

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 10, 1978

The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Frank Moore
Anne Wexler
Zbig Brzezinski
Charlie Schultze
Jerry Rafshoon

The attached was returned in the
President's outbox today and is
forwarded to you for your information.

No additional notation was made.

Rick Hutcheson

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 10, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY

Immediately upon its return from the recent recess, the Congress will begin the process of appointing Conferees and initiating Conference discussions on the Treasury Appropriations bill. As you know, this legislation contains the Dole amendment which would prohibit the use of appropriated funds to implement administrative actions on oil imports under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

It is of utmost importance that you work together to prevent instruction of the House Conferees and avoid Conference approval of the Dole amendment. I am asking Frank Moore and Stu Eizenstat to work with you to coordinate this legislative effort. This task should receive highest priority from each of you and your Departments.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. Carter".

bcc: The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Frank Moore
Anne Wexler
Zbig Brzezinski
Charlie Schultze
Jerry Rafshoon

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
May 18, 1978

Frank Moore

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for appropriate
handling.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: ~~The Vice President~~
Hamilton Jordan
Tim Kraft

RE: CARNEY'S REQUEST THAT WE
CAMPAIGN FOR HIM BEFORE HIS
JUNE 6 PRIMARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 18, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR FRANK MOORE

FROM: VAL PINSON *usf*

RE: CARNEY'S REQUEST THAT WE CAMPAIGN FOR HIM FOR BEFORE HIS JUNE 6 PRIMARY

Congressman Chuck Carney has been vigorously attempting to secure a high Administration official to appear in his District before his June 6 primary. He has been sending us periodic requests, asking our Hill people in person and forwarding articles in which one of his primary opponents say critical things about the President.

His two primary challengers are V. Gilmartan (a former prosecutor) and State Senator George Tablack (the current Chairman of the State House Ways and Means Committee. Both are legitimate contenders for the seat.

Carney has called the Vice President and Bob Strauss (Strauss at my suggestion) asking them to come to his District. He wanted the Vice President to do a fundraiser and Strauss to visit the steel center of Youngstown and make a statement on unemployment. Strauss indicated that he would try and make such an appearance before the end of May however at this time it does not look like his schedule will allow such a visit.

Carney has talked to each member of the C.L. staff requesting the President, the V.P. and Strauss, in that order. He cites the fact that the Vice President entered a primary situation when he campaigned for Ken Holland. It should be noted that in this case the primary challenger was very fringe and did in fact raise quite a bit of protest about this.

Tom Donilon has surveyed the various political antennae from the DNC to field contacts and reports that both challengers are significant that we would anger sizable local factions by entering the race. Ohio political operatives recommend against doing so. Carney will not win the primary by much more than 10 points. It is a classic strong challenge of a vulnerable incumbent.

Carney's Administration support score is 83%. He, although balks on occasion, will vote with us when we need him.

My concern is that, unlike Nix, Carney will spread the word that the President, who has professed a policy of returning all phone calls

Frank - Done - he was nice -

*Q
Wants someone to come - before or after primary
J*

Has he called me? 7

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 18, 1978

to members, will not return his call.

An alternative is to have Hamilton or Tim return the phone call and explain to him that the President can simply not become involved in a political way in such a situation. It is a tradition followed by all recent Democratic Presidents.

One final note---- Carney is a negative vote on cost containment.



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

APR 25 1978

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

JAMES T. MCINTYRE, JR. */s/ Elisha Cutler/jm*

Subject:

Draft Constitution for
the Territory of Guam

LAST DAY FOR ACTION

April 29, 1978

BACKGROUND

Public Law 94-584 authorized the Territory of Guam for the first time to draft its own constitution relating to matters of local self-government. Until now, Guam's local government activities have been provided for by an organic act of the Congress.

On March 1, 1978, Guam's Governor officially submitted the draft constitution, prepared by a locally elected constitutional convention, to Secretary Andrus who accepted it on your behalf. By law, the President must transmit the document, with comments, to the Congress within 60 days of its receipt. Congress then will have an additional 60 days to modify or amend, approve or disapprove the constitution. If approved, it will be submitted in referendum to the voters of Guam.

