

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, 03/25/1983-04/06/1983  
**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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Enclosed are background papers on

- the Administration's achievements on matters of concern to women;
- three controversial issues that may arise in the meeting;
- the "gender gap."

The salient points that emerge from these papers are essentially these:

- o More than anything else, women need
  - a sound economy that will provide opportunities both in the market place and at home; and
  - legal equity -- the removal of artificial barriers that prevent women from making choices.

In these areas, the Administration has a solid record of achievement.

- o On the economic front, the Administration has
  - reduced inflation;
  - reduced interest rates;
  - cut taxes;
  - made tax reforms that help women (i.e., expansion of IRA's, elimination of marriage penalty, reduction of estate taxes);
  - increased child care credit;
  - strengthened enforcement of child support obligations.

- o On the legal equity front, the Administration has
  - launched the 50 States Project;
  - carried forward the Federal Legal Equity Project;
  - enforced federal laws that prohibit discrimination against women.
  
- o The Administration needs the Congresswomen's support in letting the public know about our record of achievement.
  
- o Our analysis of the "gender gap" shows that it is not related to this Administration's record on so-called "women's issues."
  - Its causes are complicated but, in general, the gap exists because certain groups of single, economically vulnerable women are worried about the Administration's overall economic and foreign policies.
  - The Administration's opposition to ERA, comparable worth (see Tab II), and other elements of the feminist agenda are not related to the gender gap.
  
- o As Republicans, we must be careful that we are not driven by a misreading of the so-called gender gap to embrace proposals which, though well-intentioned, may not, in fact, benefit women.
  - E.g. unisex insurance tables may significantly hurt women in life and auto insurance.
  - Some pension changes might result in losing U.S. jobs to foreign workers because of increased labor costs.

Nor can we embrace initiatives without looking at their impact on our overall economic program and on the enduring principles of our form of government (federalism).

I. Briefing Papers on Administration's Achievements

- o Federal Equity Project
- o 50 States Project
- o Child Support Enforcement
- o Child Care
- o Tax Reform and Other Economic Initiatives
- o Appointments

II. Briefing Paper on Key Issues

- o Equal Rights Legislation
- o Wage Discrimination
- o Economic Equity Act

III. Briefing Paper on the "Gender Gap"



## FEDERAL EQUITY PROJECT

- o On December 21, 1981, you issued Executive Order 12336 which:
  - directed the Attorney General to complete the review of federal laws and regulations containing language that unjustifiably differentiates on the basis of sex; and
  - created a Task Force on Legal Equity for Women which is responsible for implementing changes ordered by you following review of the Attorney General's report. (The Task Force is composed of representatives from each of the 21 federal departments and agencies; most of the members are at the Assistant Secretary level; 14 are women.)
- o The first DOJ progress report was transmitted to the Cabinet Council on Legal Policy in June 1982. The report listed progress to date on the correction of legal inequities affecting women. The appendix listed over 100 federal statutes containing gender-biased language.
- o On September 27, 1982, President Reagan sent a letter to Senator Dole (R-Kansas) in support of legislation to correct statutes identified in the first Department of Justice report containing gender bias.
- o On October 1, 1982, Senator Robert Dole (R-Kansas) introduced legislation (S.3008) which would cleanse the federal code of approximately 100 gender-discriminatory provisions identified in the Department of Justice report.
- o In the fall of 1982, the Justice Department authorized an updated computer-assisted search of federal statutes and regulations to identify remaining gender discrimination.
- o The Task Force on Legal Equity for Women was convened for the second time on November 22, 1982. The first DOJ report was discussed and distributed with the proposed corrective legislation S.3008.
- o On December 3, 1982, the Justice Department transmitted a second status report to the Cabinet Council on Legal Policy. The second report described an updated computer-assisted search of the U.S. Code and of federal regulations.

## 50 STATES PROJECT

- o In 1981 you established the 50 States Project to fulfill your campaign promise to assist governors to identify and correct state laws that discriminate against women.
- o Steady progress is being made:
  - By September 1981, all the governors had appointed representatives to the Project.
  - A White House Conference has been held, and you personally met with the governors' representatives and urged diligent efforts to change discriminatory state laws.
  - In many states, the review process is well underway, and the Project is now working with those states on corrective action.
  - The Project has surveyed all the states on their efforts to date.
  - Based on this survey, the "Status of the States" Report, a 1982 Year-End Report, has been prepared and sent to governors, state legislative leaders, and women's commissions.
- o Some examples of specific action that have resulted from the Project include:
  - Former Governor Busbee (D-Ga), in response to the 50 States Project, directed that a statute search be undertaken in his state. This was completed in 1982.
  - Governor Ed Herschler (D-Wy), in his message to the 47th Wyoming Legislature, credited the President's initiative as fostering an effort which produced a bill to eliminate gender-based terminology in his state's statutes. This bill was passed, with minor changes, by the House.
  - The Pennsylvania Commission For Women has pledged its support to the Project.
  - The Iowa Commission For Women has included the 50 States Project as one of its priorities for 1983.
- o The Project has also taken on responsibilities in connection with the Administration's efforts to encourage private sector daycare and stronger state child support enforcement.



## CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

In 1975, Congress established the Child Support Enforcement Program to reduce the cost of welfare and foster family responsibility. This program, modeled after your highly successful initiative in California, has three major functions: (1) locating absent parents; (2) establishing paternity where necessary; and (3) establishing and enforcing child support orders for AFDC and non-AFDC families.

Eighty-seven percent of the children on the welfare rolls are due to the absence of a parent. Under the program, the states are allowed to file legal actions against an absent parent to obtain child support. The states then directly recover the child support payments from the absent parent. Amounts recovered either go to families to keep them off the welfare rolls or go to the state and federal government to offset AFDC payments made to families. The federal government pays much of the cost and provides support services, policy direction, and technical assistance.

