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, 09/01/1982-09/02/1982

Box: 16

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/

WASHINGTON

September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLLANN

STEPHEN H. GALEBACH

SUBJECT:

Proclamation on "National Employ the Handicapped Week"

(Ref. 065534)

This proclamation could cause far greater potential trouble than may be apparent on the surface. We have been taking a terrible beating on Department of Education's proposed revisions to the regulations on Public Law 94-142. The accusation against us -- not to judge whether it is warranted or not -- is that we are cutting back on federal requirements for public education of handicapped persons. We may be running into a firestorm of criticisms, accusations of hypocrisy, and claims that while the proclamation calls for "renewed energy and programs," we are actually modifying programs to take some of the vitality out of them.

I suggest that we delete the second sentence of the third paragraph and substitute in its place language along the lines of the following:

"There is an urgent need for the private sector to take the lead in offering jobs that provide individual dignity and enable disabled men and women to support their families. There is a need for state and local governments to employ fresh approaches and renewed energy in cooperation with the private sector, and for the federal government to streamline regulations in order to afford maximum benefit for handicapped persons with a minimum of administrative burden.

"We need to affirm the dignity and worth of all people in our society, whether or not they suffer from physical or mental disabilities, and we must firmly reject attitudes such as those that surfaced in the tragic case of the Bloomington Baby early this year, denying the worth of handicapped individuals."

(Not to harp on a point, but the President's strong action following the Bloomington Baby case was the single action in this Administration that has garnered the most enthusiastic support and applause from handicapped groups.)

DOCUMENT No.	065534	PD

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

8/25/82	ACTION/	CONCURR	ENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: _	9	/1/82	
Draft proclam	ation des	ignating	october 3-10, 1982	as "Nat	ional	
Employ the H	andicappe	d Week."			₹	
	ACTION	FYİ		ACTION	FYI	
HARPER		X	DRUG POLICY			
PORTER			TURNER			
BARR			D. LEONARD			
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORMA	TION	
BOGGS			GRAY			
BRADLEY			HOPKINS			
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOAR	a		
DENEND			OTHER			
FAIRBANKS						
FERRARA						
GUNN	. 🗆					
B. LEONARD						
MALOLEY						
MONTOYA						
SMITH						
UHLMANN						
ADMINISTRATION	X					

Remarks:

BOB CARLESON: Please review and provide comments by 9/1/82

MICHAEL UHLMANN: Please review by 9/1/82

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 8-25-82 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:

SUBJECT: praft proclamation designating October 3-10, 1982 as

"National Employ the Handicapped Week." ·ACTION **FYI ACTION FYI** VICE PRESIDENT **JAMES MURPHY MEESE** ROLLINS BAKER WILLIAMSON **DEAVER** WEIDENBAUM **STOCKMAN** HICKEY the same of the **CLARK** ROSEBUSH BRADY/SPEAKES CEQ **CANZERI** OSTP **USTR** DOLE FIELDING ROGERS **DUBERSTEIN** FULLER (For Cabinet)

Remarks:

GERGEN

Draft proclamation as noted above.

Draft prepared by the Department of Labor
and edited slightly for readability in this office.

Please comment as you feel appropriate.

Thank you!

Jack R. Wells

for
Dodie Livingston (x2941)

for
Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
and
Deputy to the Chief of Staff(



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

August 13, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

William Nichols

SUBJECT:

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED WEEK,

1982

Enclosed is a proposed proclamation for National Employ the Handicapped Week, 1982.

This observance was established by a joint resolution of the Congress approved in 1945 (59 Stat. 530) which requested the President to issue annually a proclamation of observance for the first week in October.

This draft proclamation has the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Enclosure

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA A PROCLAMATION

Last April this Nation proclaimed 1982 as the National Year of Disabled Persons. Throughout this year people in rural and urban areas, in the public and private sectors, are voluntarily joining together to help insure education, training, employment, accessible housing, and recreational opportunities for our disabled citizens.

The right to pursue these objectives is the birthright of all Americans. Employment is one of the most important of these opportunities. To lead more successful lives, disabled adults must be a part of the job market. Progress has been made as many more employers are hiring disabled people because they have proven to be quality employees. In the process they are benefiting not only themselves but our national economic growth as well.