AGENCY VIEWS

The Office of Management and Budget circulated the proposed constitution among the Executive Branch agencies for comment. Although all of the agencies have indicated that the constitution is a positive step toward greater degrees of self-government for the territory and should be approved, the Departments of Interior and Justice have pointed out a number of

troublesome features contained in the document, including the following which directly relate to the Federal-territorial relationship:

- The sovereignty of the United States and the supremacy of its laws are not recognized, which is a specific requirement of P.L. 94-584.
- The Governor of Guam is vested with authority to execute faithfully the Constitution and laws of the United States applicable to Guam, rather than such authority being vested in persons appointed in a manner consistent with the provisions of the U.S. Constitution.
- Legislative apportionment is based upon numbers of registered voters in a district, rather than on a permissible population basis as required by decisions of the Supreme Court.
- Guam's debt limitation formula is changed from a percentage of assessed valuation to a percentage of revenues collected in the previous fiscal year which, considering the territory's fragile economy and continued dependence on financial assistance from the United States, is not desirable.
- Wiretaps and electronic surveillance are prohibited, which the Department of Justice feels could inhibit Federal law enforcement efforts in the territory. We have asked the Attorney General to communicate directly with the Congress on this matter.

Additional problems involving draftsmanship, vagueness of intent, and a questionable amendment procedure also have been discussed by several of the agencies.

TRANSMITTAL LETTERS

The attached transmittal letters to the Congress point out those troublesome aspects of the Guam constitution which directly relate to the Federal-territorial relationship. The letters recommend that the Congress pay special attention to these issues during its review and take corrective actions if deemed necessary. In addition, the letters suggest that the Congress may wish to review the draft constitution on bases other

than just the Federal-territorial relationship and, accordingly, indicate that the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior are available to offer further comments and technical assistance to appropriate congressional committees.

Courtesy letters to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior are also attached for your signature.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the attached transmittal letters to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and that you also sign the courtesy letters to Attorney General Bell and Secretary Andrus.

Attachments

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (Public Law 94-584), I am hereby transmitting for the consideration of the Congress a proposed constitution for the Territory of Guam. The constitution, drafted by a territorial constitutional convention, was officially submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, who accepted it on my behalf, by the Honorable Ricardo J. Bordallo, Governor of Guam, on March 1, 1978.

Public Law 94-584 requires that I submit the constitution to the Congress, along with my comments. I am confident that the Congress will share my belief that the basic principles incorporated into the constitution provide a firm foundation upon which the people of Guam can assume greater responsibilities of local self-government in political union with the United States. Because it is their constitution, and must be respected as such, I shall confine my comments to those aspects of the document which relate directly and significantly to the territorial-Federal relationship. Accordingly, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the following aspects of the proposed constitution:

- Contrary to the express requirement of Section 2(b)(1) of Public Law 94-584 (the Enabling Act), the constitution does not explicitly recognize the sovereignty of the United States over Guam or the supremacy of its laws, a point noted by the Departments of State, Justice, and Interior in their reviews of the document. Accordingly, I ask the Congress to consider complications which could arise with respect to future claims of sovereignty and supremacy should it decline to take any of the corrective actions prescribed in Section 5 of the Enabling Act.

- Article IV, Section 1, of the constitution vests in the elected Governor responsibility for the faithful execution of the Constitution and laws of the United States applicable to Guam. In view of the Supreme Court's decision in Buckley v. Valeo (424 U.S. 1) that persons who enforce the laws of the United States must be appointed in the constitutionally prescribed manner, I ask the Congress to give careful consideration to this provision. Moreover, I suggest to the Congress that responsibility for the execution of Federal law is not a matter of local self-government and invite the Congress to consider whether the inclusion of such a clause, even if deemed constitutionally permissible, could lead to friction between the Governor and the Federal Government.
- Article V, Section 4(a), of the constitution provides for legislative apportionment on the basis of the number of registered voters in each district. I call to the attention of the Congress the Supreme Court's admonition in Burns v. Richardson (384 U.S. 73) and Ely v. Klahr (403 U.S. 108) that the use of voter registration as a basis may perpetuate underrepresentation of groups constitutionally entitled to participate in the electoral process and is permissible only if it produces a distribution of legislators not substantially different from that which would have resulted from the use of a permissible population basis.
- Article X, Section 4, of the constitution would amend the provision in Section 11 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S. 1423a), which imposes public debt limitations on the territory. In light of the territory's fragile local economy and the continued financial responsibility of the Federal Government for Guam, I ask the Congress to give careful consideration to this provision.

