intelligence programs by \$39 million, including construction of a \$15 million intelligence center, installation of a \$9 million FBI computer system for coordinating drug interdiction intelligence and \$12 million for a highly successful intellectual community program.
- o Constructs 3 new prisons, the drug-related portion of which cost \$32 million, for additional prisoners incarcerated as a result of increased penalties.
- o Provides 100 additional attorney and support positions and \$16 million to facilitate high cost drug prosecutions.
- o Encourages states to target \$42 million in available Federal justice grant money for drug related activities.
- o Adds \$10 million to DEA for more agents and equipment earmarked for foreign programs and \$3 million for State's crop control programs.

TITLE IV AND V -- INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center provides training for most Federal law enforcement agencies and some State and local officers.

- o Develops new \$150,000 drug abuse prevention curriculum at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for State and local law enforcement officers.
- o Provides a total of \$79 million for inflationary adjustments for all drug enforcement programs, and adds funds for Research and Development and other support programs.

Current Level: \$ 1,656 Million

Proposed Funding: \$ 2,258 Million

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL
TITLE VI -- PUBLIC AWARENESS AND PRIVATE SECTOR INITIATIVE

1986 Programs

ACTION provides grants to community organizations to promote the youth, parent, and community groups to prevent drug use among young people.

Education materials and technical expertise are provided to State, local, and private sector efforts to increase public intolerance of illegal drug use.

Current Level: \$11 million

1987 Initiatives

- o Adds \$5 million to encourage and promote private sector formation of initiatives in the prevention of drug abuse.

- o Exempts Federal agencies from Federal procurement statutes for two years if 50 percent of their contracted drug abuse prevention services are donated.

- o Amends current law to allow domestic dissemination of films, radio spots, and books prepared by the United States Information Agency (USIA) warning against the hazards of illegal drug use.

Proposed Funding: \$16 million

FACT SHEET

- - - - -

The President today signed an Executive Order to promote his policy of creating an atmosphere of intolerance towards the use of illegal drugs, by establishing procedures to achieve a drug free Federal workplace. The Executive Order is part of a series of actions taken today, including the submission of comprehensive legislation to Congress, in the President's campaign against drugs.

The Executive Order establishes a policy that Federal employees must refrain from the use of illegal drugs, and that persons who use drugs are not suitable for Federal employment. The Order instructs the heads of Federal agencies to implement this policy by establishing a plan to achieve the objective of a drug free workplace, with due consideration for the rights of the employee and the rights of the public.

The Order authorizes drug testing for Federal employees who hold sensitive positions affecting the national security or the public health and safety and for applicants for all Federal jobs. The Order also requires agencies to establish Employee Assistance Programs, to provide counseling, treatment and rehabilitation to employees who voluntarily identify themselves as drug users or for employees who are tested and found to use illegal drugs. While the Order encourages employees to seek counseling and treatment, it also requires agencies to initiate action to remove from the service any employee who does not accept a "helping hand" and continues to use illegal drugs.

The drug testing program will be conducted pursuant to scientific and technical guidelines to be promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The program will be conducted under procedures designed to protect individual privacy, consistent with the integrity of the program.

Although the Executive Order specifies certain functional categories of positions in which current employees are potentially eligible for participation in the drug testing program, the head of each agency will determine which employees, out of those potentially eligible, actually will be required to participate in drug tests. It therefore is not possible to determine in advance how many current employees actually will be tested.

The President's war on drugs is aimed not only at eradicating the supply of drugs, but also at ending the tragedy of drug use by individuals. As the Nation's largest employer, it is incumbent on the Federal government to demonstrate leadership to show other institutions in the country that, if we work together, the horror of drug abuse may be stopped. The Executive Order is an important first step in this effort.



U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

MEMORANDUM

SEP 10 1986

TO: Ralph Bledsoe
FROM: *nmw* Richard K. Willard
RE: Presidential Speech Material

We have been unable to obtain a copy of the current draft text of the President and First Lady's Speech. I'm sure the speech writers have been deluged with well meaning suggestions to the saturation level, but the attached material is so significant, I believe, that I forward it to you with the request that it be forwarded to those who can include it in the speech.