Since its inception, the Program has collected \$8.8 billion -- \$5 billion for non-AFDC families and \$3.8 for AFDC families. While the program is generally successful, the Administration believes there is room for improvement. In the ten states with the best enforcement record, the percent of AFDC payments recovered for child support averaged 10.2% in FY 1981 compared to 2.5% for the ten worst states. Nineteen states collect less from AFDC absent parents than they spend on program administration.

Over the year, we have taken steps to strengthen and improve the Child Support Enforcement Program:

- o The Administration obtained legislation permitting states to make collections for past due child support to AFDC families by having IRS make offsets to federal tax refunds. In 1982, we collected \$168 million through this initiative.
- o We will shortly propose legislation to strengthen the program. The legislation is designed to encourage greater state efforts by directly linking administrative funding to state performance and by the payment of bonuses. The bill will also facilitate collection by requiring states to adopt (1) a simple administrative process to enforce child support orders; (2) provisions for mandatory wage assignment; and (3) provisions for collection through offsetting state income tax returns.
- o We have created an interagency working group under the Cabinet Council on Legal Policy to strengthen federal enforcement assistance, particularly parent locator and collection activities. The working group has already implemented several improvements:

- HHS's ability to provide absent parent locating information has been upgraded by automating the records of agencies (e.g., the Veterans Administration) where name checks had previously been done manually.
- HHS has been given access to (on a test basis) substantial new federal records that have not previously been available to locate absent parents. (E.g., Selective Service records; the current payroll files for all federal employees, rather than the stale information previously provided by the National Personnel Records Center; the National Guard and Ready Reserve files of DOD.)
- The ability of the IRS to make collections through offsets to federal tax refunds has been upgraded. Case submissions have been increased and, through automation, the lead time needed by the IRS to make an offset has been significantly reduced.
- o HHS has launched an intensive urban assistance program. Collections have been significantly increased by the infusion of technical assistance into major urban areas where collections had previously been a problem: Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Baltimore, San Francisco, and New Orleans.
- o HHS's Office of Child Support Enforcement is changing the way in which the federal government audits state and local child support programs. Instead of merely looking to see if the elements of the program are in place, as in the past, HHS will focus on the performance and results of the program.
- o We have increased the level of federal financial assistance to states seeking to establish the automated systems necessary for a child support enforcement program.
- o The 50 States Project is developing a program to encourage states to enact legislation that will improve the local child support enforcement program.
- o In mid-February, Jack Svahn, the newly-named Undersecretary of HHS, wrote to all the Governors advising them of administrative actions they could take to improve their local child support enforcement program.
- o HHS has taken steps to expand the knowledge base in the child support area. It recently awarded three research grants for studies on interstate enforcement problems and problems relating to the establishment of paternity.



## CHILD CARE

### Background

- o While there are no federal child care regulations, unnecessary state and local regulations and restrictions on day care make it difficult for neighborhood groups and private organizations to provide child care.
- o In the 1981 Budget Reconciliation Act, the major federal day care program was folded into the Social Services Block Grant.
  - States now may decide whether to run or fund a day care program, and on the appropriate funding level.
  - Rather than reduce or eliminate child care programs, states may staff them with individuals in workfare and work-study programs.

### Administration Initiatives

- o The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 substantially increased child care tax credits to working parents and provided that employer contributions for child care are not taxable to employees.
- o The Administration has started a coordinated effort to encourage employers to provide child care services.
  - The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, in conjunction with the Rockefeller Foundation, is funding four demonstration projects to induce employers to provide day care services for working women. Final reports are due by October 1983. The types of services include day care vouchers, employer-provided on-site daycare, educating the employer about tax incentives, etc.
  - The Private Sector Initiatives Office has initiated a program to encourage private sector day care. The program will promote the demonstration projects developed by the Women's Bureau.
  - The 50 States Project has started a program to identify unnecessary state and local restrictions that inhibit private child care and to encourage local governments to relax these restrictions.
- o The Administration is encouraging states to use workfare programs and work-study programs to provide child care. This will involve using able-bodied welfare recipients to provide low-cost child care for other workfare recipients and for low-income working people and the use of college students to provide child care on college campuses or in neighboring communities.

## TAX REFORM AND OTHER ECONOMIC INITIATIVES

### o Reducing the "marriage tax penalty".

- Prior to 1981, married couples filing jointly were taxed at substantially higher marginal rates than were two single individuals earning the same income.
- The Economic Recovery Tax Act greatly reduces this penalty by allowing a partial deduction from married couples' combined salaries, thereby permitting a two-earner couple to keep more of what they earn. A typical two-earner family, for instance, will save up to \$300 per year in taxes when the plan is fully in effect in 1984.

### o Expanding IRA participation.

- The 1981 tax act raises the maximum contribution for earners from \$1,500 to \$2,000 and permits employed spouses to contribute \$500 or more each year to spousal accounts, which will aid non-paid spouses who work as homemakers.

### o Reducing the estate tax.

- The virtual elimination of the estate tax, enacted last year, is also of particular benefit to women, since they outlive men by an average of eight years. In the past, many women who had worked alongside their husbands building a family farm or business were forced to sell it when their husband died in order to pay the estate taxes.
- The new law will prevent this from occurring by:
  - Providing for unlimited property transfers between spouses.
  - Raising the tax exemption on inherited property from \$175,625 in 1981 to \$600,000 by 1987, thus preserving intact some 99.7% of all estates.

### o Increasing the tax credit for child care expenses.

- For parents who earn less than \$10,000 per year, the credit will rise from \$400 to \$720 per child.
- The credit is then scaled back by one percentage point for each additional \$2,000 of income above \$10,000. For parents with incomes of \$28,000 or more, the allowable credit remains fixed at \$480 per child.



o Facilitating day care.

