

Please file  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 4, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM:

ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

SUBJECT:

Agenda Items for Meeting,  
Thursday, November 5, 8:45 a.m.

- ✓ 1. Bilingual Regulations Memo to Cabinet.
- ✓ 2. OPL Travel Budget.
- ✓ 3. Social Security Task Force (inclusion of Bob Beck).
- ✓ 4. Pro-Family/National Family Week luncheon.
- ✓ 5. Conservative Memo.
- ✓ 6. OCA Meeting. Requested back in July -- can we have the Monday, Nov. 9, 10:30 a.m. time?
- ✓ 7. Presidential Cabinet Memo on Labor consultations.
- ✓ 8. PSI Task Force. Could I see the list because I understand there is no representation of overseas-oriented volunteer organizations or a women's organization.
- ✓ 9. Labor Schedule Proposals for the President.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 4, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: (See Distribution)

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

SUBJECT: Bilingual Election Provisions of  
the Voting Rights Act

At today's Cabinet meeting, the subject of the Bilingual Election Provisions was not addressed in our discussion of the Voting Rights Act. This is an issue with significant political implications and one which will be viewed as a bellwether of Reagan Administration support for Hispanic issues.

This Administration has started off with a good record with Hispanics, who voted for the President in record numbers in 1980 -- 36 percent, up from 17 percent in 1976. Hispanic support was much higher in key states such as Texas and Florida. We are looking at Hispanics as a high potential constituency for 1984; therefore, our position on the bilingual elections issue takes on added importance.

Although these provisions do not expire until 1985, failure to address them at this time will be viewed as opposition. It will be too late in 1984, when we are on the defensive, to explain away our lack of positive action when we had the opportunity.

I am attaching for your information an excellent staff paper which explains the scope of the bilingual provisions and addresses the concerns which have been raised about them. I feel that this is an issue which has significant long-range benefit with little downside risk and therefore should be embraced by the President as part of his Voting Rights Act position.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 5, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

FROM: HENRY ZUNIGA

SUBJECT: Bilingual Election Provisions of the Voting Rights Act

The bilingual election provisions of the Voting Rights Act were passed in 1975 and are in effect through 1985. These provisions call for bilingual elections (bilingual ballots, information, and oral instructions) in certain covered jurisdictions. These jurisdictions include the States of Texas and Arizona plus selected counties and precincts in other states.

At issue at this time is whether these provisions should be extended as part of any amendment of the Voting Rights Act or whether to delay action until the 1985 expiration date. Hispanic civil rights groups have joined with Black civil rights groups and others to form a coalition advocating the inclusion of the bilingual provisions as part of the amendments to the Voting Rights Act. The bilingual provisions have become the "Hispanic issue" among those actively supporting the Voting Rights Act.

Opponents of the bilingual provisions advance five major arguments against an extension. These are listed below, with the corresponding counterarguments put forth by Hispanic spokesmen.

1. The right to vote is an American right and should be exercised in the official language -- English.

To deny a citizen the right to vote because of a language difference is to deny him his constitutional rights. Many Hispanics, such as Mexican-Americans in the southwest, do not speak English well because of inadequate educations and discriminatory practices. Puerto Ricans educated in Puerto Rico were taught in their native language -- Spanish, and this has not been considered unAmerican. Many recent immigrants have fallen into an environment where Spanish is spoken and, hence, have not felt the need to learn English. In fact, naturalization practices now permit those over 50 to be sworn-in as citizens without any English requirements.

A recent survey<sup>1/</sup> points out that 43% of the Hispanic community speaks "only enough English to get by." Only Mexican Americans are Hispanics primarily native born (53%), with foreign born figures of 82% for Puerto Ricans, 93% for Cubans and 93% for other Hispanics. Over 52% of Cubans and 61% of Puerto Ricans know little or no English.

What this data highlights is that bilingualism is a growing trend, and one which is likely to grow rather than diminish. Thus large percentages of foreign born, non-English speaking Hispanics will become voting citizens in increasing numbers (note: Puerto Ricans are voting citizens by birth) and will depend on bilingual elections to exercise their right to vote.

2. Bilingualism fosters a "separatist" movement and risks problems similar to those being experienced in Quebec.

There is no "separatist" movement among Hispanics in this country of any size or influence. The Hispanics who are seeking bilingual election materials are not seeking total bilingualism in America. They are seeking only the necessary assistance to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

Far from being separatists, the beneficiaries of bilingual election materials are among the more conservative Hispanics. The senior citizen and recently naturalized citizen are generally very patriotic and upright and seeking to become an integrated part of the American mainstream. It was a generally accepted fact during the campaign that, aside from the upwardly mobile professionals, the senior citizen and recently naturalized were natural Reagan constituents. This was the basis of rationale for the large expenditures of campaign funds for materials in Spanish. This was precisely the target voter we were seeking and were quite successful in attracting.

3. Costs of bilingualism are prohibitive and/or wasteful since bilingual material is neither needed nor used.

Arguments that bilingual elections are too costly are no longer based on fact. Many examples now available show the cost of a bilingual election as minimal. In Los Angeles County, where 30% of the population is Hispanic, the 1980 elections cost \$7 million dollars, the bilingual elections cost \$155,000 or 1.9% of the total cost.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc., "Spanish USA, Summary of Findings."

The elections that same year in Orange County, California, indicate that the bilingual election costs were 3.4% of the total cost of the elections; Santa Clara County, California, reported 1.5% of the total. New Mexico which has experienced bilingual elections since 1912 reports the extra cost as "minimal."

Congressman Paul McCloskey (R-California), long an opponent of bilingual elections, now states that costs are no longer an issue.<sup>2/</sup>

4. American citizens do not need assistance to vote in a language other than English.

Recent statistics and results of surveys<sup>3/</sup> indicate that the bilingual material and assistance is in fact needed, used and determined to be helpful by the user. In the same 1980 election in Los Angeles, there were 45,000 separate requests for bilingual material. A recent survey indicated that 87% of Hispanics surveyed in Bexar County, Texas (San Antonio), and 76.6% in Nueces County, Texas (Corpus Christi), found the bilingual material to be helpful.

5. The provision of bilingual election materials has not significantly increased voter participation.

Actual election returns and registration figures, which compare 1976 and 1980, show sharp gains in registrations and in Hispanic citizens actually voting.

The number and percentage of Hispanics registered to vote has increased by 30%, between 1976 and 1980, in the Country, with increases in California, Colorado and Texas well above that figure (Texas at 64%). The number and percentages of Hispanics who actually voted also increased by 19% between 1976 and 1980 with those same three states well above the national average (Texas had a 49% increase). A heavy Hispanic state showing an increase at near the national level is New Mexico. New Mexico, however, has enjoyed bilingual elections since 1912, hence there was no difference in procedure between 1976 and 1980. New Mexico also shows the highest percentage of Hispanics in elected state positions. It is also important to note that New Mexico has a 100% Republican representation in Congress, including the only Hispanic Republican Congressman. The bilingual provision have not been an impediment to Republicans in New Mexico.

---

<sup>2/</sup> Statement dated June 10, 1981 before House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

<sup>3/</sup> Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, January 1980.