Put simply, the National Institute on Justice has just learned that 65% of all arrestees test positive for one or more serious drugs. By imposing drug testing as a condition of bail, we can help get the worst predatory drug users off the streets or off drugs. The study proves that testing is the most effective way to "rehabilitate." Of all drug using arrestees, 1/3 were sent to "treatment," 1/3 had drug testing imposed as a condition of bail, and were told to stay drug free as a condition of bail. The last 1/3 was the "control" group. The group that had to submit to testing as a condition of bail had a **50% lower re-arrest rate and was 1/5th as likely to commit additional crime.**

Imposing testing as a condition of bail gets the most violent criminals off the street. It is a totally new concept, just now being set up in Washington D.C., and Miami and it works. The Democrats cannot take credit for it. The public will applaud it. Even the ACLU has refused to challenge it.

Nancy and I know that every family is fearful of being victimized by crime. Research has shown that criminals commit four to six times the amount of crime when using drugs than when they are not.

If judges knew at the time of setting bail which defendants were using drugs, they could make a better decision on the danger of this person to the community. My administration, through the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), has just completed a successful experiment requiring drug testing of everyone arrested here in Washington, D.C. It produced some very startling statistics: 65% of persons arrested for crimes were using heroin, PCP, cocaine, amphetamines, or illegal methadone, shortly before their arrest. Under this NIJ experiment, those using drugs were ordered to quit or stay in jail, thus protecting the community from this high risk group. This program not only has the potential for reducing crime, but the demand for drugs by those out on bail. Similiar results were also found in a voluntary program we conducted in New York City.

Now that we know that this program works, every state and city should consider implementing a similar program, not only for all persons on bail, but for the nearly two million on probation or parole as well. The cost is inexpensive and should be born, not by the taxpayers, but by those arrested. As a part of our initiative, the Department of Justice is prepared to sponsor this new program in ten additional locations.

Drugs and Crime: Detecting Use and Reducing Demand*
Drug Testing/Supervision of Adults and Juveniles on Pretrial
Release and Probation
A National Initiative in 10 Cities

Background: Combatting drugs in America requires action on two fronts: supply and demand. Law enforcement has traditionally focused on limiting supply. NIJ research has now developed an enforcement program that can reduce demand -- by separating a particularly dangerous and predatory group of users from their drugs.

Proposal: Based on the proven effectiveness of its Washington, D.C. drug -testing program, NIJ proposes supporting mandatory drug testing of both adult and juveniles arrestees and probationers in 10 American cities over the next two years. Among pretrial releasees in D.C., the NIJ program proved effective in simultaneously reducing drug use and increasing public safety.

Costs: Estimated at \$3 million/city/year or \$30 million per year for the full program. Based in the D.C. experience -- where the city assumed all costs of the program with local funds -- we would expect cities to assume program costs following initial Federal funding. National evaluation estimates at \$4.8 million.

Rationale: Such a testing program can 1) confirm that those under criminal justice supervision remain drug-free and 2) identify those who do not, so that they can be sanctioned. It is grounded on the following facts:

- Pioneering drug testing of arrestees in Washington, D.C. and New York City revealed exceptionally high levels of drug use-- more than half of all arrestees tested positive for one or more serious drugs such as PCP, cocaine or heroin. In June, 1986, 65% of all arrestees in Washington, D.C. were positive for one or more serious drugs. Results also showed the prevalence of multiple drug use. Nearly a third of the arrestees in the District of Columbia had used more than one drug.
- The project demonstrated that drug testing can identify those defendants who pose the greatest risk for committing new crimes while on pretrial release. Drug users, particularly multiple users, have pretrial rearrest rates 50% higher than non-users.
- Critically important, mandatory drug testing reduced new crimes (as measured by re-arrest) among drug-using defendants. Released users who reported weekly for urine tests had re-arrest identical to those of non-users; thus, the testing program worked as a screen to identify which users should be taken off the streets.)
- The project also demonstrated the use of urinalysis as an early warning system. For example, the existence of "crack" was detected long before it became a concern of law enforcement authorities. Similarly, testing also spotted the high level of PCP use in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Initiative