- The 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act provides incentives for employers to include prepaid day care in their employee benefit packages.
- It also raises the dependent care tax credit from \$4,000 to \$4,800.

o Protecting incomes from inflation.

- The drop in inflation has increased the purchasing power of many women. (A woman earning \$11,000 has more than \$14/week greater purchasing power.)
- The indexing of the income tax to inflation, approved in 1981 and taking effect in 1985, will be of significant help to women whose income increases over time. No longer will inflation be allowed to force taxpayers into higher tax brackets, thus hindering women's advance up the economic ladder.

o Making poverty calculations equitable.

- Previously, the poverty level had been higher for men than for women, thereby understating the proportion of women experiencing financial hardship.
- To correct this inequity, the Reagan Administration instituted a sex-neutral definition of poverty to ensure that women are evaluated by the same assistance criteria as are men.

o Protecting the financial security of military wives.

- The President, in 1982, signed into law the Uniformed Services Spouses' Protection Act.
- Because military wives must move frequently to satisfy the career requirements of their husbands, they find it difficult or impossible to establish an independent career that would qualify them for a pension. The new law will correct the previous practice by allowing state courts to divide military retirement benefits in divorce settlements.

o Making work schedules more flexible.

- The President, on July 23, 1982, signed the Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1982, which will permanently allow federal agencies to adopt "flexitime" schedules for their employees.

-- As the President stated when signing the bill, institutionalizing flexitime will be "particularly important to working mothers who use the flexibility in scheduling work hours to help them meet their responsibilities both at home and at the office."

## REAGAN ADMINISTRATION WOMEN APPOINTMENTS

In his first two years in office, President Reagan selected more women to serve in top full-time policy making positions than any other President in history during a comparable time period. To date, 96 women have been selected for uppermost level, full-time Presidential appointments. All told, Reagan has selected almost 700 women for important positions: 145 for the Senior Executive Service, 148 for high level Schedule C jobs, and nearly 300 for part-time Presidential advisory boards.

President Reagan has appointed three women to Cabinet level positions -- more than any other President: Elizabeth Dole at Department of Transportation, Margaret Heckler at Health and Human Services, and Jeanne Kirkpatrick at the United Nations. In addition, he appointed Sandra Day O'Connor to be the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court. Two of his chief aides at the White House are women: Faith Whittlesey, in charge of Public Liaison, and Helene von Damm of Presidential Personnel. Women also have been selected as heads of five major federal agencies: Anne Burford of the Environmental Protection Agency, Loret Ruppe of the Peace Corps, Nancy Steorts of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Janet Steiger of the United States Postal Rate Commission, and Barbara Mahone of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.



## KEY ISSUES

In a letter from six of the Congresswomen who will be at this meeting, three issues were raised which you may be asked to address:

### I. EQUAL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

You may be asked: (1) to refrain from lobbying against the ERA; or (2) to support a bill intended to have the same effect as ERA by empowering judges to strike down sex-based distinctions as "inherently suspect."

#### A. ERA

While you have always been for doing away with any vestiges of discrimination against women, you have opposed ERA because its shotgun approach is unnecessary to do the job and threatens more harm and mischief than good:

- o Current law -- Both the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution and federal statutes already prohibit sex-based distinctions that discriminate against women.
  - In recent years, the Supreme Court and lower federal courts have consistently struck down sex-based classifications that disfavor women.
  - At the same time, the courts have upheld some sex-based classifications that benefit women (e.g., social security, rights for widows, exemption from draft).
- o To the extent pockets of sex discrimination remain, these should be addressed by rifleshot legislation that is clear and directly targetted at the problem at hand. The Federal Equity Project and 50 States Project were established precisely to help in this process of identifying and remedying any remaining areas of discrimination.
- o The language of the ERA is so vague that no one is sure what it means. The ERA would give a "blank check" to the judiciary, the least democratic branch, to sweep away all sex-based distinctions -- even those that are reasonable, non-injurious to women, and supported by most of society.

#### B. ERA and "Fairness"

Some conservative Congressmen and women's leaders such as Phyllis Schlafly would like you to raise the issue of "fairness" in connection with the ERA.

ERA has already twice failed ratification. Before giving it a third bite at the apple, it is only fair that the American people get a chance to consider three other Constitutional Amendments -- balanced budget, school prayer, and right-to-life. These amendments are being penned up by a minority in Congress.

### C. ERA by Statute

In lieu of ERA, the Congresswomen may seek your endorsement of a bill that would empower federal judges to do just what ERA does. The bill is sponsored in the Senate by Senator Gorton and has also been introduced in the House, where some of the Congresswomen may be supporting it.

From a philosophical standpoint, the bill is more pernicious than ERA because it bypasses the state ratification process.

From a legal standpoint, the likely effect of the bill would be the same as the ERA -- to strike down all gender-based classifications and give a blank check to judges to fundamentally restructure society in ways that would be opposed by most Americans. For example, it is reasonable to expect that, if passed, this legislation would be successfully used:

- to require the drafting and combat assignment of women;
- to strike down state laws excluding homosexuals from marriage and other domestic relation rights;
- to abolish all single-sex education (single sex education at state schools and private schools receiving federal funds would be prohibited; private schools would have 501(c)(3) status threatened, etc.);
- to strike down those state child custody, alimony, child support laws that have favored mothers;
- to impose sanctions on churches (e.g., denial of tax exempt status) that treat men and women differently.

## II. WAGE DISPARITY COMMISSION

In their letter, the Congresswomen propose a Presidential Commission to develop legislation to eliminate wage disparities between men and women.

For reasons discussed below, a Commission would be ill-advised. Directing CEA to study wage discrimination would be a preferable way of satisfying the Congresswomen's concerns.