SUMMARY

The President and the Administration should clearly support the inclusion of the bilingual provisions in the Voting Rights Act position for the following additional reasons:

- \* The bailout provisions and other points in the Voting Rights Act are far too technical and sophisticated for anyone but a student of the Voting Rights Act to understand. The average Hispanic will not understand the position the Administration takes. What he or she will understand, however, will be whether the President included Hispanics in his position -- did he support the bilingual provisions. This is an important issue to Hispanics. It will be made far more important to the Hispanic community by the Hispanic civil rights groups who will quickly and effectively spread the word that the President left them out.
  
- \* Bilingual elections have been ordered by a federal court in New York in 1974, Tones v. Sachs. This case was followed by a second court decision in 1975, Ortez v. New York State Board of Elections, which required bilingual elections statewide.

CONCLUSION

Administration support of the bilingual provisions would extend a law which is politically important to the Hispanic community; which is minimally controversial, except during the congressional hearings; which has been shown to be needed and used by Hispanics; and which has been previously ordered by a federal court independent of legislative action.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 4, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

SUBJECT: OPL Travel Budget

I am requesting a re-consideration of the travel budget we have been allocated for FY82, namely, \$15,000.

According to John Rogers' memorandum of October 8, this sum is based on the actual funds used by our office for the past eight (8) months. While such a basis for projection might, in most cases, seem appropriate, I wish to point out that the preponderance of our activities in OPL since January was, of necessity, based here at the White House. Most of the constituent groups with which we work came to Washington, on their own or at our request, to begin the liaison process and establish the grassroots networks designed for further activity. Very little travel was done by OPL as we concentrated our efforts on establishing the structure and the channels through which we would operate.

Having established these through meetings, briefings, and the like, my staff and I are now ready to work through these channels at the local level to get the President's views across.

Including myself, there are 13 professionals on the OPL staff, each with specific portfolio responsibilities. With this number, the travel allotment we have been budgeted amounts to approximately \$1,150/person/year, or less than \$100/person/month!

While I realize that the budget situation is tight and that we all have to cut back in view of the President's directives, I do believe that we are being asked to bear a disproportionate share of the burden. Furthermore, inasmuch as we have the major outreach function of the White House, such a drastic limitation of funds will significantly impair our ability to fulfill that responsibility.

I ask your careful consideration of this request and your permission to work out a suitable compromise with John Rogers.

Thank you.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 8, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: ELIZABETH DOLE

FROM: JOHN F. W. ROGERS  
SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT  
FOR ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: FY 1982 OPERATING BUDGET  
(Effective October 1, 1981)

As you know, The President has publicly committed himself to reducing the operating appropriations of government agencies, including that of the White House Office. In order to achieve the reductions which The President has approved, it will require the cooperation and participation of all departments and staff of the White House. Some savings can be achieved through the staff reductions which are now under review, but the balance savings must be achieved through economies in office overhead costs and a reduction in travel and entertainment costs. The following areas of overhead costs will be reviewed closely in the coming weeks to determine the most efficient and cost-effective means of continuing operations:

- office equipment and ADP equipment placement
- printing
- newspaper and periodical subscriptions
- mailing expenses

In order to reduce travel and entertainment costs, a budget allocation has been established in these categories for each department. Thus each department will be able to plan its priorities in these areas without adversely affecting other offices. The allocations for your particular department are shown on Attachment A. These amounts are based on the actual use of travel and entertainment funds by your office over the last eight(8) months, adjusted for consideration of office to office fairness. The amount used will be reported to you on a monthly basis to aid you in planning your expenditures. The allocations will be reviewed at mid-year to determine if reallocations are necessary. Attachments B and C are statements of policy with regard to travel and entertainment.

Attachments

Attachment A

FY 1982 Travel and Entertainment Allowance for the  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT  
FOR PUBLIC LIAISON

Travel:               \$15,000.00

Entertainment:     \$ 1,000.00

The above amounts represent the maximum cumulative funds that can be expended by the Office of the Assistant to the President for Public Liaison for travel and for entertainment in FY 1982. Any request for payment of such funds received by the Administrative Office will be charged against the applicable department's allocation and reported to the head of such department on a monthly basis.

## Attachment B

### TRAVEL POLICY FOR WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

#### 1. Travel Authorization

A fully completed travel authorization must be submitted to the Special Assistant to the President for Administration for approval prior to all trips (including political trips). All applicable information must be shown on the authorization and it must be signed by the traveler and the department head.

#### 2. Transportation

Itineraries, routing and ticketing for air and rail transportation is provided by the transportation office in Room 87, OEOP. Official travel will utilize the most economical fares possible, including government contract fares and other special discounts. Travelers desiring different routing, alternate carriers or a higher class of service for personal reasons must pay any additional fare above the minimum resulting from their deviation from the authorized routing. Commercial travel agents shall not be utilized to obtain tickets, as government discounts are not available to such agents.

Ground transportation, such as taxis, limousines, etc., will be paid on the traveler's voucher. It is not necessary to obtain a receipt if the cost is \$15.00 or less, however, charges over \$15.00 must be supported by a signed receipt. If a rental car is used, the collision damage waiver cannot be paid by the government, and will be deducted from the traveler's voucher if billed. (The government is self-insured and official travelers will be covered against liabilities arising from their conduct of official business.)

#### 3. Per Diem Expenses

Travelers will be reimbursed for their out-of-pocket expenses for meals and other miscellaneous costs according to the allowance prescribed below:

##### A. Travel with The President

When a person is traveling with The President (or in connection with the travel of The President), their hotel room charges will be paid directly by the White House. Any meals or other incidental charges to a room must be paid by the individual while checking out of the hotel. All charges for such incidentals, if billed to the White House, will be deducted from the traveler's voucher. Travelers will be reimbursed for their meals and miscellaneous expenses at a daily per diem rate of \$23.00. The actual payment will be based on the number of quarter-days the traveler is away.

Travel Policy for White House Office

B. Travel other than with The President

Any officially approved travel that is not in connection with travel of The President will be paid in accordance with the standard government-wide Federal Travel Regulations as promulgated by the General Services Administration. The statutory maximum that may be paid under these regulations is \$75.00 per day, including the cost of lodging. The travel voucher for such travel must show an itemization of the individual meal and lodging costs, so that the proper reimbursement can be computed. (Note: the back of the voucher form is designed so that the individual meal and lodging costs can be listed in a single line. Pocket-size note pads for recording travel expenses are available from the Administrative Office, Room 1, OEOB, to assist travelers in maintaining accurate records of expenses while traveling.) Hotel charges not in connection with travel of The President should not be billed directly to the White House, but should be paid by the traveler. If such a bill is received by the White House, the charges in excess of the allowable maximum will be deducted from the traveler's reimbursement.

4. Leave While Traveling

Taking leave while traveling is strongly discouraged as it creates the appearance of using government funds for personal benefit. If leave is taken while traveling, no expenses can be paid for the period of leave.

5. Mixed Official and Political Travel

Official funds can be used to pay only travel that is 100% official. If a particular trip contains even the slightest bit of political activity, it must be financed in its entirety from political committee travel funds.

## Attachment C

### WHITE HOUSE POLICY ON USE OF OFFICIAL ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCE

#### 1. Background and Purpose

The Congress has authorized and appropriated a modest sum to the White House Office for the official reception and representation expenses of the White House and Executive Office of The President. The purpose of these funds is to pay such expenses that are not otherwise payable from appropriated funds to foster and maintain relationships of value to the United States Government.

