Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Barr, William: Files Folder Title: Chron File, 07/09/1982-07/19/1982

Box: 15

To see more digitized collections visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection

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

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: BARR, WILLIAM: Files

Archivist: ggc/cas

File Folder: [Memos, 1982] [3 of 5] OA 8875- Box 10 Chron File, 07/09/1782-07/19/1987

Date: 9/18/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. memo	Michael Uhlmann to Edwin Harper re proposed changes in the text of balanced budget amendment (S. J. Res. 58) 3 p.	7/19/82	PS
2. memo	Uhlmann to Harper re campaign task force meetings 2 p.	7/13/82	PS

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
 P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
 P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
 P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of
- the PRA].
- Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
 F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statue [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOiA].
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA1.

WASHINGTON

July 9, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. DELMANN

SUBJECT: Packwood Bill on Discrimination in Insurance

As you are aware, Senator Packwood has apparently invited the whole world to testify on July 15 on S. 2204. Intelligence from the agencies suggests that the issue is being ginned up by a Packwood staffer with a strong personal interest in the subject. I have spoken to all concerned agencies, namely DOJ, OPM, and EEOC and have indicated that it would not be advisable for anyone to testify at this time. The Committee should be informed that the issue is under active consideration within the Administration, and that pending the report of the working group and review by CCLP the Administration will have no comment. DOJ and EEOC have already informed the Commtttee to this effect, and OPM was prepared to do likewise either today or Monday.

At this point, I think chances are good that the hearings will be cancelled. If Packwood digs in and nonetheless insists upon having a hearing with an Administration witness, Tim Ryan of Labor is prepared to do his duty. As chairman of the working group, Tim is well sensitized to the legal and political sensitivities of this issue and of all the people in the Administration would be the most adept at dancing around the issue without committing us to anything silly or unprincipled.

I will give you a further bulletin if need be on Monday.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

			ENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:		
BJECT: Senator Pack	wood's Bill	to "Pro]	hibit Discrimination in t	he Writin	ng and
	ACTION	FYI	4	ACTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		
PORTER			TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	NFORMA	TION
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOAR	D 🗆	
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN					
B. LEONARD					
MALOLEY					
MONTOYA					
SMITH					
✓ UHLMANN	X				
ADMINISTRATION					

Remarks:

Your recommendation?



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

July 2, 1982

OFFICE UF PULICY DEVELOPMENT

1982 JUL -2 P 4: 46

MEMORANDUM TO: Edwin L. Harper

THROUGH:

Michael J, Horowitz

FROM:

Mariali Daniels

SUBJECT:

Senator Packwood's Bill to "Prohibit

Discrimination in the Writing and Selling of

Insurance" (S. 2204).

Senator Packwood is sending letters to you and Mr. Stockman requesting administration representation at hearings on July 15 regarding S. 2204 (which is identical to H.R. 100 and Title V of S. 888, the Women's Equity Act).

The Senator has made it abundantly clear that he would like an administration official to testify (even after I explained to his staffer, Cindy Douglas, that the working group on Manhart has not come to any final position on the sex discrimination and equal benefits issue).

Obviously, support of the above bills would mean that the administration supports EBOC's interpretation of Manhart. (See Sections 4b and c of S. 2204).

Attachment

97TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

S. 2204

To promote interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 15 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 22), 1982

Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. PACKWOOD) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

A BILL

To promote interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Insurance Practices
- 4 Act".

5 FINDINGS AND POLICY

- 6 SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that discrimination based
- 7 on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, by any insurer
- 8 which is engaged in commerce or whose activities affect com-
- 9 merce, in connection with any application for, or the terms,

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- conditions, rates, benefits, or requirements of insurance policies and contracts (including annuity or pension contracts) (1)

 burdens the commerce of the Nation, (2) impairs the economic welfare of large numbers of consumers who rely on the protection of such policies and contracts, (3) constitutes an unfair trade practice which adversely affects commerce, and (4) makes it difficult for employers to comply with Federal laws prohibiting such discrimination against their employees.
- (b) The Congress therefore declares that it is the policy 10 of the United States that no insurer shall, on the basis of the race, color, religion, sex, or national origin of any individual or group of persons, (1) refuse to make insurance available to any applicant for insurance, (2) with respect to insurance contracts to which this Act applies, treat any such applicant or insured differently than any other applicant or insured with respect to the terms, conditions, rates, benefits, or requirements of any such insurance contract, or (3) commit any other discriminatory action prohibited by this Act. It is further the policy of the Congress that this Act shall not affect the responsibility and authority of States to regulate the busi-21 ness of insurance, or any regulation or order of any State agency concerning or applicable to the business of insurance, if such regulation or order is consistent with and does not 25 prevent compliance with this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act—