There are two distinct issues which have been confused in the debate over wage discrimination -- one issue relates to pay differences between individual men and women doing the same job; the other issue relates to the difference in average income between all men as a group and all women as a group.

A. "Equal Pay for Equal Work"

There is a pay gap between men and women who do the same work. For example, the average male busdriver makes more than the average female busdriver. Feminists say this is because of discrimination; however, most economic studies since 1973 have concluded that most of the pay gap (as much as 80%) is due to seniority differences. (I.e., A 1974 CEA report showed that the average man had been in his job twice as long as the average woman. While women's job tenure has increased in recent years, the experience gap remains substantial.) Of the small pay difference that remains, most economists have concluded that much of it (and some would say all of it) is due to "choice" factors, rather than discrimination (e.g., lower mobility of married women, refusal to accept as much overtime, etc.).

You have always supported the principle that men and women doing the same job with the same seniority should be paid the same. To the extent there is any lingering discrimination in this regard, there are already two federal statutes prohibiting it -- the Title VII and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. These statutes are being vigorously enforced.

Obviously, it makes no sense to set up a Commission on this type of wage disparity. It would give credibility to an idea we know is false -- namely, that the pay gap is attributable to discrimination and that it somehow lies within the power of government to do something about it more than it is already doing.

B. Comparable Worth

Today when feminist groups talk about wage discrimination, they are not talking about pay disparities within job categories nor the concept of equal pay for equal work. The pay disparity debate has now shifted to a different pay gap -- the gap between the median male worker and the median female worker. This is where the \$.59 on the \$1.00 figure comes from. Again, much of this gap is due to differences in seniority, length of work week, and choice factors. Some of the difference is also due to the fact that, with a high influx of women into the workforce in recent years, women have a high representation in lower paying job categories, e.g., clerical workers, librarians, etc. This has become especially true in recent years with the high influx of women into the workforce.



① Feminist organizations are vigorously pursuing the doctrine of "comparable worth" -- that federal judges should raise the wages of whole job categories in which women have traditionally worked. They want judges to mandate, for example, that secretaries be paid the same as truck drivers. Comparable worth is nothing less than the elimination of a market economy in the labor sector.

0 A Commission on Wage Disparity would necessarily gravitate into the comparable worth issue because there is no place else for such a Commission to go. There are only three ways such a Commission could be constituted: pro-comparable worth; anti-comparable worth; and more or less equally divided. The first is out of the question; the second would be vigorously assaulted by women's groups and therefore defeat the ostensible purpose of having a Commission to begin with; and the third would be irresponsible and, by producing a divided Commission, would be unlikely to do any good and could create a good deal of mischief.

### III. ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT

The Congresswomen's letter makes special note of the so-called "Economic Equity Act" (EEA), and they may seek your explicit endorsement at the meeting.

There have been a number of different versions of the EEA, but the differences are those of degree rather than kind. The most recent versions were introduced this Congress as S.888 and H.R.2090. In general, all versions of the EEA seek to amend the tax code and other provisions of federal law for the particular benefit of women.

Many, if not most, EEA features are unexceptionable, but some are controversial and perhaps even undesirable from a woman's point of view. More important, many people, including Members of Congress, seem to be unaware of how much of the original EEA has already been enacted or implemented.

Among those provisions already adopted with Administration support are:

- o IRA benefit for the non-working spouse;
- o Court assignment of military pensions;
- o Increased child care benefits;
- o Incentives for private sector child care;
- o Elimination of gender distinctions in language in federal statutes and regulations;

- o Army study on the role of women in military service;
- o Virtual elimination of estate taxes;
- o Relief for estate treatment of agricultural properties;
- o Program to strengthen child support enforcement.

The EEA also contains a number of provisions designed to achieve greater pension equity for women. Some proposals would be very costly to employers while providing marginal, if any, benefits to women. However, three of the pension proposals are reasonable and are under active consideration by the Administration:

- o Requiring spousal consent before survivor benefits can be waived;
- o Lowering required participation age for pension plans from 25 to 21.
- o Providing that maternity/child-rearing leave does not constitute a break-in-service under retirement plans.

The most controversial element of the EEA is a provision that would prohibit all sex distinctions in the field of insurance. The Administration has already taken the position in litigation that equal pension benefits for men and women are required under the anti-discrimination provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

You also promised in the State of the Union message that you would submit legislation to achieve greater pension equity for women. The Cabinet Council on Legal Policy will shortly make a recommendation to you in this area, but the Administration has not yet indicated, either in litigation or in testimony before Congress, how this goal can best be achieved.

There are any number of ways to achieve the goal of pension equity, which vary considerably in cost, benefit to women, and impact on the financial solvency of pension plans. For that reason, it would be well to avoid specific endorsement of any particular resolution of the problem at this point.

We have only begun to study the consequences of barring sex distinction in forms of insurance other than pensions. Although strongly favored by liberal feminist groups, it appears that unisex tables would have a significant adverse impact on most women in life insurance and auto insurance. All that we have said in testimony is that we have the matter under review.



We can expect opposition to these insurance provisions to grow as women learn about their real impact. E.g. The American Farm Bureau Women, 3 million members, is now actively lobbying against the insurance aspects of EEA.

The latest EEA, which was introduced just last week, generally tracks the provisions outlined above. In addition, it contains some new proposals -- mostly in the tax area -- which are now being reviewed within the Administration.

## THE GENDER GAP

The "gender gap" is the measured difference in certain public opinion poll questions between men and women. The President's job approval rating is most frequently cited, but the "gender gap" appears in other areas as well. This is not a new political phenomenon, but certain conditions over the past three years have cumulatively raised the statistical level of the "gender gap" to new heights, increasing political and media interest.

The current "gender gap" is caused by several factors.

First, it relates to differences between men and women in (1) the way they judge political morality, (2) their economic vulnerability, (3) their levels of political awareness, (4) the different impact higher education has on each, and (5) their perceived self-interests.