#### 2. Guidelines for Use of Entertainment Funds

Entertainment funds are not intended for the benefit of government officers or employees. Thus, they may not be used to pay for the cost of meals, theater tickets or other entertainment for Federal officials, but only for their non-government guests. The only exception being if a reception or similar large event is scheduled for the purpose of entertaining non-government guests, then the entire amount may be charged as entertainment expenses without deducting the cost of the few government officials who are present.

Entertainment funds expended should be proportionate to the circumstances and the identity of the guest, keeping in mind this Administration's commitment of frugality in government. For example:

- o Meetings should not be scheduled for lunchtime if a morning coffee and danish session would be as productive.
- o Lunch or dinner expenses appropriate to a one-time only foreign visitor may be considered excessive with respect to a businessman who meets regularly with government officials.
- o Efforts should be made to minimize the costs of receptions being planned by using government facilities or food service or by considering cost in selecting the food and beverages to be served.

#### 3. Procedures for Drawing on the Funds

Advance approval from the Special Assistant to the President for Administration is required before a planned function can be funded from this account. Request for approval should be accompanied by a cost estimate.

Requests for reimbursement should be forwarded to the Special Assistant to the President for Administration and should include a receipted bill of expenses, a list of persons present for the function, a statement of the purpose, and a brief description of the expenses (e.g. coffee and pastries, assorted cold drinks, etc.). Reimbursement may be declined if funds are not available or if the entertainment is not consistent with established guidelines.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 4, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

SUBJECT: Robert Beck

I would like to re-iterate how very important I believe it is that Bob Beck be included on the Social Security Task Force.

As you may recall, Bob is CEO of Prudential Insurance and is regarded as an expert on the subject of social security. He chairs the Business Round Table's task force on social security as well as heading up the insurance industry's social security committee. Additionally, he is actively involved with the Chamber of Commerce on the Social Security issue.

From our perspective, at least, Bob Beck's appointment is crucial, since he is so actively involved with several of our constituencies.

Thank you.

Pro/Family -National  
Family Week

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

November 4, 1981

TO: GREGORY J. NEWELL, DIRECTOR  
PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS AND SCHEDULING

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

REQUEST: White House Luncheon

PURPOSE: In celebration of the beginning of Thanksgiving week and National Family Week to give recognition and encouragement to the "pro-family" organization leaders as well as prominent citizens who have given notable support to traditional family values.  
(Spouses included)

BACKGROUND: On November 3, President Reagan proclaimed the week of November 22, 1981, as National Family Week. This is the most appropriate time for the President to give recognition to leaders of the pro-family movement and others identified with traditional family moral values. Most of the invitees are leaders of national grassroots networks of people who basically support the President. These groups continue to be vital as a source of support for the President's program and for candidates favorable to the President. Most of these groups are at least to some extent concerned with what they see as passivity in the Administration on the issues most vital to them. This non-political event will serve to recognize them for their past efforts and to encourage them to continue a high level of support.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: None.

DATE: November 22, 1981. DURATION: 2 Hours

LOCATION: State Dining Room

PARTICIPANTS: 100 - list to be developed

OUTLINE OF EVENT: Luncheon and brief remarks followed by photographs with each couple

REMARKS REQUIRED: Brief remarks

MEDIA COVERAGE: Photographs with each couple

RECOMMENDED BY: Elizabeth H. Dole, Lyn Nofziger, Herb Ellingwood

OPPOSED BY:

PROJECT OFFICER: Morton C. Blackwell



# THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

## THE PRESIDENT'S WINNING COALITION

### The Importance of Activists

Most people misperceive the nature of electoral politics. They see an election as a contest between two individual candidates, or a contest between two rival philosophies, or perhaps even a contest between all the people who belong to the different parties.

Such frameworks do not describe what really goes on in an election.

Elections, in my view, are to a very great extent contests between all the people working hard to elect one candidate and all the people working hard to elect his opponent. These are the people who matter the most in a political race.

Similarly, contests over legislation are not personal duels between legislators, but between the coalitions that those legislators can assemble to support or oppose a particular bill. The fight over the AWACS sale was less a battle between President Reagan and Senator Packwood than it was between those national and grassroots activists lobbying on each side.

It is the activists who make the difference. Most citizens do not engage in any political activity outside of voting. Most will never donate money, wear a button, or stuff an envelope. Those that do have a major impact on the outcomes, and their support is a necessary ingredient to success.

### The Winning Coalition

President Reagan won his election with the support of a Winning Coalition which drew activists from several distinct sources:

- Formal Republican Party organizations
- Businesses and Trade Associations
- Limited Government/Conservative groups

-Pro-defense groups

-Religious/Pro-family groups

Many of the groups within this coalition have completely separate concerns. Each of the groups that joined the coalition did so because Ronald Reagan addressed those issues they care about in such a way as to gain their support. They allied not because they cared about the same things, but because they all wanted to elect Ronald Reagan.

Such is the essence of any coalition. People work together despite differences in emphasis because their desires, at least, do not conflict and because they share a common goal.

This victory contrasts with the 1972 landslide of Richard Nixon. His reelection was a triumph solely of his campaign organization, and was not a coalition victory.

That is why the 1980 victory was accompanied by a parallel sweep of so many House and Senate candidates, while in 1972 the victory was much more isolated. The victorious House and Senate candidates in 1980 were, for the most part, supported by the same coalition that worked for the President.

#### Prospects for the Future of the Winning Coalition

Every element of the Winning Coalition appears likely to continue growing in membership, finances, and expertise through the 1982 and 1984 elections.

#### Formal Republican Party Organizations

There are three major Republican Party committees working on fundraising for the upcoming elections:

- The Republican National Committee
- The Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee
- The Republican Congressional Campaign Committee

All are having very successful fundraising drives. All predictions are for another record two years at least.

### Businesses and Trade Associations

The corporate and trade association Political Action Committees have, from our point of view, improved markedly.

In 1976, they had a dismal record, giving most of their money to Democrats, and much of it to incumbents with safe seats. Many of these PAC's were more interested in buying access to sure winners than in affecting the outcome of a close contest.

In 1978, my detailed study showed that business and association PACs made considerable progress in terms of size, numbers, and backing for candidates who supported the free enterprise system.

A study of their record in the 1980 elections indicates that they are continuing along the correct path. Moreover, more and more of these PACs are being created every year, and existing PACs have realistic plans to raise much more money than they have in the past.

In addition, those (still numerous) PACs who wish merely to ride with the winners will to some extent accommodate themselves to the new Administration, the new majority in the Senate, and the new conservative coalition in the House.

Next year, therefore, promises to be the biggest and best directed effort yet from business and association PACs.

### Limited Government/Conservative Groups, Pro-defense Groups, and Religious Pro-family Groups

The cluster of limited government, conservative, pro-defense, pro-family, religious-political activist groups is collectively known as the conservative movement, or the New Right.

It is composed of literally dozens of national organizations and thousands of local groups, all of them either new or newly large and increasingly effective. Whether PAC or lobby, whether focused on a small cluster of issues or on a wide spectrum of interests, all of them are concentrating on attracting more participants into public policy battles on the side of the Winning Coalition.

Most of these groups believe in training their supporters in the techniques of winning. All of these groups can point to the scalps of politicians defeated in part due to their efforts, as they ask their supporters to contribute again to their programs.

This grassroots activists development is the most dramatic force at work in politics today. There are abundant signs that groups in this category are still in a period of explosive growth. New groups are founded daily. Old groups, such as the well known NCPAC, are setting records this year for money raised.