In view of its responsibility under the Territories Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the Congress may wish to review the proposed constitution for Guam on bases other than just the effect of its provisions on the territorial-Federal relationship to which I have limited my comments.

Specifically, the appropriate committees of the Congress may wish to examine whether certain provisions of the Guam constitution are drafted with sufficient clarity to avoid the type of litigation that could preclude effective government. For example, the elevation to constitutional status of certain rights in Article II of the proposed constitution could cause such a result. Under our own system, many of these same rights are provided for by statute, not by the Constitution itself.

Also, the amendment procedure contained in Article XIV of the proposed constitution does not provide for review by the Congress, a requirement which does pertain to the basic document. The Congress may wish to consider the friction which could arise between Guam and the Federal Government should the constitution be amended in a way which would conflict with United States law.

Accordingly, I have directed the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior to provide the appropriate committees of both Houses with such technical advice and assistance as may be required. Both Departments have conducted thorough analyses of the proposed constitution and can offer the Congress additional information and recommended changes in language should the Congress choose to take any of the corrective actions prescribed in Section 5 of the Enabling Act.

I trust these comments will be of use to the Congress in its review.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER

Honorable Walter F. Mondale
President of the Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Enclosure

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (Public Law 94-584), I am hereby transmitting for the consideration of the Congress a proposed constitution for the Territory of Guam. The constitution, drafted by a territorial constitutional convention, was officially submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, who accepted it on my behalf, by the Honorable Ricardo J. Bordallo, Governor of Guam, on March 1, 1978.

Public Law 94-584 requires that I submit the constitution to the Congress, along with my comments. I am confident that the Congress will share my belief that the basic principles incorporated into the constitution provide a firm foundation upon which the people of Guam can assume greater responsibilities of local self-government in political union with the United States. Because it is their constitution, and must be respected as such, I shall confine my comments to those aspects of the document which relate directly and significantly to the territorial-Federal relationship. Accordingly, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the following aspects of the proposed constitution:

- Contrary to the express requirement of Section 2(b)(1) of Public Law 94-584 (the Enabling Act), the constitution does not explicitly recognize the sovereignty of the United States over Guam or the supremacy of its laws, a point noted by the Departments of State, Justice, and Interior in their reviews of the document. Accordingly, I ask the Congress to consider complications which could arise with respect to future claims of sovereignty and supremacy should it decline to take any of the corrective actions prescribed in Section 5 of the Enabling Act.

- Article IV, Section 1, of the constitution vests in the elected Governor responsibility for the faithful execution of the Constitution and laws of the United States applicable to Guam. In view of the Supreme Court's decision in Buckley v. Valeo (424 U.S. 1) that persons who enforce the laws of the United States must be appointed in the constitutionally prescribed manner, I ask the Congress to give careful consideration to this provision. Moreover, I suggest to the Congress that responsibility for the execution of Federal law is not a matter of local self-government and invite the Congress to consider whether the inclusion of such a clause, even if deemed constitutionally permissible, could lead to friction between the Governor and the Federal Government.
- Article V, Section 4(a) of the constitution provides for legislative apportionment on the basis of the number of registered voters in each district. I call to the attention of the Congress the Supreme Court's admonition in Burns v. Richardson (384 U.S. 73) and Ely v. Klahr (403 U.S. 108) that the use of voter registration as a basis may perpetuate underrepresentation of groups constitutionally entitled to participate in the electoral process and is permissible only if it produces a distribution of legislators not substantially different from that which would have resulted from the use of a permissible population basis.
- Article X, Section 4, of the constitution would amend the provision in Section 11 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S. 1423a), which imposes public debt limitations on the territory. In light of the territory's fragile local economy and the continued financial responsibility of the Federal Government for Guam, I ask the Congress to give careful consideration to this provision.

In view of its responsibility under the Territories Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the Congress may wish to review the proposed constitution for Guam on bases other than just the effect of its provisions on the territorial-Federal relationship to which I have limited my comments.

Specifically, the appropriate committees of the Congress may wish to examine whether certain provisions of the Guam constitution are drafted with sufficient clarity to avoid the type of litigation that could preclude effective government. For example, the elevation to constitutional status of certain rights in Article II of the proposed constitution could cause such a result. Under our own system, many of these same rights are provided for by statute, not by the Constitution itself.