Despite these advances, employment of disabled men and women lags far behind the rest of the working-age population. In today's competitive job market, there is an urgent need for fresh approaches and renewed energy in programs to educate, train, and place disabled people in jobs.

Congress has called for the designation of the first full week in October each year as National Employ the Handicapped Week. This special week is an excellent time to dedicate ourselves to meeting the goal of increased opportunities for disabled citizens.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REACAN, President of the United Pictors of America, do hereby designate the week beginning Cotoler 3, 1982, as National Employ the Handicapped Week. I urge all governors, mayors, other public officials, leaders in business and labor, and private citizens to help meet the challenge of the future by insuring that disabled people have the opportunity to participate fully in the accordic Life of the Mation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this

day of , in the year of our Lord

nineteen hundred and eighty-two, and of the Independence of

the United States of America the two hundred and seventh.

WASHINGTON

September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMA

STEPHEN H. GALERACIO

SUBJECT:

Proclamation on "American Education Week"

(Ref. 065532)

This proclamation contains some good language endorsing both private and public education, and parental choice. Why not allude more clearly to our tuition tax credit bill?

I suggest we add a sentence at the end of the second paragraph as follows: "Our tax system should ensure that effective parental choice in education is not the preserve of only the wealthy."

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

STAFFING MEM	ORANDUN	1		;		
DATE: 8/25/82	ACTION	1/CONCURRENC	E/COMMENT DUE BY:	·	8/31/	82
SUBJECT: Draft Pro				*		
	Education					
	ACTION	ı FYİ		ACTION	FYI	
HARPER		X	DRUG POLICY			/
PORTER			TURNER			
BARR			D. LEONARD			
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORM	ATION	
BOGGS			GRAY			
BRADLEY			HOPKINS			
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOA	RD 🗆		
DENEND			OTHER			
FAIRBANKS						
FERRARA						
GUNN	. 🗆					
B. LEONARD						
MALOLEY						
MONTOYA						
SMITH						
UHLMANN						
ADMINISTRATIO	N					

Remarks:

BOB CARLESON: Please review and provide comments by 8/31/82

MICHAEL UHLMANN: Please review by 8/31/82

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: _	8-24-82	ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY

SUBJECT: Draft proclamation designating the week beginning November 14,

1982, as "American Education Week."

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT			JAMES		. 🗆
MEESE		. 🗆	MURPHY	- <i>-</i>	
BAKER			ROLLINS		
DEAVER			WILLIAMSON	2	
STOCKMAN	<u> </u>		WEIDENBAUM		
A. 28 1			HICKEY	. 🗖	
CLARK			ROSEBUSH		
BRADY/SPEAKES			CEQ		<u>,</u>
CANZERI	0/		OSTP .		
DOLE	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$		USTR		
FIELDING	4		ROGERS		
DUBERSTEIN	ф			. 0	
FULLER (For Cabinet)	4			. 0	
GERGEN				. 0	

Remarks:

Draft proclamation as noted above.

Draft prepared by the Department of Education and edited for readability in this office. Please comment as you feel appropriate.

Thank you!

de

Jack R. Wells
for
Dodie Livingston (x2941)
for
Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
and
Deputy to the Chief of Staff(



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

August 24, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

SUBJECT:

MICHAEL J. HOROWITZ

COUNSEL TO THE DIRECTOR

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

Enclosed is a proposed proclamation which would designate the week beginning November 14, 1982, as American Education (Week.

This draft proclamation was submitted, at our request, by the Department of Education and has been retyped solely as to format.

There is no statutory basis for its issuance; however, similar proclamations have been issued annually since 1955.

The proposed proclamation has the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Enclosure

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA A PROCLAMATION

The wisdom and foresight of our founding fathers set in motion the greatness of America and the personal liberties we enjoy today. These blessings have thrived because of the value succeeding generations have placed on knowledge and education. For this reason alone, nothing matters more to the future of our country than the continued success of our educational system.

Part of our greatness is that parents have the right to oversee their children's education. While our states provide public schools and State and local educators assist parents in achieving educational goals, it is clearly the right and duty of parents to supervise these functions.