Second, the "gender gap" results from the extreme changes in our society (the rapid increase in the number of working women, the sexual revolution, the expanding divorce rates, the rise in the age of marriage, the explosion of welfare aid for dependent children, etc.) that have fragmented women into many groups, but has not had a similar impact on men, over the last thirty years.

In other words, female lifestyles and public opinion attitudes differ depending on (1) a women's marital status (single--never married, married, divorced or separated, and widowed), (2) the presence of children in her home (no children, children with husband, and children without husband), and (3) her employment status (full-time, part-time, unemployed, working for career, working out of necessity or housewife not seeking employment). The attitudes held by women in any combination of these conditions are further complicated by varying levels of education and age.

The fact is that there is no one single women's force today because women differ from each other according to how these various factors have influenced their lives.

The third factor contributing to the "gender gap" is the President's image on such general characteristics as "soft-tough" and "caring-uncaring." Certain groups of women tend to view the President as "too tough" and "too uncaring." Men, who generally have a positive orientation to "toughness" and who recognize that in hard times certain sacrifices are necessary even if it hurts, do not react as negatively to the President's image as do women.

Fourth, the President's policies of budget cutting and increased defense spending, coupled with the recession of 1981-82 and concern over social security, strike at certain fundamental

female self-interests. The budget cuts adversely affect the growing number of single parent families (90% of which are headed by a female) which rely heavily on federal aid. The defense issue raises the specter of war and frightens mothers more than fathers, as it always has. The recession and misperception of the President's commitment to social security served to reinforce the fears of some of these women.

Understanding the complex nature of the "gender gap" clarifies what it is not. It is not the result of any single set of issues or "women's group." Therefore, it is not surprising that public opinion polls do not register a "gender gap" on the so called "women's issues," which are really only issues for a narrow segment of women. In fact, some of the issues being espoused in the name of "women" are actually detrimental to some groups of women. For example, laws that would equalize insurance benefits for older women would likely cause younger women to lose the lower premiums for life and automobile insurance that they now enjoy compared to men of the same age.

Economic recovery, keeping the country out of war while improving its ability to defend itself, and a good communications program of administration successes will do more to close the "gender gap" than any legislative program supposedly aimed at "women." The concerns (low inflation, economic strength, peace, moral leadership, etc.) that cut across the various women's groups are more important to closing the "gender gap" than issues (the number of women appointed to high government positions, pension equity, wage parity, etc.) which are of interest to only one or two of those groups.



MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 30, 1983

FOR: EDWIN L. HARPER  
FROM: MICHAEL M. HELMANN  
SUBJECT: Talking Points re American Life Lobby Press Release

Attached are talking points for Larry Speakes. The Washington Times today covered American Life Lobby's efforts to press Secretary Heckler to investigate these cases. A copy of the article is attached.

Office of Cabinet Affairs is assisting us in day-to-day monitoring of calls that come into HHS on the handicapped infant hotline and investigatory efforts by the Department.



Talking Points - HHS Investigation of Allegations of Infanticide

- o The Connecticut Department of Human Services issued a study in October 1982 concerning 20 cases of possible infanticide in Connecticut hospitals.
- o The American Life Lobby has urged Secretary Heckler to investigate these 20 cases.
- o Allegations of this sort are handled by HHS through its Office for Civil Rights.
- o The White House is monitoring investigatory actions by HHS, along with all other actions following upon the Administration's new regulations to protect handicapped infants.
- o The President has a strong interest in guaranteeing effective and timely enforcement of the civil rights laws protecting handicapped persons against discrimination.

# Parents support rule on infanticide

By Miles Cunningham  
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

A coalition of parents who have retarded children filed suit yesterday to join the government in its rule against infanticide.

The Department of Health and Human Services advanced rules earlier this month denying federal funds to hospitals that permit infants with severe birth defects to die from lack of care or nutrition. In each hospital is posted a warning that such practice is illegal and further:

"Any person having knowledge that a handicapped infant is being discriminatorily denied food or customary medical care should immediately contact:

"Handicapped Infant Hotline  
"U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
"Washington, D.C. 20201  
"Phone 800-368-1019 (available 24 hours a day)

Or  
"Your state child protective agency."  
It is this message that the American Academy of Pediatrics has sued to block.

The academy favors a review panel in each hospital and language in the hospital notice that is "less alarming," said Elizabeth Noyes, spokeswoman for the academy.

"We are in agreement on a lot of these things," she said. "Let us sit down and reason this out, that's what the academy is saying. These are terribly complicated things."

A hearing on the issue is scheduled for today by Sen. Jeremiah Denton, R-Ala., before his subcommittee on families, and an appeal is to be heard in U.S. District Court on April 8 where the rule was upheld earlier.

At a press conference held yesterday, the American Coalition of Citizens With Disabilities reminded reporters the law forbids the government from granting funds to hospitals or persons who dis-

criminate against handicapped persons.

The coalition adopted a resolution last June commending President Reagan and urging the president to direct all departments of the federal government to comply with the law, that is post the warning.

Among others, the coalition includes the Down's Syndrome Congress, an organization of parents concerned with that affliction.

"Down's Syndrome is the most common cause of mental retardation in the world and is the most often observed chromosomal anomaly in man," said the organization. "It occurs approximately once in every 750 to 1,100 live births. Down's Syndrome knows no racial, ethnic or religious barriers."

The American Life Lobby, another private organization pressing for the hospital notice, released a letter yesterday it had sent to the Department of Health and Human Services demanding an explanation for "20 cases of possible

infanticide of handicapped babies at Connecticut hospitals."

Gary Curran, consultant to the organization, said it was the fifth instance of suspected infanticide that the American Life Lobby has requested the department investigate in the last 10 months.