Attorney General of the United States: Direct the National Institute of Justice to implement widely a program of demonstrated effectiveness that will increase public safety by reducing the use of and demand for drugs among persons under criminal justice supervision. Recognizing that not only is drug abuse itself a crime, but also that when criminals are "doing drugs," they commit all types of crimes at higher rates than when they are drug-free, the initiative will transfer NIJ's drug-testing program to 10 major cities across the country. That program will give local criminal justice agencies the capacity to:

- Identify both arrestees and probationers who are using illicit drugs and who thus pose a high risk for committing further predatory crime if they are unsupervised within the community;
- Reduce the use of and demand for drugs among such pretrial releasees and probationers through programs of stringent supervision and mandatory urine testing; and
- Identify early on those individuals who will not conform to supervision requirements and therefore need to be further restricted and/or returned to custody in order to reduce the victimization of innocent citizens.

National Institute of Justice: Design the expanded program, the national evaluation and support local governments in establishing comprehensive drug testing programs. These programs would, at minimum, include:

- Urine testing of virtually all arrestees (adult and juvenile) to identify drug users, and to detect level, patterns and trends of drug use in that jurisdiction;
- Programs of mandatory drug testing for a) drug-user defendants on pre-trial release and b) sentenced offenders on probation, in order to ensure that they remain drug-free;
- Sanctions for those who continue to use drugs. Such sanctions can be graduated, ranging from more frequent testing and house arrest, to short-term shock incarceration, to incarceration until trial or for the remainder of the sentence.
- Development of a data base on drug-use in each city/county that can provide an informed basis for coordinated inter-agency responses to the problem (see Benefits to Local Government, below.)

Compile and analyze data provided by each of the 10 sites, which will allow NIJ to:

- Develop a national "early warning system" of changes in levels or patterns of drug use and/or drugs of preference. (While many traditional "indicators" of changes in drug abuse --emergency room statistics, drug overdose deaths, admissions/applications to treatment programs--do not show up until well after the change or introduction of a new drug has taken place, changes in drug use among criminal populations appear to precede such changes in the general population.)
- Evaluate national programs
- Plan future national strategies

Local Government Actions and Benefits

Comprehensive Uses of the Information from the Drug Testing Program

POLICE

1. Early warning system -- e.g. changes in the types of drugs available or preferred
2. Track changes in the number and/or percentage of users -- city-wide or by precinct
3. Data to correlate with local crime measure in designing investigation or enforcement strategies
4. Data to evaluate drug suppression programs
5. Information for community surveillance of drug-using defendants or probationers

PRETRIAL SERVICES

1. Identify high risks for release
2. Supervise high risks releasees, with mandatory testing program
3. Report releasees who do not stay drug free to the court for review/sanction
4. Data for program evaluation

PROSECUTOR

1. Charging decisions (under career criminal and dangerousness statutes)
2. Pretrial release or supervision recommendations
3. Plea negotiations and decisions
4. Program assessment

COURTS

1. Making pretrial release decisions
2. Setting pretrial release conditions
3. Making effective use of prison/jail space
4. Sentence decisions
5. Program assessment

JAIL

1. Efficient Use of detention space
2. Prisoner control

PROBATION

1. Risk assessment and determining level of supervision
2. Supervising drug users with on-going testing
3. Sanctioning probationers who do not stay drug free
4. Program evaluation

DRUG/HEALTH SERVICES

1. Program planning (volume of "clients", drugs of concern)
2. Prevention planning
3. Other health needs forecasting (e.g. AIDS)
4. Program evaluation

SCHOOLS

1. Prevention programs/education -- e.g. directed at specific drugs
2. Training of staff: e.g., in identification of drug abuse among students

It is recommended that this program be evaluated for three perspectives:

- 1) process - how it is implemented
- 2) outcome - results produced
- 3) costs - cost of producing those results

The reasons for evaluating the program are as follows:

1. The cities will be using an empirical and standardized measure of drug use--urinalysis data. This presents a unique opportunity to:
 - a. evaluate each local program;
 - b. evaluate similar programs across all the sites because they all will use the same method to measure outcome, and;
 - c. construct an aggregated data base of drug use, not only for comparing the effectiveness of current programs, but to use as a baseline for evaluating future practices as well.