The timely theme for American Education Week this year is
"A Strong Nation Needs Strong Schools." Every American should
take this theme to heart and give renewed support to our schools,
be they public, private, or church-affiliated. Strong community
support results in effective schools. Effective schools assure
our Nation of an educated citizenry and that our democratic society
will flourish.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning November 14, 1982, as American Education Week.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this

day of , in the year of our Lord

Nineteen hundred and eighty-two, and of the Independence of
the United States of America the two hundred and seventh.

WASHINGTON

September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

STEPHEN H. GAZEBACNO

SUBJECT:

Proclamation on "National Hospice Week"

(Ref. 065533)

This proclamation is fine except for one phrase that could cause serious and unnecessary problems. By saying that Hospice advocates "quality of life," we echo a buzz-word of the pro-abortion, pro-infanticide advocates. The "quality of life ethic" is commonly opposed in discourse today to the "sanctity of life ethic," as when someone argues that a certain person does not have a meaningful quality of life and, therefore, need not be protected in his right to life.

This problem can easily be resolved by substituting an initial phrase such as "Hospice advocates personal care," etc. There is no need to raise the controversial issue in such an innocuous document as this.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

E: 8/28/82	ACTION/	CONCURR	ENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:		9/1/82
FCT. Draft proclar	nation de	signatin	g November 7-14, 1983	2 as "N	Vational
Hospice Week					
	ACTION	FYİ	A	CTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		
PORTER	o '		TURNER		
BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY II	NFORMA	NOITA
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD		
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN	. 🗆				
B. LEONARD					
MALOLEY					
MONTOYA					
SMITH					
UHLMANN	/				
ADMINISTRATION					

Remarks:

3

BOB CARLESON: Please review and provide comments by 9/1/82

MICHAEL UHLMANN: Please review by 9/1/82

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 8-2	8-82 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY.	
SUBJECT:	Draft proclamation designating November 7-14, 1982, as	
#275 + d ou = 1		

144 6	Tonal Hospice wee	Λ.				
		ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
	VICE PRESIDENT			JAMES		·o ,
	MEESE			MURPHY		oʻ
	BAKER			ROLLINS		
	DEAVER			WILLIAMSON	i d	
	STOCKMAN			WEIDENBAUM		
	The state of the s	9		HICKEY		
	CLARK			ROSEBUSH		_ ·
	BRADY/SPEAKES			CEQ		
	CANZERI		~ □ `	OSTP		
	DOLE			USTR		
,	FIELDING			ROGERS		
•	DUBERSTEIN					
	FULLER (For Cabinet)					
	GERGEN					
· · · · · ·	 Jis P. V. Miller or Will Review State Communicative State (September 2007) 			Principal and responsible to the second seco	PARTIES AND AND AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTIES AND A	PARTY WILLIAM MET MET CHILL SERVICE

Remarks:

Draft proclamation as noted above.

Draft prepared by the Department of Health and

Human Services and edited slightly for readability
in this office.

Please comment as you feel appropriate.

Thank you!

Jack R. Wells for

Dodie Livingston (x2941)

for

Richard G. Darman

Assistant to the President
and

Deputy to the Chief of Staff(



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

August 18, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

MICHAEL J. HOROWITZ

COUNSEL TO THE DIRECTOR. ///

SUBJECT:

NATIONAL HOSPICE WEEK

Pursuant to Public Law 97-182, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning November 7, 1982, as "National Hospice Week." The enclosed proclamation would fulfill that request.

The proposed proclamation, which was submitted at our request by the Department of Health and Human Services, has been retyped in this office solely as to format and has the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Enclosure

NATIONAL HOSPICE WEEK

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA A PROCLAMATION

The hospice concept is rapidly becoming a part of the Nation's health care system. To direct the Nation's attention to the value of hospice care, the Congress, by joint resolution approved May 24, 1982 (S.J. Res. 170, Public Law 97-182), requested that the President proclaim the week of November 7 through November 14, 1982, the National Hospice Week.