In a letter to HHS Secretary Margaret Mary Heckler, Curran said the Connecticut cases involved babies where "decisions were made to withdraw respiration from these infants apparently based on prognosis of poor quality lives."

The HHS rule stems from what has been called the "Baby Doe" case in Bloomington, Ind., where a year ago a retarded infant allegedly was allowed to starve to death by parents, doctors and the state courts.

The pediatricians object to the rule on grounds there was not "appropriate time" for the public to comment on the language of the notice and it implies that infanticide occurs randomly.

**OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

**STAFFING MEMORANDUM**

DATE: 3/27/83 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ASAP

SUBJECT: Talking Points - American Life Lobby - News Release

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
HARPER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DRUG POLICY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PORTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TURNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BARR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	D. LEONARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BLED SOE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OFFICE OF POLICY INFORMATION		
BOGGS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOPKINS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARLESON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER		
DENEND	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FAIRBANKS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FERRARA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GALEBACH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GARFINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GUNN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. LEONARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MONTOYA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROCK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROPER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UHLMANN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADMINISTRATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Let's have some talking points ready for Larry Speakes.



# AMERICAN LIFE LOBBY INC.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS: MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 490, STAFFORD, VA 22554  
OFFICES: ROUTE #6, BOX 162-F, STAFFORD, VA 22554  
(703) 659-4171 METRO DC 690-2049

GOVERNMENT LIAISON OFFICE: 6B LIBRARY COURT SE (CAPITOL HILL) WASHINGTON, DC 20003 • (202) 546-5550

PRESS RELEASE

Hold For Release:  
March 29, 1983 10:00 a.m.

For More Information Contact:  
Gary Curran - 202/546-5550  
after 3/29 - 617/485-8484

## AMERICAN LIFE LOBBY REQUESTS FEDERAL INVESTIGATION OF 20 INFANTICIDE CASES AT CONNECTICUT HOSPITALS

The American Life Lobby today released a letter to U. S. Department of Health & Human Services (DHHS) Secretary Heckler requesting an investigation of 20 cases of possible infanticide of handicapped babies at Connecticut hospitals reported in an October 1982 Connecticut Department of Human Services study citing an instance of a 19 day long starvation of a handicapped baby and five cases where death occurred due to withdrawal of care because "poor quality lives" might result if they were allowed to live.

Gary Curran, Legislative Consultant to American Life Lobby, released the letter this morning during an appearance on the Sherye Henry Show on WOR Radio in New York City.

This is the fifth instance of infanticide that the American Life Lobby has requested U.S. DHHS to investigate in the last ten months. The federal agency has investigated over 12 complaints of infanticide in the same period.

Curran, in the letter to Secretary Heckler, pointed to five cases reported in the Connecticut study where "decisions were made to withdraw respiration 'from these infants apparently based on prognosis of poor quality lives'" and asked if this was "the Bloomington Baby Doe five times over." In the Bloomington, Indiana infanticide in April 1982, a retarded child was starved to death by parents, doctors and hospital with state court approval causing a national outcry.

MORE....



A.L.L. "... for God, for Life, for the Family, for the Nation"

The American Life Lobby, the nation's largest (108,000 member) pro-life/pro-family organization, led the fight to establish new federal regulations, which went into effect March 22, 1983, to protect the lives of handicapped newborn babies. The new regulations require a notice be posted in hospitals warning that withholding treatment or nutrition to a handicapped person is a violation of federal law and provides a hot-line 800 phone number to report such cases.

-30-

Editor's Note:

Gary Curran will meet the press at a press conference at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 29 at:

Highland Heights  
651 Prospect St.  
New Haven, CT

Secretary Heckler's phone number: 202/245-7000

The DHHS Press Office phone number: 202/245-1850

The U.S. DHHS investigative office is the Office for Civil Rights:  
202/245-6403



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Washington, D.C. 20201

March 16, 1983

Dear Administrator:

This is to inform you that the Interim Final Rule amending Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (45 CFR 84.61) was published on March 7, 1983 in the Federal Register. Enclosed is a copy of the rule.

The rule requires that each recipient that provides covered health care services to infants shall post and keep posted a notice in a conspicuous place in each delivery ward, each maternity ward, each pediatric ward and each nursery, including each intensive care nursery.

The required notice must be posted within five days after each recipient is informed by the Department of Health and Human Services of the applicable toll-free national telephone number.

THE INFANT DOE HOTLINE NUMBER IS 800-368-1019. (TTY capability)  
Callers within the city of Washington, D.C., call 863-0100.

For your convenience, we are enclosing a copy of a replica of the required notice. You may wish to make copies of this for posting.

Please insert the appropriate address and telephone number of your State Child Protective Agency.

You are free to provide your own version of this notice providing it is in conformance with Section 84.61(b).

For your further convenience we are sending you, under separate cover five copies in English and in Spanish of a 17 1/2 X 14 poster which contains the required notice.

Your immediate attention to this matter is important.

Sincerely,

Betty Lou Dotson, Director  
Office for Civil Rights

Enclosures



DISCRIMINATORY FAILURE TO FEED  
AND CARE FOR HANDICAPPED  
INFANTS IN THIS FACILITY IS  
PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL LAW

SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 STATES THAT "NO OTHERWISE QUALIFIED HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUAL SHALL, SOLELY BY REASON OF HANDICAP, BE EXCLUDED FROM PARTICIPATION IN, BE DENIED THE BENEFITS OF, OR BE SUBJECTED TO DISCRIMINATION UNDER ANY PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE."