- (1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication between a place in a State and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or a territory or possession of the United States; or between points in the same State but through a point outside thereof.
- (2) The term "discriminatory action" means action by an insurer which is unlawful under this Act and contrary to the policy stated in section 2.
- (3) The term "insurance" means any arrangement (whether by contract, policy, binder, reinsurance, or otherwise) whereby an insurer (including any governmental agency) will provide benefits (whether by reimbursement, periodic or lump-sum payments, or otherwise) in case specified events occur in connection with death, disability, medical conditions, attainment of specified age, retirement from employment, economic loss, theft, or other events customarily dealt with in insurance policies and contracts (including annuity or pension contracts) relating to life, accident and casualty, theft, retirement, liability, health, disability, or economic loss.

1 (4) The term "insured" means any person who is
2 insured under, or is or may be an applicant for insur3 ance under, a contract of insurance issued or to be
4 issued by the insurer.

1(

1:

1:

1.

1.

- (5) The term "insurer" means any person (A) who provides insurance to others or otherwise engages in the business of insurance and (B) whose activities (i) affect commerce, (ii) utilize facilities of the United States Postal Service, (iii) utilize any facilities used in commerce by any person, or (iv) result in a discriminatory action carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation, or required, permitted, or sanctioned, or supported with funds provided, by the United States, any State or political subdivision, or any agency or officer thereof; and includes such person's agent.
- (6) The term "activities affect commerce" means any activity which directly or indirectly relates to, impinges upon, or involves any activity in commerce, and includes any governmental activity.
- (7) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, governments, and agencies of the United States or of any State or political subdivision thereof, labor unions, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, mutual companies, joint ventures,

- joint stock companies, societies, trusts, unincorporated organizations, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, and fiduciaries.
 - (8) The term "sex" means the gender of the insured and includes pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a female insured, except that nothing in this Act shall be deemed to amend section 701(k) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
 - (9) The term "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

13 UNLAWFUL DISCRIMINATORY ACTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful discriminatory action for any insurer, because of the race, color, religion, sex, or national origin of any person or any group of persons, to do any of the following with respect to any person who after the effective date of this Act applies or may apply for a contract of insurance or is an insured under a contract of insurance made after the effective date of this Act—

> (1) to refuse to make, or to refuse to negotiate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, or delay receiving and processing an application for, a contract of insurance of the type ordinarily made by such insurer; and

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

1'

1!

1	(2) to treat such applicant or insured differently
2	than the insurer treats or would treat any other appli-
3	cant or insured with respect to the terms, conditions,
4	rates, benefits, or requirements of such insurance con-
5	tract.
6	(b) It shall be an unlawful discriminatory action for any
7	insurer—
8	(1) to utilize any statistical table (whether of mor-
9	tality, life expectancy, morbidity, disability, disability
10	termination, or losses) or any other statistical compila-
11	tion as a basis for any action which is contrary to this
12	section;
13	(2) to discriminate in any manner against any
14	person because such person has opposed any practice
15	made unlawful by this Act or because such person has
16	made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in
17	any manner in an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or
18	litigation under this Act; or
19	(3) to make, print, or publish, or cause to be
20	made, printed, or published, any notice, statement, or
21	advertisement, relating to insurance coverage that such
22	insurer provides or will provide, indicating any prefer-
23	ence, limitation, specification, or discrimination based
24	on the race, color, religion, sex, or national origin of