Hospice provides a humanitarian way for a terminally ill patient to approach death with dignity, in relative comfort in a supportive atmosphere, and surrounded by family members. Its most important element is concern for patients and their families. Hospice advocates quality of life, living comfortably until death, the absence of pain, maintenance of personal control, and the close fellowship of the family-unit.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning November 7, 1982, as National Hospice Week. I urge all citizens, government agencies, the medical community and appropriate private organizations to observe the week with forums, programs and activities designed to encourage national recognition and support for the hospice care concept.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this

day of , in the year of our Lord

in the a in direct and eighty two, and of the Ir lependance of a

complicit States of America the two hundred and seventh.

washington September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

STEPHEN H. GALEBA

SUBJECT:

Modification of Presidential Statement on Abortion Consistent with Presidential Addresses to Knights of Columbus and National Right-to-Life Committee

Jack Burgess has talked with Msgr. Hoye, Director of the United States Catholic Conference, who had earlier been hesitant about Presidential action in favor of cloture. Jack has now gotten Msgr. Hoye's commitment to endorse the President's action if the statement includes language consistent with the Knights of Columbus address and the National Right-to-Life Committee address, in which the President said he "believed in" human life proposals of Senators Helms, Hatch, and Hatfield and urged speedy Senate consideration of them.

Jack agrees with us that the following language will do the trick:

- 1. To be included after the initial paragraph of the public statement --
 - "As I have told pro-life groups in recent months, I continue to support the other pro-life measures in the Senate, including Senator Hatch's constitutional amendment; but I am writing to Senators today because a cloture vote on the amendment to the debt ceiling bill is now definitely set on the Senate calendar."
- 2. To be included at the beginning of the final paragraph of the public statement --
 - "The amendment before the Senate does not purport to solve the problem of abortion-on-demand, and its consideration should not impede quick action on Senator Hatch's Amendment or other pro-life measures."
 - 3. In letter to Senators, add bracketed language:
 - "... will not impede other pro-life measures, [including Senator Hatch's,] now before the Senate."

WASHINGTON

September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN . -

STEPHEN H. GALEBACH

SUBJECT: Hatch Amendment

The Hatch Amendment provides as follows:

"A right to abortion is not secured by this Constitution. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to restrict and prohibit abortion: Provided, that a provision of a law of a State which is more restrictive than a conflicting provision of a law of Congress shall govern."

The effect of this Amendment would be:

- o to reverse Roe v. Wade, giving states discretion whether or
- o to authorize Congress as well as the states to restrict and prohibit abortion.

Prior Presidential position has been:

- to support in general terms all the pro-life measures under Senate consideration.
- o In address to Knights of Columbus on August 3, the President said, "I believe in the human life legislation. The Senate now has three proposals on this matter from Senators Hatch, Helms, and Hatfield. The national tragedy of abortion on demand must end. I am urging the Senate to give these proposals the speedy consideration they deserve."

WASHINGTON

September 1, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHUMANN

STEPHEN H. CALEBACH

SUBJECT: Presidential Statement on Abortion

This is to report on questions that came up at our meeting today regarding language of Presidential statement:

- The Hyde Amendment was first enacted in 1976.
- The section of the memorandum that describes the Helms amendment should be changed, in the paragraph that says institutions receiving federal funds may not do training, research, or experimentation related to abortion. The paragraph should read that federal funds may not be used for these purposes. (This is Section 204 of the new Helms measure, a copy of which is attached.)
- 3. For Senator Hatch, we can be even more specific in stating the nature of his support: he is one of the signers of the cloture petition.

The Senator from North Carolina promoses in unprinted amendment numbered

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. I object.

the PRESIDENT pro tempore. The will read the amendment.
The hill clerk read as follows:

At the end of the modified Helms amendment strike out the last two words in the last line, to wit: "United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"United States of America".

Title II

BEC. 201. The Congress finds that—
(a) the American Convention on Human Rights of the Organization of American States in 1969 affirmed that every person has the right to have his life protected by law from the moment of conception and that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of life;

(b) the Declaration of the Rights of the Child of the United Nations in 1959 affirmed that every child needs appropriate legal protection before as well as after birth:

(c) at the Nuremburg International Military tribunal for the trial of war criminals the promotion of abortion among minority populations, especially the denial of the protection of the law to the unborn children of Russian and Polish women, was considered a crime against humanity.