ANY PERSON HAVING KNOWLEDGE THAT A HANDICAPPED INFANT IS BEING DISCRIMINATORILY DENIED FOOD OR CUSTOMARY MEDICAL CARE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY CONTACT:

HANDICAPPED INFANT HOTLINE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201  
PHONE 800-368-1019 (AVAILABLE 24 HOURS A DAY)  
IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON, D.C. - 863-0100 (TTY CAPABILITY)  
OR  
YOUR STATE CHILD PROTECTIVE AGENCY

FEDERAL LAW PROHIBITS RETALIATION OR INTIMIDATION AGAINST ANY PERSON WHO PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.

IDENTITY OF CALLERS WILL BE HELD CONFIDENTIAL.

FAILURE TO FEED AND CARE FOR INFANTS MAY ALSO VIOLATE THE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LAWS OF YOUR STATE.

File

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 1, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR EDWIN MEESE, III  
EDWIN L. HARPER

FROM: Michael M. Uhlmann

SUBJECT: Reauthorization of Civil Rights Commission

I. Background.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 established the Commission as an agency of limited duration, to expire after producing a final report to Congress and the President. As the original and subsequent expiration dates have approached, the Act has been periodically amended to extend the Commission's life.

Under current law, the Commission will expire at the end of this fiscal year. The President is on record as supporting extension.

Don Edwards has stolen a march on us by introducing his own extension legislation. Markup is scheduled for April 7.

The Commission has forwarded its own proposed extension legislation to OMB for clearance.

In cooperation with OMB, we have drafted proposed extension legislation for submission by the President. If it is to have any impact, it must be forwarded to the Hill no later than April 5 so that it can be introduced in time for the markup.

This matter coincides with, and is likely to be subsumed in the battle to confirm our forthcoming nominations to the Commission.

II. Issues.

o Length of extension. Our draft proposes a ten year extension (we had previously contemplated six). The Edwards bill and the CRC draft both propose a fifteen year extension.

o Terms of office. Our draft provides for staggered six year terms, with the President retaining his authority to nominate replacements at will. The CRC draft would also establish staggered six year terms, but members could be removed before their terms expired "for cause" only. Edwards has announced that he will add a provision addressing this issue after consulting with civil rights groups. These groups support either fixed terms or life tenure with removal only for cause.



o Subpoena authority. Our draft would not change the Commission's existing authority to subpoena persons or documents (the Commission is currently authorized to issue subpoenas within a fifty mile radius of a Commission hearing). The CRC draft would give the Commission nationwide subpoena power for documents. Such a provision is likely to be added to the Edwards bill (although Arthur Flemming has argued that this is an issue the Commission's supporters had best not open).

### III. Analysis.

This is a key skirmish in the larger battle to confirm our four impending nominations to the Commission.

The legislative aim of Edwards et al. is to "grandfather in" the existing Commissioners and substantially increase their capacity to make mischief. They will attempt to build a record, in moving their legislation, suggesting that the Commission must be protected against the Administration's "onslaughts" so that, when our nominations are made, they can be characterized as "there they go again".

It is therefore essential that we not allow ourselves to be placed in the position of reacting against Edwards' legislation, but in favor of our own.

Edwards' bill has received little, if any, publicity. Our own legislation (especially in view of the recent subpoena flap) would probably be widely publicized.

Republicans on the Subcommittee, particularly Sensenbrenner, are eager to take on the misuse of the Commission by its current members and staff as a Government financed lobby for the Left. They have, for example, added Checker Finn to the witnesses who will appear on April 7. An Administration bill (which we would expect Sensenbrenner to introduce in the House) would enable them to emphasize that while they are critical of the Commission's abuses, they are in favor of the Commission itself.

#### Recommendations:

o That the President forward the attached legislation to the Hill.

o That we immediately alert Sensenbrenner and other key allies of its contents.

o That we retain flexibility to make changes in our legislation in response to changing circumstances (e.g., if our four nominees are confirmed, the position of Edwards regarding issues such as lifetime tenure and removal for cause would change).



o We should take steps now to assure that the Senate Republican leadership recognizes the importance of all four of our nominees to the Commission, and is prepared to do battle for them.

Attached are drafts of (1) a transmittal message; (2) the bill itself; (3) a section-by-section analysis of the bill; and (4) a fact sheet.

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

I am transmitting herewith the "Civil Rights Commission Reauthorization Act of 1983".

We Americans have come to share a vision of the nation we want to be: A nation in which sex, race, religion, color, national origin, age, or condition of disability do not determine an individual's worth--or where he or she can work, study, or live. We can be justly proud both of the progress we have made toward realizing that ideal--and of our willingness to recognize that progress remains to be made.

In my State of the Union Address on January 25 of this year, I emphasized the importance of the role the Commission can play in assuring that we, as a nation, keep our statutory commitments to fairness and equity for all Americans--and the necessity to assure that the Commission is not allowed to expire, as current law provides, at the end of 1983. In recognition of that importance, the legislation I am transmitting for your consideration would continue the Commission's important work through 1993.

The ten year extension I propose today would be the longest in the Commission's history. However, I believe it is necessary to assure the continuity required for the effective pursuit of the Commission's mission, while preserving the original Congressional intent that the Commission have a specified purpose and duration.

In addition, I am proposing that future members of the Commission be appointed for specified terms, as is currently the case with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and similar agencies. This will assure that the Commission's membership is reviewed at the specified intervals, promote continuity and provide for the regular introduction of new perspectives to the Commission's work.

Finally, I am proposing that the Commission's current authorities and procedures be continued intact. The existing statutory provisions have, since the Commission's founding, enabled the Commission to fulfill its unique function while avoiding duplication of activities performed by the EEOC, Department of Justice, and other line agencies.

I ask that this legislation be adopted quickly to avoid any uncertainty regarding the Commission's status and any resulting disruption in its important work.

THE WHITE HOUSE

April ,1983

A BILL

To amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Commission Reauthorization Act of 1983".