any person or group of persons, or an intention to

1	make any such preference, limitation, specification, or
2	discrimination.
3	(c) With respect to all contracts of insurance existing on
4	the date this Act becomes effective—
5	(1) it shall be an unlawful discriminatory action
6	for any insurer after the effective date of this Act-
7	(A) to charge or collect premium payments
8	or contributions which become due after the effec-
9	tive date of this Act; or
10	(B) to determine the amount of or to pay to
11	any insured or other beneficiary under an insur-
12	ance, annuity, or pension contract any periodic or
13	lump-sum payment after the effective date of this
14	Act;
15	if such charge, collection, determination, or payment, is
16	based, directly or indirectly, either on race, color, reli-
17	gion, sex, or national origin of any person or group of
18	persons, or on any statistical table whose use would, if
19	applied to contracts made after the effective date of
20	this Act, violate any provision of this section; and
21	(2) the insurer may modify the premium and con-
22	tribution rates and may increase but not decrease the
23	periodic and lump-sum payments under such existing
24	contracts insofar as they are due after the effective

date of this Act, if clearly necessary to comply with

1	the nondiscrimination requirements of this Act (and if
2	the State agency having jurisdiction to regulate the
3	business of insurance concurs that the modification re-
4	quested by the insurer is clearly necessary to comply
5	with such requirements and authorizes such modifica-
6	tion), but such insurer need not refund any portion of
7	the premiums and contributions which were payable to
8	the insurer prior to the effective date of this Act nor
9	pay any additional amounts for the benefits which were
10	payable by the insurer prior to the effective date of this
11	Act.
12	(d) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prevent an
13	insurer who regularly provides insurance coverage solely to
14	persons of a single religious affiliation from continuing to pro-
15	vide insurance solely to persons of that religious affiliation.
16	INAPPLICABILITY
17	SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to—
18	(1) modify any provision in the Social Security
19	Act;
20	(2) modify any provision in any law or Executive
21	order prohibiting discrimination in employment on the
22	basis of an individual's race, color, religion, sex, or na-
23	tional origin, or in any rule, regulation, order or agree-
24	ment under such law or Executive order; or

(3) exempt or relieve any person from any liabili-1 ty, duty, penalty, or punishment under any present or 2 future law of any State or political subdivision thereof, 3 other than any such law which purports to require or 4 permit the doing of any act which would be a discrimi-5 natory action under this Act. 6 EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. This Act shall become effective on the ninetieth 8 day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

WASHINGTON

July 9, 1982

FOR: EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM: MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

SUBJECT: Specter Bill -- S.1688

Reference Number: Ø85Ø68PD

S.1688 has been reported out of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which Specter chairs. Specter has been pressing Thurmond for some time to have the bill taken up by full Committee, but the Chairman is not disposed at this point to schedule any mark-up sessions on anything -- and if he has his way will hold to that course for the remainder of the session.

Specter is making noises about trying to have the bill polled out of Committee, a procedure which requires unanimous consent and is therefore unlikely to occur.

Almost no one other than Specter himself is keen on the bill. OMB opposed the original version strenuously (for good reasons), and had some but not all of their concerns addressed in the revised version. DOJ has always had mixed feelings about it, and at this point would just as soon see it go away. Ed Meese was of various minds on it at different times, but finally came down in favor of the final version, albeit with some reservations.

On the critical point of whether the bill's scheme should be temporary or permanent in nature, it was specifically agreed to in the negotiating sessions with Specter that the program would be experimental. Specter's man, Paul Michel, agreed that the Report language would emphasize that point, which was re-emphasized when Lowell Jensen testified in March.

The whole matter might have had a timely death a year ago —because no one in the Administration really was enthused about it — but for a meeting Specter had with the President. Although Ed Meese and Bill Smith recounted somewhat different versions of the conversation, Specter interpreted some remarks made by the President (e.g., "sounds like an interesting idea") as a presidential endorsement of the bill. It was that episode which led to negotiating sessions with Specter, during which he and Michel made constant reference to the President's prior "endorsement". Depending on his frustration level, Specter may be counted on to raise the issue again and may press us to escalate our support.