#### The Winning Coalition and the President's Program

The Winning Coalition held together in the major battles over the budget resolution and the tax cut. In the Senate AWACS fight, the coalition eventually was virtually intact, working for another key win for the President.

#### The Future of the Activists on the Left

The other side has its activists as well, but they are in danger of being seriously weakened.

To the extent that the budget cuts defund those programs which for years have illegally or improperly been used to pay for political organizing, the corps of activists working for bigger government and higher taxes will be reduced.

For years, untold thousands of liberal activists were selectively registering voters in liberal Democratic areas, getting out the vote in those same areas, organizing rent strikes, training liberal precinct organizers, and so on, at taxpayer expense. With their funding reduced, many on the Left will find themselves cut adrift.

[Members of the President's Winning Coalition, however, have never depended on (or gotten) government funding.]

Shut off from much of their usual government-funded organizing, likely to lose some of their constituency as hundreds of thousands able to fend for themselves become productive taxpayers, and bickering among themselves over the question of who is to blame for their losses, the opposition is attempting to create its own "New Right."

They are trying to create their own voluntarily funded groups in order to parallel what the conservatives have done. For several reasons, these are likely to fail in the long run and are certain to be unequal to the task in the short run.

#### Potential Problems

From the above analysis, there appears to be building a long term realignment caused by an infusion of new resources and new activists.

What could go wrong for the Winning Coalition?

The first pitfall to avoid is a failure of will. Such a failure would be characterized by a lessening of the Administration's commitment to reducing government spending. Specifically, the President needs to continue to press for

- cutbacks in the illegal and improper government activities which fund the political opposition, and
- cutbacks in those social welfare programs not targeted to the truly needy.

The second pitfall to avoid is a failure of strategy or tactics, which might be characterized by:

- Poor communication among the elements of the Winning Coalition
- Failure to plan ahead on the key elements of the President's program
- Divisions and fights that could break out among the diverse elements of the Winning Coalition.

## THE 1981 VIRGINIA DISASTER

For the past several years, a coalition in Virginia beat the liberal Democrats in virtually every statewide race, three gubernatorial races, every U.S. Senate race, and a record of Presidential election victories beginning in 1968.

In 1981, that coalition split in an acrimonious fight.

The major elements of the coalition which for long dominated Virginia were the following:

1. the traditional Republicans
2. the traditional Harry Byrd, Sr. Democrats
3. the New Right, movement conservatives

Basically, it was a struggle between "teams" of like minded activists. There was a bitter contest over the Lt. gubernatorial nomination. The old-line Republicans, the conservative former Democrats, and the New Right each had its own candidate.

For the past couple of years, the state party chairman had been taking verbal pot shots at conservative activists, particularly conservative religious leaders who had loyally supported virtually every Republican statewide candidate.

The party's gubernatorial nominee had been active in 1964 in Youth for Rockefeller, switching to Scranton when Rockefeller dropped out. While he was Attorney General, the 1981 gubernatorial nominee was a fund raiser for the Ripon Society.

During the campaign the gubernatorial candidate presented himself as a conservative, but he made little or no effort to establish a rapport with any of the wide spectrum of conservative movement organizations which have impact in Virginia politics.

The conservative activists who were formerly of Democratic affiliation and the newly activated conservative movement organization leaders both decided to support the gubernatorial nominee. They realized that they were part of a coalition.

Both groups allied to the Republican party establishment, however, decided to run candidates for Lt. Governor. So did the GOP establishment.

The New Right conservatives led with more than 40% of the convention on the first ballot for the Lt. Governor nomination. The former Byrd Democrat ran a strong second. The purely Republican candidate, Nathan Miller, ran a poor third.

In subsequent ballots, Miller's votes were chewed off in hunks by the other candidates until it appeared that the former Byrd Democrats' candidate, Herb Bateman, would win.

An intense rivalry had developed. The conservative movement candidate, Guy Farley, withdrew. On the next ballot, Miller's original delegates returned to him and most of Farley's people decided to support Miller rather than their intense rival, Bateman.

The resulting ticket was simply not capable of generating enthusiasm from enough of the activists who had participated in all the previous GOP ( and Byrd Democrat) victories.

The bitterness extended to the grass-roots. The liberal-to-moderate factions of the party, for instance, refused to support strong conservatives running for reelection to the state legislature in Fairfax County. Larry Pratt, a 1980 Reagan delegate, was defeated for reelection; so was John Buckley, 1980 Presidential elector from the 8th Congressional district.

Conservative activists who have poured resources into previous Virginia Republican campaigns simply sat on their hands or worked only for those candidates who had supported them in the party struggles earlier in the year. Others, active in the party leadership, went through the motions of campaigning, but privately expressed themselves as unconcerned with the outcome of the election.

In short, the various elements of the traditionally dominant coalition in Virginia politics went their separate ways. The result was defeat for candidates of each component of the coalition.

To some extent this was a normal outcome of the struggle over the control of the spoils of victory. To some extent it was the result of strong personality conflicts among the leaders of different elements of the coalition.

At the state level, the central problem was that important elements of the normal, governing coalition felt cut out of the action. They were made to feel unwelcome; they were hardly courted at all; they felt beaten and betrayed; they knew they would lose credibility with their followers if they urged the same kind of effort under these circumstances that they had organized in the previous election victories.

The lesson here for the Reagan winning coalition is obvious. Those in positions of responsibility in the Reagan Administration must recognize that they are supported by a diverse coalition, the major elements of which are led by strong leaders.

Whether or not the Reagan winning coalition can be held together in future election battles remains to be seen. Divine right of kings was overturned in this country two hundred years ago. An attempt to resurrect this principle failed in the Nixon years. Leaders who know they have recruited and elected U.S. Senators and Congressmen should not be taken for granted by any Administration.

The coalition which Franklin D. Roosevelt put together in the 1930's held together as the normal governing coalition in America for almost fifty years.

There were many inherent conflicts in Roosevelt's days between union leadership, civil rights organizations, and segregationist southern Democrats. But Roosevelt and subsequent leaders of the Democrat party generally had the good sense to court constantly all the elements of their coalition. No major element was treated as an unwanted stepsister.

When the leftists began to ignore and then to attack the interests of conservative Democrats, the Roosevelt winning coalition began to break up.

## ISSUE INITIATIVES IMPORTANT TO THE WINNING COALITION

All of the below listed suggestions are either part of the body of commitments made by the President or logical policy developments consistent with the President's philosophy.

They are listed not necessarily in order of eventual political importance but in order of perceived urgency among groups which are part of the President's winning coalition.

1. Some clear initiative on behalf of Right-to-Life. The President could take any one of several actions which would calm the activists among this group of previously committed Reagan supporters.

- A. Endorsement of the Human Life Amendment.
- B. Endorsement of the Human Life Bill.
- C. Announcement of some Administration action against abortion such as a decision to drop abortion from the list of medical procedures which can be financed through government insurance programs.

2. Gun control

The President should repudiate those portions of the recently released Justice Department Committee study of crime which would require increased regulation and control of handguns.

3. Busing

The President should announce his support for limitation of jurisdiction of federal courts on forced school busing.

4. Hobbs Act reform

The President should announce his support for an amendment to the Hobbs Act which would remove the exemptions now enjoyed by organized labor under which union organizations cannot be prosecuted for certain categories of extortion.

5. Legal Services Corporation

The President should make sure to wipe out funding for this organization of left-wing activists.