Also, the amendment procedure contained in Article XIV of the proposed constitution does not provide for review by the Congress, a requirement which does pertain to the basic document. The Congress may wish to consider the friction which could arise between Guam and the Federal Government should the constitution be amended in a way which would conflict with United States law.

Accordingly, I have directed the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior to provide the appropriate committees of both Houses with such technical advice and assistance as may be required. Both Departments have conducted thorough analyses of the proposed constitution and can offer the Congress additional information and recommended changes in language should the Congress choose to take any of the corrective actions prescribed in Section 5 of the Enabling Act.

I trust these comments will be of use to the Congress in its review.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER

Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Enclosure

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

Enclosed for your information are copies of letters I am sending to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on the subject of the proposed constitution for the Territory of Guam.

This letter is to request that you provide the appropriate committees of the Congress with further comments and technical assistance as required. Any suggested language changes to the constitution or testimony on the subject should be processed through the normal channels.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER

Honorable Griffin B. Bell
Attorney General
Washington, D.C. 20530

Enclosures

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Enclosed for your information are copies of letters I am sending to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on the subject of the proposed constitution for the Territory of Guam.

This letter is to request that you provide the appropriate committees of the Congress with further comments and technical assistance as required. Any suggested language changes to the constitution or testimony on the subject should be processed through the normal channels.

Sincerely,

JIMMY CARTER

Honorable Cecil D. Andrus
Secretary of the Interior
Washington, D.C. 20240

Enclosures

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: WHITE HOUSE STAFF

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN *H.J.*

SUBJECT: BRIEFINGS FOR WHITE HOUSE
STAFF ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7
AND WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8
10:00 A.M., ROOM 450, OEOB

On Tuesday, February 7, and Wednesday, February 8, briefings will be held for all White House staff members on the Administration's domestic and foreign policy programs.

Briefings will take place in Room 450, OEOB, both days. The Vice President will make introductory remarks at 10:00 a.m., followed by a presentation by Stu Eizenstat on domestic programs, and one by Zbig Brzezinski on foreign policy. Each presentation will last for 10-15 minutes, followed by a question and answer period. The same schedule will be followed both days. The briefings should be concluded by 11:15 a.m.

The head of each office is requested to arrange the work schedule in that office so that members of the staff can attend the briefings on one of these two days. We hope that all staff members will take advantage of this opportunity to participate in the briefings to learn more about the Administration's domestic and foreign policy programs.

The briefings are limited to White House Staff members.

John

*File - Mine
with memo*

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 12, 1978

Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Frank Moore
Jody Powell

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for appropriate
handling.

Rick Hutcheson

cc: The Vice President
Jim McIntyre
Charles Schultze
Tim Kraft
Fran Voorde
RE: ECONOMIC AND LEGISLATIVE
PRESENTATIONS

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Mr. President:

Instead of signing the
budget on Monday, Jan. 23,
you could do it immediately
after church on Jan. 22. ← no

Jody agrees with
this

Phil

Why not
Fri 1/20?
J

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 11, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

FROM: HAMILTON JORDAN *HJ.*
JODY POWELL *J.P.*
FRANK MOORE *F.M.*
STU EIZENSTAT *Stu*

SUBJECT: Economic and Legislative
Presentations

We have developed with Charlie Schultze, Jim McIntyre and Mike Blumenthal, a schedule for you to present this year's economic and legislative program. The schedule is designed to space events in a way that ensures maximum, informed coverage over an extended period, while meeting the legal constraints -- State of the Union (January 19), Economic Report (January 19) and Budget Message (January 23).

The one open question is whether you want to announce the Tax Message in Georgia on Saturday, January 21. *no* The argument for your making a brief announcement (with no questions and with Secretary Blumenthal having done an embargoed briefing on Friday) is two-fold. First, the Tax Message contains what will probably be one of your most popular proposals -- a \$25 billion tax cut. While you will announce that fact in the State of the Union, you might take another opportunity to be closely associated with the cut (and to appear in the Sunday papers making the announcement).

*Fritz
may
some
This*

Second, the Message contains your tax reforms, almost none of the specifics of which will be in your State of the Union Message. While many of the specifics were leaked by Secretary Blumenthal, your announcing some of the reforms would still have significant news value: you would be visibly honoring a major campaign commitment and would be able to articulate your reasons for some of the more controversial reforms. In addition, to the extent that it is clear from the start that you are completely committed to the reforms, the job of pushing them through the Congress will be made easier.