The latter reason is sufficient justification alone for evaluating this program.

2. The program allows local criminal justice agencies some discretion to use funds to develop innovative practices that may be effective and transferrable to other cities.
3. Evaluation will identify administrative problems and solutions that will enable other cities to successfully adopt the most effective components of the program (in previous programs, too many good projects "failed" because of errors at the local level in implementing them.)
4. This program represents a substantial outlay of funds; cities not included may be reluctant to adopt it in the future because of its expense. There is good reason to believe that the benefits of the program far outweigh the costs, but hard numbers gained through evaluation would be invaluable in helping cities plan which program components they wish to adopt on what schedule.

ANNOTATED OUTLINE

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON DRUG ABUSE POLICY

TO THE DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL

September 10, 1986

I. Summary

This section should contain a report summary, including the major findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

II. Introduction and Background

This section should contain a brief review of the drug abuse problem, the Administration's efforts since 1981, the recent actions by the President on the six goals, and the charter and establishment of the Working Group.

III. The Administration's Plan

This section should focus on the actions and steps the Administration intends to take. It should include sections on each goal, with subsections on each initiative under a goal. It should include 1) statements on why each goal (and each initiative) is important, 2) the specific steps involved in each initiative, 3) what decisions are needed by the President, 4) and brief statements on what the expected results are from each goal/initiative.

IV. Legislative Action

This section should focus on legislative proposals, both those to be offered by the Administration, and those being proposed by Members of Congress on which the Administration should have a position. The proposals should be categorized, and for each there should be references to options available to the Administration, i.e. appropriate degrees of support or non-support.

V. Funding

This section should focus on costing of the initiatives, both those offered by the Administration and any being proposed by Congress that are felt worthy of support.

VI. Communications

The final section of the Report should include a proposed plan for communications of the Administration's program.

I envision presentations of the Report to the Council without the President in attendance on September 10 and 15, and then possibly with the President on September 16. You might think about how best to present the recommendations and the decision issues in a timely manner. You could focus on the Administration plan on September 10, and on legislation at the meeting of the 15th. The two would be combined for the September 16 meeting.



U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

MEMORANDUM

SEP 10 1986

TO: Ralph Bledsoe
FROM: *nmw* Richard K. Willard
RE: Presidential Speech Material

We have been unable to obtain a copy of the current draft text of the President and First Lady's Speech. I'm sure the speech writers have been deluged with well meaning suggestions to the saturation level, but the attached material is so significant, I believe, that I forward it to you with the request that it be forwarded to those who can include it in the speech.

Put simply, the National Institute on Justice has just learned that 65% of all arrestees test positive for one or more serious drugs. By imposing drug testing as a condition of bail, we can help get the worst predatory drug users off the streets or off drugs. The study proves that testing is the most effective way to "rehabilitate." Of all drug using arrestees, 1/3 were sent to "treatment," 1/3 had drug testing imposed as a condition of bail, and were told to stay drug free as a condition of bail. The last 1/3 was the "control" group. The group that had to submit to testing as a condition of bail had a **50% lower re-arrest rate and was 1/5th as likely to commit additional crime.**

Imposing testing as a condition of bail gets the most violent criminals off the street. It is a totally new concept, just now being set up in Washington D.C., and Miami and it works. The Democrats cannot take credit for it. The public will applaud it. Even the ACLU has refused to challenge it.

Nancy and I know that every family is fearful of being victimized by crime. Research has shown that criminals commit four to six times the amount of crime when using drugs than when they are not.