6. Block grants

There are many current opportunities to advance the block grant concept beyond its current status in the recently enacted budget resolution. An Administration willingness to force votes, even losing votes, will provide conservative activist groups with ammunition from voting records to be used in the 1982 and 1984 elections.

#### 7. Tuition tax credits

This is a Reagan commitment, the fulfillment of which will greatly encourage many supporters and will work dramatic improvements over the years in our nation's education system.

#### 8. Department of Education

The abolition of the Department of Education and the shifting of most of its programs to the states through a block grant system should receive a high priority from the Administration.

#### 9. Family Protection Act

This proposal has been amended since the last Congress. It is an omnibus bill which is unlikely to pass in this Congress, but which contains many proposals that are highly attractive to large segments of the Reagan winning coalition. The President could show strong interest by specifically endorsing the following four of the thirty-two concepts included in the Family Protection Act:

- Parental Notification; provides that parents be notified when an unmarried minor receives contraceptive devices or abortion-related services from a federally-funded organization
- Parental Care Trust; establishes a trust account procedure similar to the Individual Retirement Account, under which taxpayers can save \$3000 a year for the support of an aged parent or a handicapped relative
- Sex-intermingling; local schools are given back the authority over sex-intermingling in sports and other school activities
- Voluntary Prayer; guarantees the individual's constitutional right to the free exercise of religion, whether in public or in private

#### 10. National Defense

There is general agreement among conservative, pro-defense organization leaders that the U.S. should undertake strong new initiatives in high-technology weapons, such as lasers and space weapons. The rationale is that we should compete with the Soviets in such areas where we have a decided advantage. The President's support for increased emphasis on high technology defense programs would be consistent with his desire to maintain a voluntary military

11. Voting Rights Act

The left has made an effort to make this a "cause celebre." The conservative groups would be upset if the President gives in to the liberal pressures and endorses permanent Federal pre-clearance controls over certain state and local election procedure changes. The President should work to provide some real escape hatch so that jurisdictions with excellent records in this area could work their way out from under the onerous provisions of the current law.

12. Veterans policy

The Veterans groups are reasonable satisfied with current Administration policy. I recommend that the Administration take no steps which would significantly lower the level of medical services currently provided by the VA. Legislative and election battles are much more easily won if these powerful organizations are retained as part of the President's winning coalition.

## HOLDING CONSERVATIVES IN THE WINNING COALITION

We are not in an era of static political forces. We can and should encourage the growth of groups in basic agreement with the President.

We should make leaders of these groups understand that they have a piece of the action in this Administration. We should tolerate their occasional divergences on policy matters. We should discredit any feelings they have that they are considered pariahs by this Administration.

We should facilitate meetings for these groups with the President.

We should clear the log jam on long-pending requests by these groups for meetings with the Senior Staff. Examples of pending requests are busing, gun groups, and Right to Work.

We should encourage Administration figures to accept speaking engagements before conservative groups.

We should tighten the process by which "Reagan credentials" are required for appointees to the departments and agencies.

We should break the log jam on the recommended appointments of conservative activists to Presidential boards and commissions.

We should appoint conservative leaders and activists to serve on appropriate delegations for the President.

We should take quick actions at the highest levels to repudiate further "unnamed sources" in the White House which are critical of conservative organizations.

We should take particular care that future federal judicial appointees are solidly in tune with the President's political philosophy.

We should make sure that the President will not approve any of the pending revisions of the U.S. criminal code which are offensive to major elements of the winning coalition.

We should not retreat at all on tax cuts.

We should push vigorously forward on the second, third, and fourth rounds of budget cuts.

We should reach agreement on no new SALT treaty with the Soviets.

We should put some real anti-Soviet teeth into the Voice of America and other U.S. broadcasting services behind the Iron Curtain.

We should launch a thorough, "human rights" criticism of the Sandanista regime of Nicaragua.

We should get tough on technology transfers to Soviet bloc countries.

We should specifically encourage the conservative religious component in the Task Force on Private Sector Initiative.

We should stifle any RNC or Administration criticism of "negative" campaigns by conservative organizations against liberal incumbents. This political tactic works, as NCPAC and the GOP's anti-Tip O'Neill ads proved last year. The liberals used this tactic to defeat Reaganite Delegates Pratt and Buckley in Fairfax County (VA) in the 1981 elections.

Many people contend that this Administration will suffer disaster at the polls in 1982 unless the economy makes a dramatic recovery. History demonstrates that that is not necessarily so. Franklin Roosevelt was elected during this nation's worst economic crisis. The economy remained a disaster area all through the 1930's.

Despite the continued, severe depression, Roosevelt won consistent victories. These were the two secrets of his success:

1. He retained the initiative on issues. He kept people talking about his proposals.
2. He held his coalition together.



No working paper.



# THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF

DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

I am writing to reaffirm to you my belief that this Administration should actively seek the counsel and input of the representatives of organized labor.

During my eight years as Governor of California, I was proud of my relationship with organized labor. While some disagreements may have existed, I always found that we could disagree without being disagreeable.

By this Memorandum, I am asking each of you to take immediate steps to see that "our doors are always open" to the labor community.

In furtherance of this "open door policy", I would ask that you give special consideration to regularized meetings with labor representatives, that you actively solicit labor views on major policy issues impacting labor, and that you consider those views in the decision-making process of your Department or Agency.

Over the years, the American labor movement has played a major role in the American economic miracle. Unions are among our most valued institutions and serve as some of our best examples of participatory democracy. I want to ensure that their views are fully heard and considered by my Administration.

PSI TASK FORCE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: JAMES ROSEBUSH

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

SUBJECT: Women's Voluntary Organization Component  
of the PSI Task Force

As we agreed, I have done some research to determine which organization would most appropriately represent volunteer women on the Private Sector Initiatives Task Force.

All indications are that the General Federal of Women's Clubs (GFWC) is the premiere organization of this type. The GFWC is massive in its membership, well organized and respected for its volunteer initiatives. The organization has been supportive of the President's programs and was one of the first to respond to his call for volunteer action.

While the GFWC is clearly a winner, the political background of its current president, Juanita Bryant, would make her an unsuitable participant on the Task Force. She is an active and vocal Democrat who has repeatedly attacked the President. She could be expected to use her position as president for partisan ends, even though the GFWC is officially a non-partisan organization.

To deal with this fact, I am recommending that the incoming president, Jeri Winger, be appointed to the PSI Task Force. Mrs. Winger's tenure as president-elect will officially begin in June of 1982. According to GFWC regulations, she will serve as president-elect for two years before ascending to the presidency in 1984. Her assured participation in a GFWC leadership role for the next four years will provide a valuable measure to the continuity to the Task Force and its activities.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 4, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

SUBJECT: Private Sector Initiatives Task Force

I wish to recommend again that the Task Force include at least one person from the area of international voluntarism. In that regard, I would like to suggest three possible candidates:

1. Loret Ruppe, Director of the Peace Corps. With her domestic counterpart, Tom Pauken, on the Task Force, Loret would be a natural complement. The Peace Corps epitomizes international voluntarism and Loret herself has been actively pursuing ways in which the private sector can work with the Peace Corps on overseas projects.
2. James Doty or 3. Jay Niemczyk, of the People-to-People Program. Doty is the President and Jay the Executive Director of the Board. People-to-People was founded by President Eisenhower and promotes international exchange visits and programs. It has never received one cent of federal funds and thus is truly of "the private sector." President Reagan now serves as honorary chairman.