- 2 -

_____ Announce Tax Message

_____ Do not Announce Tax Message

_____ Other

TIMETABLE FOR PRESENTATION OF ECONOMIC AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Jan. 12 President meets with black leaders re '78 agenda.

Jan. 13 President meets with business leaders re economic/tax program.

Jan. 13 President meets with George Meany re '78 agenda.

Jan. 16 President meets with O'Neill re entire '78 agenda.

Jan. 16 President meets with House Steering and Policy Committee.

Jan. 17 President meets with 94th and 95th Members Caucus with '78 agenda.

Jan. 19 President meets separately with Ullman and Long re economic/tax program.

Jan. 19 President gives State of the Union Address; State of Union Message released and delivered to Congress (written texts for both released about 6:00 p.m., with embargo until Address is delivered)

Economic Report of the President released around noon, with embargo until Economic Report is signed following day; Schultze background briefing similarly embargoed.

Jan. 20 President signs Economic Report, with brief remarks.

Jan. 20 Blumenthal background briefing on Tax Message, embargoed until President announces Tax Message.

Jan. 21 (President announces Tax Message in Georgia.)* - *KA*

Tax Message signed and delivered to Congress.

Budget released to press and Congress, embargoed until noon Monday; McIntyre background briefing similarly embargoed.

Jan. 23 President signs budget in Georgia, with brief remarks.

Budget publicly released and delivered to Congress at noon.

* The President might decide to not make the announcement. If he does not, Secretary Blumenthal would do so.

Jan. 30 CEA Report delivered to Congress.

Feb. 1-10 President meets with business and labor leaders
 re private sector jobs program.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 22, 1977

The Vice President
Stu Eizenstat
Hamilton Jordan
Bob Lipshutz
Frank Moore (Les Francis)
Jack Watson

The attached is forwarded to you for
your information.

Rick Hutcheson

ROSENTHAL DOCUMENT REQUEST



INFORMATION

November 21, 1977

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Rosenthal Document Request

This memorandum is in response to several questions raised at this morning's Cabinet meeting. We today delivered to Congressman Rosenthal a number of documents and summaries of documents. Consistent with a recent Defense Department response to Congressman Stratton's request for sensitive documents, we have provided only summaries of documents involving communications with foreign governments and interagency policy-deliberative documents. We have also outlined conditions under which Rosenthal, as Subcommittee Chairman, may personally inspect the originals of those documents.

As a legal matter, the only grounds on which Executive Branch officials can withhold documents from Congress is Executive privilege. Because of the connotations this term has acquired since Watergate, it is preferable for us to couch our response in other terms, such as separation of powers. As previously reported, we and Justice agree that in this case our legal position is sound.

Perhaps as important as our legal position, however, is the political likelihood of a committee vote to subpoena the withheld documents (since this would occur before any court test of our legal position).

Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal, Chairman of the Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, is interested not only in the documents themselves but in making sure that he does not set a precedent in accepting partial information from the Executive Branch that would give away Legislative Branch



prerogatives to Executive Branch information. Congressman Waxman of California, the most junior member of the Subcommittee, is primarily interested in proving his belief that there is no such thing as Executive privilege. He was involved in the subpoena of Rogers Morton and would like to become involved again.

The three Republicans on this Subcommittee -- Garry Brown of Michigan, Clarence Brown of Ohio and Tom Corcoran of Illinois -- see partisan advantage to the confrontation and appear to be willing to back the Waxman approach. The other six members of the Subcommittee -- Cardiss Collins (Ill), Robert Drinan (Mass), Elliott Levitas (Ga), David Evans (Ind), Roby Moffitt (Conn), and Fernand St Germain (RI) -- have not yet committed on this issue. Rosenthal will present the Administration's offer when his Subcommittee members return to Washington November 28.

If the Subcommittee decides that the offer is unacceptable and that they want more information, they will proceed in one of two directions: (1) Rosenthal said that he might then take it to the President, who he believes will turn the materials over to the Committee; or, following a Subcommittee vote, (2) ask the Chairman of the full Government Operations Committee, Jack Brooks of Texas, to issue a subpoena for the documents.

Our investigations into Chairman Brooks receptiveness to such a request for subpoena finds a mixed response. While Chairman Brooks strongly believes in the Legislative Branch's prerogative to see any Executive Branch document, he also believes in compromising on the documents question if he believes the Executive Branch is being reasonable. White House Congressional Liaison (Bill Cable) is trying to get a more definitive reading of Brooks' likely response.