(d) the Federal Constitutional Court of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1975 ruled that the life which is developing itself in the womb of the mother is an independent legal value which enjoys the protectionof the constitution and the state's duty to protect human life before birth forbids not only direct state attacks, but also requires the state to protect this life from other persons:

(e) the Declaration of Independence afmed that all human beings are endowed heir Creator with certain unalienable rights among which is the right to life:

(f) as early as 1859 the American medical profession affirmed the independent and actual existence of the child before birth as a living being and condemned the practice of abortion at every period of gestation as the destruction of human life;

(g) before 1973, each of the serveral States had enacted laws to restrict the perform-

ance of abortion;

(h) agencies of the United States continue to protect human life before birth from workingplace hazards, the effects of dangerous pharmaceuticals, and other hazardous substances:

(i) it is a fundamental principle of American law to recognize and affirm the intrinsic

value of all human life;

(j) scientific evidence demonstrates the life of each human being begins at conception:

(k) the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Roe v. Wade erred in not recognizing the humanity of the unborn child and the compelling interest of the several States in protecting the life of each person before birth; and

(1) the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Roe v. Wade erred in excluding unborn children from the safeguards afforded by the equal protection and due process provisions of the Constitution

of the United States.

SEC. 202. No agency of the United States shall perform abortions, except when the life of the mother would be endangered if

the child were carried to term.

pc. 203. No funds appropriated by Coness shall be used directly or indirectly to,

perform abortions, to reimburse or pay for abortions, or to refer for abortions, except when the life of the mother would be endangered if the child were carried to term.

Szc. 204. No funds appropriated by Congress shall be used to give training in the techniques for performing abortions, to finance research related to abortion, or to finance experimentation on aborted children.

Szc. 205. The United States shall not enter into any contract for insurance that provides, directly or indirectly, for payment or reimbursement for abortions other than when the life of the mother would be endangered if the child were carried to term.

SEC. 206. No institution that receives Federal financial assistance shall discriminate against any employee, applicant for employment, student, or applicant for admission as a student, on the basis of that person's opposition to abortion or refusal to counsel or assist in the performance of abortions.

SEC. 207. Any party may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from an interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order of any court of the United States regarding the enforcement of this Title, or of any State law or municipal ordinance based on this Title, or any judgment, decree, or order which adjudicates the constitutionality of this Title, or of any such law or ordinance. Any party to such case shall have a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States on the same terms as govern appeals pursuant to section 1252 of title 28, United States Code, notwithstanding the absence of the United States as a party to such case. Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, attorneys' fees shall not be allowable in any civil action involving, directly or indirectly, the provisions of this Title.

SEC. 208. If any provision of this Title or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is judicially determined to be invalid, the validity of the reminder of thi Title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected by such determination."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment I have sent to the desk is to bring some of the Federal Government's legislative power to bear on the abortion problem. We, in Congress, have extensive constitutional authority to provide legal protection for unborn human beings, and this bill takes advantage of part of that authority.

The first section contains findings involving treaties, international bodies, foreign tribunals, American history, Senate hearings, and Supreme Court decisions relating to unborn human beings and the right to life. These findings will put Congress on record as clearly recognizing and affirming the right to life and rejecting the tragedy of abortion on demand.

The next four sections restrict the use of Federal funds for abortion. The traditional Hyde amendment formulation is employed, which last passed the Senate on May 21, 1981, by a vote of 52 to 43. Further funding limitations are included with the objective of getting the Federal Government totally out of the business of supporting abortion with tax money.

The sixth section is a freedom-ofconscience provision for medical personnel who work in institutions receiving Pederal financial assistance and who object to taking part in providing abortions. Discrimination against such medical personnel on account of their prolife convictions is prohibited.

The seventh section provides for expedited Supreme Court review of cases arising out of State antiabortion statutes. This provision will insure that the Supreme Court gets an early opportunity to review its decision in Roe versus Wade. In addition, award of attorneys' fees is specifically prohibited in cases involving this bill in order to carry out the purpose of the bill in ending Federal financial support for abortion. The last section is a severability clause.

TRADITION AGAINST ABORTION

Mr. President, there has been a long-standing tradition in Anglo-American jurisprudence and in Western civilization generally that the protection of innocent human life is a preeminent value. On January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court made a radical break with that tradition. It decided the case of Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), and in the process, announced a newly discovered rule that the Constitution sanctions abortion on demand. The effects of Roe converted abortion from a felony into a constitutional right—overnight.

Swift was the change in centuries of law, and swift were the results in American culture. Since January 22,4973, there have been more than 10 million abortions. A handful of babies survived the procedures and are alive today. The rest perished. Whatever the fate of the dead in the economy of God's merciful providence, we, on Earth, are without 10 million American children. Let us pause for a moment and think about that fact.