If any of the above are unacceptable for any reason, then I would like to ask consideration of a representative from one of the international relief organizations, i.e. CARE, Catholic Relief Services, etc.

I would appreciate your consideration of these candidates.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 5, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: ELIZABETH H. DOLE  
VIA: RED CAVANEY/JACK BURGESS  
FROM: BOB BONITATI *pb*  
SUBJECT: Attached Schedule Proposals

In scheduling these three labor meetings I think it would be very useful to have the meeting with the Teamsters first. To be followed by the AFL-CIO Executive Council and then the meeting of independent unions.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with representatives of the Teamsters

DATE: Week of 12/7 - prior to AFL-CIO Executive Council

PURPOSE: To maintain communication with a union that has been supportive of the President.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room  
20 representatives of the Teamsters  
45 minutes

CABINET PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: President gave video-taped message to Teamsters Convention in Las Vegas, June 1, 1981.

BACKGROUND: - Meeting with the Teamsters is part of program to maintain communications with labor and demonstrate that this Administration has an "open door policy".

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with AFL-CIO Executive Council

DATE: Week of 12/7

PURPOSE: To establish dialogue with the leaders of organized labor and demonstrate that this Administration is interested in the concerns of labor.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room  
35 member AFL-CIO Executive Council  
1 hour

CABINET PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION:

BACKGROUND: Our relations with organized labor are in need of improvement. The leadership of the AFL-CIO has publicly adopted an anti-Administration attitude, but there are signs that some members of the AFL-CIO Executive Council would like to begin to "get along with the Administration". This meeting could demonstrate the President's "open door policy" towards labor.

APPROVE

DISAPPROVE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with representatives of independent unions (not affiliated with the AFL-CIO)

DATE: — First two weeks of December

PURPOSE: To establish dialogue with the representatives of independent unions and demonstrate that this Administration is interested in the concerns of labor.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room  
25 representative of independent unions  
45 minutes

CABINET PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION:

BACKGROUND: Meeting with representatives of independent unions would be part of Administration program to maintain communications with labor and demonstrate that we have an "open door policy".

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 5, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: ELIZABETH H. DOLE  
VIA: RED CAVANEY/JACK BURGESS  
FROM: BOB BONITATI *by*  
SUBJECT: Attached Schedule Proposals

In scheduling these three labor meetings I think it would be very useful to have the meeting with the Teamsters first. To be followed by the AFL-CIO Executive Council and then the meeting of independent unions.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with representatives of the Teamsters

DATE: Week of 12/7 - prior to AFL-CIO Executive Council

PURPOSE: To maintain communication with a union that has been supportive of the President.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room

20 representatives of the Teamsters

45 minutes

CABINET PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: President gave video-taped message to Teamsters Convention in Las Vegas, June 1, 1981.

BACKGROUND: -- Meeting with the Teamsters is part of program to maintain communications with labor and demonstrate that this Administration has an "open door policy".

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with AFL-CIO Executive Council

DATE: Week of 12/7

PURPOSE: To establish dialogue with the leaders of organized labor and demonstrate that this Administration is interested in the concerns of labor.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room

35 member AFL-CIO Executive Council

1 hour

CABINET

PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY

PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS

COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS

PARTICIPATION:

BACKGROUND:

Our relations with organized labor are in need of improvement. The leadership of the AFL-CIO has publicly adopted an anti-Administration attitude, but there are signs that some members of the AFL-CIO Executive Council would like to begin to "get along with the Administration". This meeting could demonstrate the President's "open door policy towards labor.

APPROVE

DISAPPROVE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

DATE: 11/5/81

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

MEETING: Meeting with representatives of independent unions (not affiliated with the AFL-CIO)

DATE: First two weeks of December

PURPOSE: To establish dialogue with the representatives of independent unions and demonstrate that this Administration is interested in the concerns of labor.

FORMAT: Cabinet Room  
25 representative of independent unions  
45 minutes

CABINET PARTICIPATION: Secretary Donovan

FIRST LADY PARTICIPATION:  REQUIRED  ADVISED  NOT ADVISED

SPEECH MATERIAL: Brief remarks of welcome

PRESS COVERAGE: Photo coverage  
Press made aware of meeting

STAFF: Robert F. Bonitati

RECOMMEND: Elizabeth H. Dole

OPPOSED:

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION:

BACKGROUND: Meeting with representatives of independent unions would be part of Administration program to maintain communications with labor and demonstrate that we have an "open door policy".

APPROVE \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVE \_\_\_\_\_

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 5, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR ELIZABETH H. DOLE

VIA: Red Cavaney/Jack Burgess

FM: Bob Bonitati

RE: Vice President's Reception

I have attached a copy of a follow up memo I sent to Thad Garrett concerning the Vice President hosting a reception for labor leaders at his residence.

Red Cavaney has suggested that I bring this to your attention so that the concept might be cleared with Jim Baker.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  
September 28, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR THAD GARRETT

FM: Bob Bonitati

RE: Reception for labor leaders

I would like to suggest that the Vice President consider hosting a reception for a group of labor leaders at his residence.

Such a gesture might help to warm the chilly relationship that now exists between the Administration and organized labor.

An appropriate time might be early November, prior to the AFL-CIO Convention.

As I indicated to you before, the reception might be held in honor of the AFL-CIO Centennial year.

I'd be pleased to discuss this further with you and to assist in planning and organizing if you decide to host such a reception.

cc: Elizabeth H. Dole

CC 1-7  
Hester

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 3, 1981

TO: JENNIFER FITZGERALD  
VICE PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENTS & SCHEDULING

FROM: Elizabeth H. Dole

REQUEST: Reception for labor leaders at the Vice  
President's residence

PURPOSE: To attempt to improve strained relations  
between the Administration and organized  
labor and commemorate the AFL-CIO Centennial  
year.

BACKGROUND: Our relations with organized labor are in  
need of improvement. A reception for labor  
leaders commemorating the AFL-CIO Centennial  
year could help to dispel the notion that  
the Administration is anti-labor and will be  
interpreted as an attempt to "reach out".

PREVIOUS  
PARTICIPATION: None

DATE: After conclusion of AFL-CIO Convention.  
Friday, November 20 or the week following.

DURATION: 1 1/2 hours

LOCATION: Vice President's residence

PARTICIPANTS: Vice President, Cabinet Officers  
Approximately 150 labor leaders

OUTLINE OF EVENT: Cocktail party/reception

REMARKS REQUIRED: Brief remarks honoring AFL-CIO Centennial

MEDIA COVERAGE: Press made aware of reception.

RECOMMENDED BY: Elizabeth H. Dole

PROJECT OFFICER: Robert F. Bonitati

f - family  
To Jim  
Ciccone  
11/9  
MDT

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  
October 26, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM:

ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

SUBJECT:

Office of Public Liaison Briefing  
on the Family Protection Act

I. Summary

At the request of major pro-family groups, our office scheduled a discussion on the proposed Family Protection Act on Wednesday, October 7, 1981. Pro-family leaders have designed this omnibus legislation to reverse past government policies which they believe have been harmful to or destructive of families.

Leaders of these grass roots organizations believe that if the Administration will reverse what they see as a passive policy on social issues, this will invigorate their troops to do battle in the critical 1982 elections.