For that reason, I do not think it should be addressed by

CCLP, where only one of two things can happen -- either (1) a softening of our prior support, which Specter will treat as treason, or (2) an increase of support, which no one within the Administration really wants.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

DATE: 7/6/82	ACTION/	CONCURI	RENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:	7/8/	/82	
SUBJECT: CM 236 - Spe	ctor Bill S	1688				
•					•	
	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI	
HARPER			DRUG POLICY			
PORTER			TURNER			
BARR			D. LEONARD			
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORMA	ATION .	
BOGGS			GRAY			-
BRADLEY			HOPKINS			
CARLESON			OTHER			
FAIRBANKS						
FERRARA	. 🗆					
GUNN						
B. LEONARD						
MALOLEY						
SMITH						
UHLMANN	X		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
ADMINISTRATION						

Remarks:

WASHINGTON July 6, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR MIKE UHLMANN

FROM:

QUEDWIN L. HARPER by 9 Rule

SUBJECT:

CM 236 - Spector Bill S. 1688

According to the Cabinet Issues tracking report for the week of July 4th, we are supposed to be scheduling consideration of the Spector Bill at the CCLP. The concern was the provisions of the bill have been revised and have undergone fundamental changes — that is, it's no longer a pilot project. Would you please give me a status report and a recommendation as to whether or not this needs to be taken up at the CCLP.

WASHINGTON

July 13, 1982

FOR: EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM: MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

SUBJECT: Upcoming Testimony on Busing Amendment

(Reference No. 085059)

On July 22 Ted Olson is testifying on the Helms-Johnson Amendment before Rep. Kastenmeier's subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

The Helms-Johnson Amendment is a rider on the DOJ Authorization bill. It has already passed the Senate.

I have asked OMB to set this Friday (July 16) as the deadline for submitting draft testimony and possible Q&As under the A-ll process. Olson has promised to get me the draft as soon as possible, and certainly no later than this Friday.

In his testimony Olson says that he intends to adhere closely to the position taken in the Attorney General's May 6th letter to Chairman Rodino on the amendment. That letter was carefully worked out between DOJ and senior WH staff. Basically, the letter: (1) construes the bill as a limited measure that removes remedial powers from inferior federal courts but leaves intact the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; (2) concludes that the bill is constitutional; and (3) reiterates the Administration's opposition to busing. However, the letter stopped short of endorsing the amendment.

The letter from Kastenmeier inviting the testimony specifically requests the Department to take a position on the bill. Olson feels that the Administration has already made its opposition to busing clear and that if we tried to play "dog in the manger" on this bill we would be hurt among the broad segments of Congress and the country who believe that busing is a failed experiment. On the other hand, Olson realizes that the Administration does not want to get out too far in front on this bill. He is preparing a draft that:

(1) reiterates the Administration's opposition to busing;

- (2) states that, assuming its reading of the bill is correct, the Department believes that the kind of limited restrictions set forth in the bill are appropriate; and
 - (3) expresses reservations on two aspects of the bill:
 - (a) its retroactivity -- Olson would like to say that making the bill applicable to old court orders may reopen old wounds; and
 - (b) limitations on DOJ -- Olson would like to say that it is unwise to put in a provision precluding DOJ from ever seeking a busing plan because there may be an occasion where a DOJ-sponsored plan may be less objectionable than some draconian alternative proposed by a district court judge.

As soon as I get Olson's draft testimony, I will give you my recommendations. We should be getting the draft in ample time to make the necessary political cut.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

DATE: 7/6/82	ACTION/	CONCUR	RENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:	7/12/8	32
SUBJECT: Busing Amendme	nt Testimor	ıу			
				· · · · · ·	
	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		
PORTER			TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORMA	ATION .
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS			Craig Fuller		X
FERRARA	. 🗈				
GUNN					
B. LEONARD					
MALOLEY					<u> </u>
SMITH					
✓ UHLMANN	X				
ADMINISTRATION					

Remarks:

WASHINGTON

July 6, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR MIKE UHLMANN

FROM:

In Edwin L. HARPER ky & Rinh

SUBJECT:

Busing Amendment Testimony

According to the schedule, Ted Olson of the Justice Department is scheduled to testify on the Helms-Johnson Busing Amendment on July 22. Could you check into this and see what the plans are for this testimony - points to be covered, general strategy, etc.

cc: Craig Fuller

July 13, 1982

こうまとう まてななし

They are a second of the second distant

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLBANN

SUBJECT:

Campaign Task Force Meetings

Task Forces Dealing with Crime

For what I gather were patronage reasons, three separate task forces were created to deal with crime — one called Criminal Justice, one called Law Enforcement, and one dealing with Victims of Crime. The subjects covered by the first two had considerable overlap, while the last was fairly narrow and distinct in its focus. I am acquainted with a number of the folks in all three groups and have no reason to believe that they do not continue to share the President's philosophy.