TRUE NATURE OF ABORTION

Mr. President, the United States has been given many great gifts. We have land rich in beauty and natural resources. We have a climate conducive to the most productive agriculture in the world. We have a heritage which includes the best of European and other cultures. We have a tradition of political freedom and economic opportunity which draws immigrants year after year. We have religious liberty and strong families. We have all this and much more.

But beyond these many things, I believe that we all would admit that our most precious gift in America is something else. We see it all around us, especially in the Capitol at this time of year. This gift carries us away from the daily grind into a world of hope and wonder. It is the gift—and mystery—of children. Can we ever overestimate the immense value of American children?

I say no, Mr. President, and everything in our heritage and culture says no, as well. The English poet, John Masefield, has stated the great truth about children in these lines:

And he who gives a child a treat Makes joy-bells ring in Heaven's street,

WASHINGTON

September 2, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

SUBJECT: Op Ed on Tuition Tax Credits

Attached per your request is a draft op ed piece for Mr. Meese on tuition tax credits.

You should note that we have included a statement that the Administration would support the refundability proposal made by members of the Senate Finance Committee. To date, we have actually resisted refundability. However, refundability is favored by every group in the coalition and by virtually all the Senators who support credits. It is almost sure to pass, and our continued opposition to it puts us in a difficult position. We think the Administration should get out front on this matter. In so doing, we would deflect a lot of criticism that this is a "rich man's bill."

DRAFT -- Op Ed for Mr. Meese

The <u>Post's</u> editorial last Friday against the President's tuition tax credit bill is misleading. Its charge that the President's bill would allow credits to go to racially discriminatory schools is false and is based on a distortion of the facts. This false accusation must be put to rest so that Congress and the American people can proceed to consider the real issue at stake in tuition tax credits.

The <u>Post</u> concludes that the President's bill constitutes "an endorsement of segregated private schools" because the bill "does not provide for enforcement by the IRS." What the <u>Post never mentions</u>, however, is that the bill contains explicit, strong, and unequivocal prohibitions against racial discrimination; that it specifically confers enforcement authority on the Department of Justice, the agency generally charged with enforcing anti-discrimination laws; and that it provides the Attorney General with all the tools he needs to enforce the non-discrimination requirements, including civil and criminal penalties. Surely these provisions, which are modeled after numerous civil rights laws, deserve mention in any editorial that seeks to condemn the President's bill as an attempt to benefit segregated schools.

These provisions have in fact been analyzed closely by a variety of Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and non-sectarian groups

which have been staunch opponents of racial discrimination for many years. These groups have not only endorsed the bill, but have applauded its anti-discrimination provisions. In short, those groups with sincere commitments against racial discrimination but which are not hostile to the concept of tuition tax credits are fully satisfied by the President's bill.

But these same groups also have a legitimate concern that government regulation not become an excessive intrusion and burden upon racially fair-minded schools. People understandably want to protect against regulations such as those proposed by the IRS in 1978 and retracted under massive protest, which would have imposed presumptions of guilt and quota requirements on many private schools totally innocent of racial discrimination.

Senator Bradley and the <u>Post</u> have ignored these legitimate concerns. The Senator's proposed amendment would establish intrusive and unfettered IRS regulation of schools, with no safeguards against abuse. They go well beyond what is needed to police against discrimination, and could open the way to severe administrative burdens on schools that have never been unfair toward racial minorities.

The President's bill achieves a balance, ensuring that discriminatory schools do not benefit, and that fair-minded schools do not suffer. Those who oppose the whole idea of tuition tax credits know that to move the discrimination

provisions away from this balance will ensure defeat for the bill.

The <u>Post's</u> editorial conceals the facts that readers need in order to judge for themselves whether the President's bill is a balanced approach. The distortion of facts also obscures the 's issue that our citizens and representatives most need to address in the tuition tax credit debate.

That issue concerns the continued vitality, diversity, and pluralism of our educational system. It concerns meaningful choice for parents between public education and the many forms of private education that are available. Parents have a fundamental right to send their children to schools that reflect their own moral values and educational preferences. The rising costs of education, however, are threatening to put this freedom of choice beyond the reach of many low— and middle—income families who cannot afford the "double burden" of paying private school tuitions and State and local taxes that support the public school system. The issue is whether freedom of choice in education is going to exist only for the wealthy or whether that freedom will be preserved and extended to low— and middle—income families.