II. Discussion

Leaders of National Pro-Family Coalition, Moral Majority, Eagle Forum and United Families of America met with Administration officials from OMB, OPD, HHS, DOEd, Congressional Affairs Office, and the Vice President's office. Also in attendance were Senator Roger Jepsen, principal sponsor of the Family Protection Act in the Senate and Congressman Albert Lee Smith, principal House sponsor. The list of the attendees is attached.

Senator Jepsen outlined the conservative, pro-family thesis that government policy, including tax policy, is disruptive to families. This omnibus bill, of which Senator Laxalt is principal co-sponsor, is intended to remove the government from advocacy in various areas such as busing and homosexuality. Through tax incentives, it would encourage families to make provisions for children's education, care of elderly relatives at home, etc. A summary of the concepts contained in the act is attached.

The groups at this briefing were some of the best known of the literally hundreds of pro-family and religious groups which

intend to make the Family Protection Act their principal affirmative legislative program in this Congress. These groups were all strong supporters in the nomination process and in the general election in 1980.

The point was repeatedly made that without some meaningful signs of encouragement from the Administration, much of the grass roots enthusiasm which produced startling changes in the 1980 elections in both Houses will not be available for candidates who support Administration policies in 1982.

These pro-family groups do not expect the Administration to actively support this entire bill. But they did emphasize that continued lack of Administration leadership on social issues will have a negative impact.

They noted with pleasure that Senator Laxalt told the Eagle Forum at their banquet on October 2 that the President had assured him that the Administration will take an active role in social issues starting early next year.

Subsequent to the briefing, the pro-family organization leaders reviewed the thirty-two concepts contained in the proposed act. They selected the following four segments of the act which they felt would be appropriate for endorsement.

Parental Notification -- Provides that parents be notified when an unmarried minor receives contraceptive devices or abortion-related services from a federally-funded organization.

Parental Care Trust -- Establishes a trust account procedure similar to the Individual Retirement Account, under which taxpayers can save \$3,000 a year for the support of an aged parent or a handicapped relative.

Sex-intermingling -- Local schools are given back the authority over sex-intermingling in sports and other school activities.

Voluntary Prayer -- Guarantees the individual's Constitutional right to the free exercise of religion, whether in public or in private.

Let's discuss, please.

cc: E. Meese  
M. Deaver

*discussed  
je*

## THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

List of Attendees - Family Protection Act Briefing - October 7, 1981

Senator and Mrs. Roger Jepsen  
Congressman Albert Lee Smith  
Gina Bessey - Office of Senator Jepsen  
Sara Newcomb - Office of Congressman Smith

Connie Marshner - National Pro-Family Coalition  
Ron Godwin, Louis Ropog - The Moral Majority  
Noreen Barr - Eagle Forum  
Gordon Jones - United Families of America

Don Moran - OMB Staff  
Elizabeth H. Dole - OPL Staff  
Diana Lozano - OPL Staff  
Bill Triplett - OPL Staff  
Morton Blackwell - OPL Staff  
Wendy Borchardt - OPL Staff  
Kathy Christiansen - OPL Staff  
Maiselle Shortley - OPL Staff  
Mary Gall - Vice President's Staff  
Gary Bauer - OPD Staff  
Bill Gribbin - Legislative Affairs Staff  
Jerry Regier - HHS Staff  
Robert Rubin - HHS Staff  
John Rodriguez - Department of Education Staff

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

List of Attendees - Family Protection Act Briefing - October 7, 1981

Senator and Mrs. Roger Jepsen  
Congressman Albert Lee Smith  
Gina Bessey - Office of Senator Jepsen  
Sara Newcomb - Office of Congressman Smith

Connie Marshner - National Pro-Family Coalition  
Ron Godwin, Louis Ropog - The Moral Majority  
Noreen Barr - Eagle Forum  
Gordon Jones - United Families of America

Don Moran - OMB Staff  
Elizabeth H. Dole - OPL Staff  
Diana Lozano - OPL Staff  
Bill Triplett - OPL Staff  
Morton Blackwell - OPL Staff  
Wendy Borchardt - OPL Staff  
Kathy Christiansen - OPL Staff  
Maiselle Shortley - OPL Staff  
Mary Gall - Vice President's Staff  
Gary Bauer - OPD Staff  
Bill Gribbin - Legislative Affairs Staff  
Jerry Regier - HHS Staff  
Robert Rubin - HHS Staff  
John Rodriguez - Department of Education Staff

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

(202) 224-3234

THE FAMILY PROTECTION ACT -- 97th Congress  
Jepsen-Smith S. 1378

## CONCEPT SUMMARY

### TITLE I -- Family Preservation

1. Rights of Parents -- Reinforces the responsibility and legal rights of parents to direct the religious and moral upbringing of their children. (Section 101)
2. Parental Notification -- Provides that parents be notified when an unmarried minor receives contraceptive devices or abortion-related services from a federally-funded organization. (Section 102)
3. Juvenile Delinquency -- Prohibits the federal government from preempting or interfering with state statutes pertaining to juvenile delinquency. Interstate compacts will be maintained. (Section 103)
4. Child Abuse -- Restricts the federal government from preempting or interfering with state statutes pertaining to child abuse. Revises the definition of child abuse to exclude corporal punishment (spanking) "applied by a parent or individual explicitly authorized by a parent to perform such function." Federal funds for operating a child abuse program are subject to specific authorization from state legislatures. (Section 104)
5. Spouse Abuse -- Restricts the federal government from preempting or interfering with state statutes pertaining to spouse abuse. (Section 105)
6. Legal Services: Abortion -- Prohibits any funds under the Legal Services Corporation from being used in litigation seeking to compel abortions, assistance, or compliance with abortion, or funding for abortion. (Section 106)
7. Legal Services: Divorce -- Prohibits any funds under the Legal Services Corporation from being used in litigation involving divorce. (Section 106)
8. Legal Services: Homosexual rights -- Prohibits any funds under the Legal Services Corporation from being used in litigation involving homosexual rights. (Section 106)
9. Spouse Allowance -- Reinstates Department of Defense provision that service personnel living separately from their families automatically send home the predetermined "dependent's allowance" for family support. (Section 107)
10. Homosexual Organizations -- Denies federal funds to any organization which uses the funds for the express purpose of advocating homosexuality as a lifestyle. (Section 108)

TITLE II -- Taxation

11. Education Savings Account -- Establishes a savings plan whereby relatives may deposit up to \$2,500 tax exempt, per year, to save for a child's education . (Section 201)
12. Tax-exempt schools -- Private educational institutions are granted tax exemption if they fulfill certain requirements. ((Section 202)
13. Multi-generational household -- Allows a tax credit of \$250 or a tax exemption of \$1,000 for each household which includes a dependent person age 65 or older. This provision allows either the tax credit or the tax exemption -- not both. (Section 203)
14. Parental Care Trust -- Establishes a trust account procedure similar to the Individual Retirement Account, under which taxpayers can save \$3,000 a year for the support of an aged parent or a handicapped relative. (Section 204)
15. Retirement Savings Account for Spouses -- Contributions by an employed person to a savings account for the non-salaried spouse are tax-deductible up to \$1,500 a year. This amount increases to \$3,000 if the spouse is handicapped. (Section 205)
16. Day Care -- A corporation may deduct from taxes its contribution to a joint employee-employer day care facility. (Section 206)
17. Exemptions for Childbirth or Adoption -- Married couples filing jointly are granted an additional \$1,000 tax exemption for the year in which a child is either born or adopted. The exemption increases to \$3,000 if the child is born handicapped or if the adopted child is handicapped, over the age of 6, or biracial. Additionally, this provision allows the individual to deduct the amount of adoption expenses paid during the taxable year: (Section 207)