I have been informed that virtually all of them were either directly or indirectly handpicked by Ed Meese, who is personally acquainted with them all. Because I am not privy to the considerations which led Ed to make these selections, I thought it wise to seek his advice. Accordingly, I gave the membership rosters of the three groups to Ken Cribb today, who said he would get a reading from Ed at the earliest possible moment. As soon as I hear back from him, I will let you know.

I must confess that I am not enthusiastic about having so large a group (upwards of 50 people) into the White House for any serious deliberative purpose. On the other hand, if Ed can reduce this large cast to a small representative example -- without giving offense to anyone -- then that is a different matter altogether. My own recommendation is that, unless the group is very small, anything other than a dog and pony show would be an invitation to mischief. I do favor the idea of having these folks in (a) to thank them again for their efforts and (b) to tell them what we've done.

The agenda for a large meeting is really very simple: (a) a brief presentation by Ed Meese and/or the Attorney General on our accomplishments to date; (b) a comment period (with Q's and A's); and (c) refreshments, with a Presidential drop-by.

2. Regulatory Reform Task Force

It is Boyden Gray's strong recommendation (with which I concur) that this task force not be reassembled. For one thing, five of its eleven members were appointed to office by the President and are now serving. For another, three of the

remaining six may be counted upon to criticize, as they have already done in print, the substance and pace of our regulatory reform efforts. I do not see that any good purpose will be served by attempting to reassemble the group either in whole or in part.

WASHINGTON

July 15, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. URLMANN

SUBJECT: Status of CCLP Matters

Implementation Proceeding

o Most major elements of the anti-narcotics program are in place, and we are receiving generally good reviews. A push against the administrative apparatus is necessary from time to time, but nothing heavy required at this point. Further PR opportunities should be pursued.

o School bussing. Litigative strategy on course: alternatives to bussing are the watchword. DOJ letter on pending legislation approved and sent; Olson testimony on July 25 will be pre-cleared here. Low profile recommended.

Needs a Push on the Hill

- o Anti-crime package has excellent chance of Senate passage, virtually none in House. Should be pushed hard by the President in Senate as priority to maximize political advantage. Danger possibility: if we seek too much bi-partisanship, we may lose the chance to get some of our prized goodies, e.g., insanity defense. (Howard Baker wants as much bi-partisanship as possible in order to avoid "extended debate".) Vital to get out of Senate this year.
- o Immigration Reform bill. If Simpson-Mazzoli come our way on our proposed changes -- but only if they do -- the bill will need a push. Debatable whether the President, as opposed to DOJ, ought to do the pushing.
- o School Prayer. Proposed constitutional amendment pending on the Hill. No short-term prospects for enactment, but should be pushed hard by us.

WASHINGTON

July 16, 1982

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHAANN

SUBJECT: Specter Bill - S, 1688

Reference Number 085234

Instructions on the attached are confusing. 1. Am I or am I not to draft a response?

- I never said S. 1688 was dead -- only (a) that 2. it would not likely move out of Senate Judiciary without a big push from us and (b) that unless Meese, OMB, and DOJ change their minds, everyone down here seems to think that's the way we should leave it.
- I gather that our "yet-to-be revealed crime package" is so secret that even we don't know about it yet. When I read the story, I assumed it was a mis-translation of something you said.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

7/14/82			CE/COMMENT DUE BY:	-/-	
et: <u>Senator</u> 5	perten	letten re	5.1688		
			•		
	ACTION	FYI	A	CTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		
PORTER			TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY IN	IFORM/	ATION
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD		
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN					
B. LEONARD			P.		
MALOLEY					
MONTOYA					
SMITH		1 P.,			
UHLMANN	X				
ADMINISTRATION					

M. Uhlmann: This does not sound dead?

Please draft a response for ElH's

Significant. Thoule & Rule

Edwin L. Harper
Assistant to the President
for Policy Development
(x6515)

Please return this tracking sheet with your response.