If judges knew at the time of setting bail which defendants were using drugs, they could make a better decision on the danger of this person to the community. My administration, through the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), has just completed a successful experiment requiring drug testing of everyone arrested here in Washington, D.C. It produced some very startling statistics: 65% of persons arrested for crimes were using heroin, PCP, cocaine, amphetamines, or illegal methadone, shortly before their arrest. Under this NIJ experiment, those using drugs were ordered to quit or stay in jail, thus protecting the community from this high risk group. This program not only has the potential for reducing crime, but the demand for drugs by those out on bail. Similar results were also found in a voluntary program we conducted in New York City.

Now that we know that this program works, every state and city should consider implementing a similar program, not only for all persons on bail, but for the nearly two million on probation or parole as well. The cost is inexpensive and should be born, not by the taxpayers, but by those arrested. As a part of our initiative, the Department of Justice is prepared to sponsor this new program in ten additional locations.

Drugs and Crime: Detecting Use and Reducing Demand*
**Drug Testing/Supervision of Adults and Juveniles on Pretrial
Release and Probation**
A National Initiative in 10 Cities

Background: Combatting drugs in America requires action on two fronts: supply and demand. Law enforcement has traditionally focused on limiting supply. NIJ research has now developed an enforcement program that can reduce demand -- by separating a particularly dangerous and predatory group of users from their drugs.

Proposal: Based on the proven effectiveness of its Washington, D.C. drug -testing program, NIJ proposes supporting mandatory drug testing of both adult and juveniles arrestees and probationers in 10 American cities over the next two years. Among pretrial releasees in D.C., the NIJ program proved effective in simultaneously reducing drug use and increasing public safety.

Costs: Estimated at \$3 million/city/year or \$30 million per year for the full program. Based in the D.C. experience -- where the city assumed all costs of the program with local funds -- we would expect cities to assume program costs following initial Federal funding. National evaluation estimates at \$4.8 million.

Rationale: Such a testing program can 1) confirm that those under criminal justice supervision remain drug-free and 2) identify those who do not, so that they can be sanctioned. It is grounded on the following facts:

- Pioneering drug testing of arrestees in Washington, D.C. and New York City revealed exceptionally high levels of drug use-- more than half of all arrestees tested positive for one or more serious drugs such as PCP, cocaine or heroin. In June, 1986, 65% of all arrestees in Washington, D.C. were positive for one or more serious drugs. Results also showed the prevalence of multiple drug use. Nearly a third of the arrestees in the District of Columbia had used more than one drug.
- The project demonstrated that drug testing can identify those defendants who pose the greatest risk for committing new crimes while on pretrial release. Drug users, particularly multiple users, have pretrial rearrest rates 50% higher than non-users.
- Critically important, mandatory drug testing reduced new crimes (as measured by re-arrest) among drug-using defendants. Released users who reported weekly for urine tests had re-arrest identical to those of non-users; thus, the testing program worked as a screen to identify which users should be taken off the streets.)
- The project also demonstrated the use of urinalysis as an early warning system. For example, the existence of "crack" was detected long before it became a concern of law enforcement authorities. Similarly, testing also spotted the high level of PCP use in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Initiative

Attorney General of the United States: Direct the National Institute of Justice to implement widely a program of demonstrated effectiveness that will increase public safety by reducing the use of and demand for drugs among persons under criminal justice supervision. Recognizing that not only is drug abuse itself a crime, but also that when criminals are "doing drugs," they commit all types of crimes at higher rates than when they are drug-free, the initiative will transfer NIJ's drug-testing program to 10 major cities across the country. That program will give local criminal justice agencies the capacity to:

- Identify both arrestees and probationers who are using illicit drugs and who thus pose a high risk for committing further predatory crime if they are unsupervised within the community;
- Reduce the use of and demand for drugs among such pretrial releasees and probationers through programs of stringent supervision and mandatory urine testing; and
- Identify early-on those individuals who will not conform to supervision requirements and therefore need to be further restricted and/or returned to custody in order to reduce the victimization of innocent citizens.