TITLE III -- Education

18. Religion Courses -- Provides a cause of action for parents if an educational institution receiving federal funds prohibits them from participating in decisions regarding their child's enrollment in religion courses. (Section 301)
19. Visitation of Classrooms -- Provides a cause of action for parents if an educational institution receiving federal funds prohibits them from visiting their child's classroom. (Section 301)
20. Teacher Unionization -- Provides a cause of action for individuals if an educational institution receiving federal funds requires forced payment of dues as condition for the employment of teachers. (Section 301)

FAMILY PROTECTION ACT -- 97th Congress

Page 3

21. Reviewing Textbooks -- Provides a cause of action for parents if an educational institution receiving federal funds prohibits parents from reviewing textbooks prior to their use in public schools. (Section 301)
22. Balance in Textbooks -- Prevents federal funds from being used to promote educational materials that do not present men and women in all the various roles they play in today's society. (Sec. 301)
23. Teacher Qualifications -- States are ensured the right to determine teacher qualifications unhampered by federal regulations. (Section 302)
24. Attendance Requirements -- States are ensured the right and authority to regulate attendance requirements at public schools without interference from the federal government. (Section 302)
26. Sex-intermingling -- Local schools are given back the authority over sex-intermingling in sports and other school activities. (Section 302)
27. Block Grants -- Titles I, II, III, IV, VII and IX of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 are replaced with block grants of money to states as they deem necessary.
28. Release Time for Parenthood Education -- If schools require a course on parenting, parents may arrange for their children to be taught the course by a church or by the parents on a release time basis. (Section 304)
29. Legal Services: Busing -- Prohibits any funds under the Legal Services Corporation from being used in litigation involving busing solely for the achievement of racial quotas or for desegregation purposes. (Section 305)

TITLE IV -- Voluntary Prayer

30. Guarantees the individual's Constitutional right to the free exercise of religion, whether in public or in private. (Section 401)

TITLE V -- RIGHTS OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND EDUCATIONAL AFFILIATES

31. Federal agencies may not regulate religious activities such as church schools, religious activities, religious youth homes, and ministries of religious institutions. The provision in no way interferes with provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (with respect to race, creed, color, or national origin) or with the authority of local governments to require reasonable fire, health, and safety standards. Exempts religious organizations from regulations of affirmative action, quotas, guidelines, or actions designed to overcome racial imbalance. (Section 501)

TITLE VI -- JURISDICTION

This section outlines the various courts of jurisdiction to which an action under the Act may be brought by an aggrieved party. (Section 601)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 26, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM:

ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

SUBJECT:

A Labor Offensive

The AFL-CIO will conduct its Centennial Convention in New York City from November 16 through November 19.

With the current disposition of the news media to focus on the "rift between labor and the Administration", that period of time should produce the same kind of negative media play that we experienced around Labor Day and Solidarity Day. The opportunities for negative media will be heightened by the fact that the AFL-CIO has decided to not invite the President to address their Convention. Not inviting an incumbent President is a considerable break with years of tradition. (See attached)

Rather than being on the defensive during this period, I would suggest that we seize the media initiative and implement an offensive program designed to portray the Administration as reaching out to listen to the concerns and interests of organized labor.

In planning such an offensive we have taken into consideration several factors:

1. Lane Kirkland is receiving increasing internal criticism from union leaders for his continued anti-Administration style and rhetoric.
2. There is a growing sentiment within the AFL-CIO to cease the hostilities and to try to "get along with the Administration". Such people as United Steelworkers President, Lloyd McBride; Service Employees Union President, John Sweeney; Building & Construction Trades President, Bob Georgine; Plumbers President, Marty Ward, all want to reduce the adversary relationship and begin to cooperate.
3. A number of business leaders and key members of Congress believe that the Administration has to take some initiative in trying to make peace with organized labor. They feel that many of our policy decisions have only served to antagonize labor and that the party and the country can ill afford further hostilities.

f Anti Labor  
TO Jim  
Ciccone  
11/9

An offensive program (which requires some immediate decisions) could include several components, or parts thereof, to portray the President as a magnanimous man who wants to be open, accessible and willing to work with labor. Possible options for consideration:

1. During the week of November 2 (the AFL-CIO Convention begins on November 16), make public a letter the President will send to all Cabinet members indicating that he wants to have an "open door" policy for labor leaders and that they should seek the input of representatives of organized labor.
2. During the week of November 8 the Vice President hosts a (much publicized) reception for a wide-ranging group of labor leaders at his residence. The event could be hosted to commemorate the AFL-CIO Centennial year.
3. During the week of November 2 the President communicates with Kirkland, inviting him and the AFL-CIO Executive Council to meet with him at the White House sometime after their Convention. In extending the invitation, the President can recognize that there are differences of opinion but that we must all work together to solve our problems and that he wants to receive the input of the labor community.
4. A meeting is scheduled for late November with the AFL-CIO Executive Council here at the White House and at that time the President announces that he wants very much to hear from leaders of organized labor and is asking the Vice President to have regular (quarterly) meetings with a group of top labor leaders (Teamsters included).

While undertaking one or more of these activities can be debated, they are designed to:

- (A) Provide a positive image of the Administration communicating with labor,
- (B) Attempt to head-off the spate of news stories about the poor relations/communication with organized labor, and
- (C) Provide some ammunition for the moderate labor types who want to call a truce and begin to work with the Administration.

Let's talk.

*discussed  
jc*

October 26, 1981

By PHIL ROURA and TOM POSTER

## Walesa to address AFL-CIO meeting here, then tour

Lech Walesa, the head of Poland's Solidarity union, will make his first trip to the United States next month to address the centennial convention of the AFL-CIO at the Sheraton Centre, it was learned yesterday. It is also the first time since 1963 that the convention has been held in the Big Apple.

Because of the controversy surrounding the Polish union leader, security at the convention site will be heavy. That will continue when Walesa moves on to Chicago and Detroit to visit the Polish communities in those cities.

The convention opens Monday, Nov. 16, and runs through Nov. 19, with Walesa scheduled to speak on Tuesday, Nov. 17. "Yes, we have invited Walesa and, barring unforeseen problems in Poland, Walesa will be with us," Tom Donahue, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, told the People Page. "He will receive the first George Meany Human Rights Award on behalf of Solidarity."

Also attending the convention will be two Democrats who figure to be in the thick of the 1984 nomination for the presidency: Walter Mondale and Ted Kennedy. Mondale will address the unionists on opening day; Kennedy will have to wait until Wednesday, Nov. 18, before getting in his licks.

But most notable among the missing is President Reagan. "He is not being invited," said Donahue. Other sources told us why: The Prez still is being given an extremely cold shoulder that was first shown him on Labor Day when he was excluded from the big parade here. One top labor source said: "The President is not being invited because of his actions in the air traffic controllers' strike."

P.S. Because of the PATCO strike, Walesa will not fly while in the United States. Plans call for him to jet to Montreal from Warsaw and then drive down to New York. Newsweek magazine says that some Reagan administration officials are worried that the Soviet Union will view Walesa's U.S. visit as "a provocation." But they have decided not to oppose a visa. That would really get U.S. labor angrier than they already are at the President.