ESTABLISHMENT OF TERMS FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 2. Section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) is amended to add the following at the conclusion of the section:

"(f) Members of the Commission will be appointed for a term of six years except for the members first appointed pursuant to this Act:

(i) Two of such members, not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for a term of two years;

(ii) Two of such members, not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for a term of four years;

(iii) Two of such members, not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for a term of six years.

Provided that: Those members of the Commission who, on the effective date of this Act, are serving as members pursuant to appointments made under prior authority shall continue to serve until successors are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

"(g) (i) A member of the Commission may continue to serve on the Commission after the expiration of the member's term until a successor has been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

(ii) Persons appointed to fill vacancies occurring other than by the expiration of a term of office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member they succeed."

EXTENDING THE LIFE OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. Section 104(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c(c)) is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting "1993" in lieu thereof.



AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 4. Section 106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975e.) is amended to read as follows:

"There are authorized to be appropriated \$12,180,000 to carry out the provisions of this chapter for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following nine fiscal years."

## Section by Section Analysis

Section 1 gives the short title of the proposed legislation, "Civil Rights Commission Reauthorization Act of 1982".

### ESTABLISHMENT OF TERMS FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Section 2 would amend section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) to add two new subsection at the conclusion of the section, (f) and (g). New subsection (f) would provide for staggered terms of six years for the members of the Commission. To initiate the staggered terms, the first six appointments pursuant to this legislation would be made in three pairs. One member pair would be appointed to two year terms, another to four year terms, and a third member pair to six year terms. Each pair of appointments would be of persons "not affiliated with the same political party" (the Civil Rights Act of 1957 requires that no more than 3 members of the Commission be members of the same political party). Thereafter, all appointments would be to six year terms (or, as provided in new subsection (g), where an appointee is succeeding or replacing a member whose term has not expired, to the remainder of the term in question).

Persons serving as members of the Commission upon enactment of this proposed legislation would continue to serve until successors are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. New subsection (g) would provide that members may continue to serve after the expiration of their terms of office until a successor has taken office as a member of the Commission.

### EXTENDING THE LIFE OF THE COMMISSION

Section 3 would extend the life of the Commission by ten years by amending Section 104(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c(c)) to provide that the Commission will submit its final report to Congress and the President in 1993 rather than 1983.

### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 4 would amend Section 106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975e.) to authorize the appropriation of \$12,180,000 for fiscal year 1984 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following nine fiscal years. This period coincides with the period of extension of the Commission's life in Section 3.

## FACT SHEET

### PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS TRANSMITTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1983

#### Summary

Pursuant to his State of the Union Address on January 25, the President today transmitted to the Congress a bill extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission. The ten year extension provided for in the bill would be the longest in the history of the Commission.

The President's Message reiterated his commitment to making America "...the nation we want to be: A nation in which sex, race, religion, color, national origin, age, or condition of disability do not determine an individual's worth--or where he or she can work, study, or live." Americans "...can be justly proud both of the progress we have made toward realizing that ideal--and of our willingness to recognize that progress remains to be made". The Civil Rights Commission, the President emphasized, can play an important role "...in assuring that we, as a nation, keep our statutory commitments to fairness and equity for all Americans...". The President's purpose in proposing an unprecedented ten year extension is to "...assure the continuity required for the effective pursuit of the Commission's mission--while preserving the original Congressional intent that the



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 4, 1983

MEETING WITH ROSSOW FAMILY

April 5, 1983

Roosevelt Room

4:00 p.m.

FROM: EDWIN L. HARPER

I. PURPOSE

To give recognition to the Rossow family for their extraordinary efforts to help handicapped children and to give each of the Rossows' adopted and foster children an opportunity to meet the President.

II. BACKGROUND

Last month the President telephoned the Rossow family and spoke with the parents and each of the children. The family came to the President's attention when he viewed the "Death in the Nursery" TV series on infanticide.

The Rossow family, from Ellington, Connecticut, was featured in that series as an ideal alternative to allowing handicapped children to die or abandoning them to an institution.

The Rossows have come to Washington this week to testify before the Senate Subcommittee on Family and Human Services, at a hearing on child abuse and protection of handicapped children. The Rossow parents have been leaders in Connecticut in counseling parents of newborn handicapped children and in speaking out publicly about the value of life of handicapped children.

The visit with the President is primarily to be an opportunity for the President to meet and talk with the children.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Parents

Carl Rossow  
Rachel Rossow

Children

Rachel Marie  
Robert  
Edward  
Susan  
Patrick  
(continued)

Glencora  
Maria  
Mary  
Simone  
David  
Charles  
Ellen  
Dina  
Benjamin

(10 of the children will be in wheelchairs.)

Helpers for the family

Doris R. Marshall  
Thomas Nerney

White House Staff

Robert B. Carleson  
Stephen H. Galebach  
Anne Higgins  
Dee Jepsen  
Virginia Knauer

IV. PRESS PLAN

Pool photo coverage at end of meeting.

White House photographer.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

When the President enters the room, he will be introduced first to the parents, Carl and Rachel. The parents will then introduce each of the children, with the President talking with each child in turn. The Rossows will also present the President with a short cassette recording of a song about their son Benjamin.

---

Attachment: Talking Points

## Talking Points

- o I want to commend you for the outstanding example you have set for all Americans in your care for handicapped children.
- o Thank you for reminding us all of the great value of the family and the importance of love in our lives.
- o I have been looking forward to meeting your children ever since I spoke with each of them by phone last month.



MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 5, 1983

FOR: EDWIN L. HARPER  
FROM: MICHAEL M. UHLMANN  
SUBJECT: Talk by Steve Galebach to Christian Legal Society

Christian Legal Society, Steve Galebach's previous employer, has asked that he give a talk on law and the family at a weekend conference, Friday evening, April 22, in Hyannis, Massachusetts. This will be a noncontroversial appearance before a small, friendly audience, without any press coverage. I recommend it be approved.