National Institute of Justice: Design the expanded program, the national evaluation and support local governments in establishing comprehensive drug testing programs. These programs would, at minimum, include:

- Urine testing of virtually all arrestees (adult and juvenile) to identify drug users, and to detect level, patterns and trends of drug use in that jurisdiction;
- Programs of mandatory drug testing for a) drug-user defendants on pre-trial release and b) sentenced offenders on probation, in order to ensure that they remain drug-free;
- Sanctions for those who continue to use drugs. Such sanctions can be graduated, ranging from more frequent testing and house arrest, to short-term shock incarceration, to incarceration until trial or for the remainder of the sentence.
- Development of a data base on drug-use in each city/county that can provide an informed basis for coordinated inter-agency responses to the problem (see Benefits to Local Government, below.)

Compile and analyze data provided by each of the 10 sites, which will allow NIJ to:

- Develop a national "early warning system" of changes in levels or patterns of drug use and/or drugs of preference. (While many traditional "indicators" of changes in drug abuse --emergency room statistics, drug overdose deaths, admissions/applications to treatment programs--do not show up until well after the change or introduction of a new drug has taken place, changes in drug use among criminal populations appear to precede such changes in the general population.)
- Evaluate national programs
- Plan future national strategies

Local Government Actions and Benefits

Comprehensive Uses of the Information from the Drug Testing Program

POLICE

1. Early warning system -- e.g. changes in the types of drugs available or preferred
2. Track changes in the number and/or percentage of users -- city-wide or by precinct
3. Data to correlate with local crime measure in designing investigation or enforcement strategies
4. Data to evaluate drug suppression programs
5. Information for community surveillance of drug-using defendants or probationers

PRETRIAL SERVICES

1. Identify high risks for release
2. Supervise high risks releasees, with mandatory testing program
3. Report releasees who do not stay drug free to the court for review/sanction
4. Data for program evaluation

PROSECUTOR

1. Charging decisions (under career criminal and dangerousness statutes)
2. Pretrial release or supervision recommendations
3. Plea negotiations and decisions
4. Program assessment

COURTS

1. Making pretrial release decisions
2. Setting pretrial release conditions
3. Making effective use of prison/jail space
4. Sentence decisions
5. Program assessment

JAIL

1. Efficient Use of detention space
2. Prisoner control

PROBATION

1. Risk assessment and determining level of supervision
2. Supervising drug users with on-going testing
3. Sanctioning probationers who do not stay drug free
4. Program evaluation

DRUG/HEALTH SERVICES

1. Program planning (volume of "clients", drugs of concern)
2. Prevention planning
3. Other health needs forecasting (e.g. AIDS)
4. Program evaluation

SCHOOLS

1. Prevention programs/education -- e.g. directed at specific drugs
2. Training of staff: e.g., in identification of drug abuse among students

It is recommended that this program be evaluated for three perspectives:

- 1) process - how it is implemented
- 2) outcome - results produced
- 3) costs - cost of producing those results

The reasons for evaluating the program are as follows:

1. The cities will be using an empirical and standardized measure of drug use--urinalysis data. This presents a unique opportunity to:
 - a. evaluate each local program;
 - b. evaluate similar programs across all the sites because they all will use the same method to measure outcome, and;
 - c. construct an aggregated data base of drug use, not only for comparing the effectiveness of current programs, but to use as a baseline for evaluating future practices as well.

The latter reason is sufficient justification alone for evaluating this program.

2. The program allows local criminal justice agencies some discretion to use funds to develop innovative practices that may be effective and transferrable to other cities.
3. Evaluation will identify administrative problems and solutions that will enable other cities to successfully adopt the most effective components of the program (in previous programs, too many good projects "failed" because of errors at the local level in implementing them.)
4. This program represents a substantial outlay of funds; cities not included may be reluctant to adopt it in the future because of its expense. There is good reason to believe that the benefits of the program far outweigh the costs, but hard numbers gained through evaluation would be invaluable in helping cities plan which program components they wish to adopt on what schedule.