The President's bill will help preserve educational freedom and will provide the greatest benefit to those who need it most -- low- and middle-income families. The President will support a proposal by members of the Senate Finance Committee to make

credits "refundable" so that even the poorest families who do not pay taxes will be benefited by the legislation. Middle- and low-income families are the largest users of private schools. In 1979 fully 54 percent of the students in private schools came from families with incomes below \$25,000.

It is sad that opponents of tuition tax credits have chosen to manipulate the issue of racial discrimination in their efforts to scuttle this bill.

Minorities will be among the chief beneficiaries of the President's bill. Minority parents want a choice between public and private schools. Fully 19 percent of the students in Catholic schools are members of a racial minority. Recent studies show that in many urban areas 70-80 percent of parochial school children are members of racial minorities. One-third of the families with children in these schools are Protestant.

There are already hundreds of thousands of minority families making heroic sacrifices so that their children can attend private schools. The President's bill will help these families and bring a real choice to many more who presently do not have it. The bill will greatly enrich and expand the educational opportunities of minorities. That is why economists Thomas Sowell and E. G. West agree that tuition tax credits have "a revolutionary potential for low-income groups."

Supporters of tuition tax credits have worked long and hard for educational opportunity for American families of all races and income levels. The President's bill is the most fair and effective way to bring their efforts to fruition. Congress should pass this bill before this session ends.

THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON

September 2, 1982

FOR:

EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM:

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

SUBJECT:

Response to ERA Letters

(Ref. 090730)

1) The draft response by Diana Lozano looks fine.

- 2) The Baroody paper also looks good. (A copy is attached.)
- 3) We haven't yet received the OPL fact sheets; when we do, we will give you our comments.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

ATE: 8/19/82	ACTION/	CONCURR	ENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:		8/20/82
UBJECT: Response	to ERA I	etters			
	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
HARPER			DRUG POLICY		<u> </u>
PORTER			TURNER		
✓ BARR			D. LEONARD		
BAUER			OFFICE OF POLICY	INFORM	ATION
BOGGS			GRAY		
BRADLEY			HOPKINS		
CARLESON			PROPERTY REVIEW BOA	RD 🗆	
DENEND			OTHER		
FAIRBANKS					
FERRARA					
GUNN					
B. LEONARD					
MALOLEY					
MONTOYA					
SMITH					
/ UHLMANN		X			
ADMINISTRATION					

Remarks:

- 1) Comments ASAP
- 2) Have you checked out the Baroody paper?
- 3) Please review these fact sheets as they come in.

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

WASHINGTON

August 17, 1982

Bill Barr

MEMORANDUM FOR ED HARPER

FROM:

ELIZABETH H. DOLE

SUBJECT:

Response to ERA Letters

out the Borosdy

We have discovered a considerable backlog of letters from women concerning the ERA.

I would like to develop a standard response to these and future letters on the subject of the ERA. A draft has been prepared, which I would like you to sign-off on. The attachment referred to is the Baroody paper on accomplishments for women, which Mike has now authorized for outside use. My staff will also be preparing fact sheets on the 50 States Project and the Task Force on Legal Equity for Women. I will forward the draft fact sheets to you for your review and comments.

(3) Pls review . There on soon as They

3H

WASHINGTON

August 17, 1982

Dear Ms. Ferdinand:

On behalf of President Reagan, thank you for your letter concerning equal rights for women.

The President is vitally concerned about legal equity for women and has implemented programs at both the national and state levels to identify laws which discriminate against women. Whether or not the ERA is passed by Congress, the process of identifying specific sex-biased laws must be undertaken, and the Administration is proceeding aggressively in this direction under the President's leadership.

I am enclosing some information concerning the accomplishments of the Reagan Administration which specifically benefit women, in the areas of equal rights, economic equity and representation in the Reagan Administration. I hope you find it informative.

Again, thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

Diana Lozano Special Assistant to the President

Ms. Barbara Ferdinand 410 Memorial Drive Apartment 552B Cambridge, MA 02139