Mashington D.C. 20310 MICY DEVELOPMENT

July 14, 1982 1982 JUL -9 A 12: 53

BY HAND

Honorable Edwin Meese Counsellor to the President The White House Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Ed:

I am advised that a recent article in the Washington Post quoted you referring to a vet-to-be unveiled crime package." As you know, I believe the violent crime epidemic and public fear of crime have reached such proportions that bold Federal initiatives are required — and are going to be demanded by the people. Unfortunately, the nationwide "breakdown in the criminal justice system" which the President accurately described in his fine speech in New Orleans last September has not only continued, but worsened, resulting in a condition of crisis and near collapse in the criminal courts in numerous cities, including Philadelphia and New York. Accordingly, I hope that the Administration is indeed preparing urgent measures to combat crime.

As you know, I believe the most urgent need is for federal action against armed career criminals. \$\infty\$. \$\infty\$

I am planning a series of hearings on the crisis in the state criminal courts, beginning this month and continuing through the fall. These hearings could provide a useful vehicle for giving the Administration's package sustained public attention.

concert on this urgent national problem?

Sincerely,

Arlen Specter

AS:prm

cc: Ed Harper Fred Fielding

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UELMANN

SUBJECT: Proposed Changes in the Text of Balanced Budget

Amendment (S.J. Res. 58

Section 1 Changes:

"....The Congress and the President shall, pursuant to legislation and through exercise of their powers under the First and Second Articles, ensure that actual outlays do not exceed the outlays set forth in such statement." (Underlined portions contain the proposed change.)

Although it is difficult to evaluate the meaning of language which is apparently being draftd on the back of a brown paper bag, you can read the proposed change in either of two ways: either (a) it is mere surplusage (in which case, you are better off without it); or (b) it is potentially (and perhaps intentionally) mischievous.

The argument that it is surplusage goes as follows. (1) The Amendment is designed to be as self-executing as possible. Insofar as implementing legislation may be required, Congress and the President may through the normal legislative processes place such legislation on the books. But (3) the Amendment neither adds to nor detracts from any constitutional power that either branch may possess. The purpose of the mandatory language ("shall ensure") is simply to indicate that Congress and the President have a duty to see to it that the Amendment's procedures are complied with. Read this way, however, I am hard-pressed to see what the purpose of the additional language is.

The additional language can, however, be read mischievously, i.e., as an effort to restrict certain powers that the President, at least by implication, now possesses. This reading would argue that the change in Section 1, read together with the change in proposed new Section 6, means that there is no enforcement of the Amendment absent implementing legislation.

If one assumes, as I do, that the typical offending party under the Amendment will be Congress, it could be argued that the combined effect of changing Section 1 and adding Section 6 (absent implementing legislation) estops the President from doing anything to keep Congress on the reservation.

If the latter interpretation is the correct interpretation of the changes (and I suspect it is), they should be opposed. The legislative history of S.J.Res. 58 to date is clear that the Amendment in and of itself does not alter the powers possessed by Congress or the Executive. It merely adds a new duty. The thrust of the proposed changes, however, seems to be in the direction of giving the President (jointly with Congress) a new duty, while conditioning the exercise of that duty on whether or not Congress enacts implementing legislation.

Section 2 Changes

"Total receipts for any fiscal year set forth in the statement adopted pursuant to this article shall not increase by a rate greater than the rate of increase in national income in the year or years ending not less than six months nor more than twelve months before such fiscal year..."

The purpose of the proposed change, as I read it, is to add greater flexibility in the determination of the base period against which the future FY estimates are made. I defer to the wizards on CEA and elsewhere on whether this is wise or unwise as a matter of policy, but changing the base period formula does not alter any legal power or duty.

Proposed new Section 4

"The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any case or controversy arising from the content of the statement provided for in this Article."

This is, as near as I can figure, a crude effort to keep the judiciary away from any disputes arising under the Amendment. It seems to me to invite more mischief than it seeks to eliminate. In the normal course, one could expect the judiciary to stay a country mile away from what are quintessentially executive/congressional disputes over the spending power. Where judicial self-interest is an insufficient disincentive, the doctrine of standing would come into play, i.e., if Congress or the President did, or failed to do something forbidden or mandated by the Amendment, who would be able to sue in court? The Amendment as reported by the Committee wisely suggests that the ordinary give-and-take between the political branches should take care of any such disputes.