Juanita M. Kreps



THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
Washington, D.C. 20230

November 21, 1977

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your request of November 1, 1977 for a variety of documents relating to the anti-boycott amendments to the Export Administration Act, proposed regulations implementing those amendments, and a recent trip on which Department officials briefed Mideast government officials on the new law and the proposed regulations.

In promulgating regulations implementing the new anti-boycott amendments to the Export Administration Act, the Department of Commerce has gone to considerable lengths to permit full and open public comments. Although exempt under this Act from the formal rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department has nonetheless chosen to have a full public comment period and to require that all public comments, oral as well as written, be a part of the public record. In addition, the Department took the unusual step of inviting public comments prior to, as well as subsequent to, the publication of proposed regulations. As a result, we have received extensive comments. As you are aware, the Department has already made available to your subcommittee copies of approximately 2,000 pages of public comments received prior to the publication of proposed regulations. All public comments received since proposed regulations were published are likewise a matter of public record and are available to your subcommittee.

Your November 1 request asks for additional documents, including communications from foreign governments, notes of meetings with foreign government officials, and interagency policy-deliberative documents. Our response, described in the paragraphs that follow, is designed to assure that your subcommittee will have access to all information necessary for the discharge of its responsibilities. Although there are strong competing considerations, we have sought in our response to accommodate your subcommittee's interests.

Accordingly, we are furnishing your subcommittee with a list of all foreign government officials with whom Department of Commerce officials met on their recent briefing trip to Mideast countries. In addition, we are furnishing full copies

of many of the documents covered by your request. This includes various internal documents, embassy cables, and personal notes of briefings and meetings. These documents are sensitive, internal papers and are furnished on the understanding that they are for the subcommittee's use and that the subcommittee intends not to release them publicly. As to those documents that bear security classifications, it is further understood that the subcommittee will honor those classifications and protect the confidentiality of those documents.

With respect to the remainder of the documents covered by your request, competing interests must be considered. The Department has responsibilities and interests in protecting the confidentiality of certain categories of documents, e.g., it is incumbent upon this Department to honor the confidentiality of government-to-government communications. In this case, the Department's notice of proposed rulemaking expressly stated that communications from foreign governments would not be a matter of public record. Not only is this Department obliged as a matter of law to follow its own rules, but foreign government communications were submitted in reliance on our assurance of confidentiality. Indeed, since your subcommittee's October 23 hearing, several foreign governments have expressly requested that their communications be kept confidential. In addition, an important interest is to be served in maintaining the confidentiality of interagency policy-deliberative documents. Interagency discussions in the process of policy formulation must likewise be free from public scrutiny lest the full and candid consideration of policy alternatives be harmfully chilled.

Accordingly, the Department will make information of this particularly sensitive character available to the subcommittee under the same procedures agreed to by other Congressional committees under similar circumstances. We have prepared for your subcommittee detailed summaries of all of these documents, deleting from those summaries the names of countries and government officials. The summaries will place before the subcommittee all of the substantive information it has requested but will do so without violating our government's pledges of confidentiality. These summaries are being furnished the subcommittee on the same basis as the original documents described above.

In addition, in order to eliminate any question with respect to the accuracy of the summaries provided, we shall make arrangements for you, the subcommittee chairman, personally to inspect the originals with my representative. This review will be without any verbatim record or reports, with adequate protection within the subcommittee of the fact that inspection has been made, and on the understanding that this will end the subcommittee's inquiry with respect to these particular documents.

The foregoing arrangement is on the understanding that by providing for inspection the Department does not waive any of its rights or prerogatives in the event these documents are sought formally by the subcommittee. We further understand that the subcommittee, by agreeing to this procedure, does not waive any of its rights or prerogatives with respect to future requests for other documents.

I appreciate the interest of your subcommittee in this subject, which is one of this Department's most important responsibilities. The issue that is of paramount importance, of course, is the publication of final regulations that fairly implement Congress' intent in enacting meaningful anti-boycott legislation.

Sincerely,


Juanita M. Kreps

Enclosures

Mr. Benjamin S. Rosenthal
Chairman
Subcommittee of the Committee
on Government Operations
Washington, D. C. 20515



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org