

The original documents are located in Box C10, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 1/18/1975” of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Date of January 18, 1975 supplied by
Ruth Kilmer, secretary to Mr. Seidman.



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 18, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: L. WILLIAM SEIDMAN *JWS*

SUBJECT: Special Representative for Trade Negotiations
and the Executive Director of CIEP

This memorandum addresses the organizational issues raised in Bill Walker's memorandum on this subject.

I. Should the same person hold both the STR and the CIEP jobs?

The two positions are currently held by Bill Eberle. However, three factors suggest the merit in making separate appointments. First, the two positions are both demanding, full-time jobs. This is particularly true in the wake of passage of the Trade Reform Act and the onset of major international trade negotiations. Secondly, the two positions entail distinctly different functions. The Executive Director of CIEP is responsible for the coordination of international economic policy under the EPB. The Special Trade Representative has primary responsibility for trade negotiations involving the United States. Thirdly, Congress has expressed its opposition in the past to merging STR and CIEP and a joint appointment may be adversely received, particularly following passage of the Trade Reform Act.

II. Should CIEP provide staff support for the Economic Policy Board in the domestic area as well as the international?

The broad charter of the EPB and the intent of the new White House staff structure support the decision that CIEP's coordinating responsibilities and staff be integrated into the Economic Policy Board. Such an arrangement avoids duplication of effort and is the lowest cost method of operation. Recent experience demonstrates an increasing overlap between domestic and international factors affecting national economic policy. Utilizing CIEP staff for both domestic and international coordination not only enhances the quality of economic policy coordination but it also makes maximum use of personnel. The practical working of such an arrangement will be heavily dependent on the individual selected as the Executive Director of CIEP and Deputy for International Economic Policy and on the understanding he has of his working relationship with the Executive Director of the EPB.



III. Should CIEP focus on long-term issues and serve a policy development role, or should it concentrate on shorter-term issues related to implementation of broad policy concepts?

It is important to clarify that the EPB staff and CIEP are designed as coordinating mechanisms rather than as independent policy development bodies competing with other government agencies. Effective coordination requires attention to both long-term and short-term issues. It does not require that the coordinating body undertake itself the task of substantive policy formulation, but rather that it have the capacity to evaluate the work of departments and agencies, package that work in an appropriate manner for Presidential and EPB decision-making, and see that policies adopted are implemented.

IV. Reporting Relationships of the Special Trade Representative and the Executive Director of CIEP.

In determining the reporting relationships of the Special Trade Representative and the Executive Director of CIEP it is necessary to distinguish between statutory reporting rights and normal reporting channels. Statutorily, the Special Trade Representative can report directly to the President. This right can and should be preserved. However, the thrust of the White House staff organization suggests that in the normal functioning of the White House both the Special Trade Representative and the Executive Director of CIEP would report to the EPB thru its Executive Director. Again, the practical working of such an arrangement will be dependent on the individuals involved.