While the sense behind the proposed new Section 4 is correct, I think we are better off without it. No one wants the judiciary mucking about in the details of fiscal matters, but I question the wisdom of excluding the judiciary altogether from a role when (as might happen) the President and Congress dig in behind sandbags on the interpretation of Article I vs. Aricle II.

Proposed new Section 6

"The Congress shall implement and enforce this Article by appropriate legislation."

As indicated earlier, this language, when read together with the change in Section 1, implies that there is no enforcement of the Amendment without the enactment of implementing legislation. If Congress enacts no such legislation but nonetheless violates one or more of the provisions of the Amendment, a President might be estopped from carrying out his duty in Section 1.

I think we should stick with the neutral principles embodied in the legislative history of S.J. Res. 58, i.e., that the Amendment neither adds to nor detracts from any power possessed by either branch under Article I and Article II. If you start monkeying around with the basic text at the 11th hour, there is no telling what you will end up with.

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHINDON

SUBJECT:

OFCCP Regulations

Reference Number: 085261

I previously indicated my belief that the political market had already discounted the effect of the proposed changes. Although I have not discussed the matter with him in detail, Boyden Gray generally shares that view. It may therefore be useful if you were to talk directly to him.

Beyond that, you may want to ask DOL to prepare
(a) a draft set of Q's and A's and (b) some sort of
marketing plan in which they sell the positive features of
what they're trying to do.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

ECT: 8:00		Meetings	7/13/82		
	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		
PORTER			TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORMA	TION
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOA	RD 🗆	
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN					
B. LEONARD			*		
MALOLEY					
MONTOYA					
SMITH					
UHLMANN	X				
ADMINISTRATION					

Remarks:

(UHLMANN) ACTION OFCCP

A+ 81

- ELH confirm accuracy of summary.

- D.D. to circulate

- Get comments to D.D.

- Then discuss political issues.

Piease return this tracking sheet with your response.

Edwin L. Harper
Assistant to the President
for Policy Development
(x6515)

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1982

FOR:

WENDELL GUNN

FROM:

MICHAEL M. / YHLMANN

SUBJECT: FMC Progress Report

I think you should ask Chris De Muth's office to evaluate Green's report and use that as a basis for submitting your comments to Harper.

Uldowy

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

			time Commission		
	ACTION	FYI	A	CTION	FY
HARPER		X	DRUG POLICY		
PORTER			TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY I	NFORMA	TIOI
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD		
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN					
B. LEONARD					
MALOLEY			-		
MONTOYA					
SMITH					
UHLMANN	100				
ADMINISTRATION	2				

Remarks:

MIKE UHLMANN WENDELL GUNN E

AFEING MENODANDUA

FOR ACTION

COB 7/13/82

May I please have any comments on attached by COB 7/28. I defer to you as to whether Ed Harper should receive a synopsis of this memo or what. This one seems a little unusual.

Judy Johnston 7/15

cc:Roger Porter
Please return this tracking
sheet with your response.

Edwin L. Harper
Assistant to the President
for Policy Development
(x6515)

THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON

CABINET AFFAIRS STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: July	14, 1982	NU	MBE	ER:_	07278110	CA	DUE BY: _	c.o.b.,	Friday,
SUBJECT:	Progress	Report	of	the	Federal	Maritime	Commission		

₹	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
Vice President State Treasury Defense Attorney General Interior Agriculture Commerce	0 0000000	0 00000000	Baker Deaver Clark Darman (For WH Staffing) Harper Jenkins		000000
Labor HHS HUD Transportation Energy Education Counsellor OMB CIA	00000000000			00000	00000
UN USTR	8		CCCT/Gunn CCEA/Porter		0 0
CEA CEQ OSTP	00000	00000	CCFA/Boggs CCHR/Carleson CCLP/Uhlmann CCNRE/Boggs	0 0 0 0	0000

REMARKS:

Please review and comment as appropriate by no later than close of business, Friday, July 23.

Thanks.

RETURN TO:

Craig L. Fuller
Assistant to the President
for Cabinet Affairs

☐ Becky Norton Dunlop Director, Office of Cabinet Affairs