

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** President, Office of the: Presidential  
Briefing Papers: Records, 1981-1989  
**Folder Title:** 01/21/1983 (Case File: 117224)  
**Box:** 25

---

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>

Page 1 of 1

ID # 117221

WHITE HOUSE  
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
WORKSHEET

- X-MEDIA
- H-INTERNAL

Name of Document: BRIEFING PAPERS  
FOR PRESIDENT'S  
SCHEDULED  
APPOINTMENTS FOR

JAN 21 83

Subject Codes:

P	R	0	0	7	-	0	1
H	O				-		
S	T	0	1	8	-		
L	G	.	N	E	<sup>w</sup>		0
					-		
					-		
F	G	0	1	0	-	0	2
E	D				-		
F	I	0	0	2	-		
F	A	0	0	3	-		
P	R	0	1	1	-		
P	R	0	1	6	-	0	1
					-		
					-		
W	E	0	0	3	-		
L	E				-		
W	E	0	0	1	-		
					-		
					-		

1) Subject: Meeting with Senator Bennett  
Johnston and the King and Queen  
of Mardi Gras, Jake Netterville  
and Sally Johnston

2) Meeting with the Cabinet Council on  
Economic Affairs to discuss  
Independent Education Accounts

3) Meeting with high school seniors  
participating in The Close-Up  
Foundation program.

4) Meeting with Pro-Life Leadership  
to discuss pro-life legislation.

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL		RSZ			C	

Referral Note:

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE  
Friday, January 21, 1983



*N.Y. Times*

9:00 am (20 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:20 am (10 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark) <i>General Beavers</i>	Oval Office
9:30 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Ambassadors Nitze and Rowny</u> (Clark)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
10:00 am (55 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:55 am (5 min)	<u>Senator Bennett Johnston, et al</u> (Duberstein)	Oval Office (TAB A)
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs</u> (Fuller)	Cabinet Room (TAB B)
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (40 min)	<u>Students TV Show</u> (Holmes)	450 OEOB (TAB C)
2:10 pm (50 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
3:00 pm (20 min)	<u>Meeting with Pro-Life Groups</u> (Dole)	Cabinet Room (TAB D)
Afternoon	N <u>To Camp David</u>	

UNP 1/20/83  
4:00 pm

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

2

III.. PARTICIPANTS

Ambassadors Nitze and Rowny, the Vice President, Secretary Shultz, William P. Clark, and ACDA Director-Designee Kenneth Adelman. *Sen. Weicker*

IV. PRESS PLAN

*Em, JB, McFarland*

Photo opportunity; press statement; Nitze/Rowny press conference.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Photo opportunity, discussion, and press statement.

Attachments

Tab A Talking Points  
Tab B Press Statement

Prepared by: Sven Kraemer

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

*By M/N 10/31/07*

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

set

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE  
Friday, January 21, 1983



8:57 DIPLOMATIC RECEPTION ROOM - PHOTOS WITH  
PARK POLICE + METRO POLICE - MOTORCYCLE UNIT

9:04 - OVA

9:00 am (20 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:20 am (10 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> 9:22 (Clark) BUSH, Em, JB, McFARLAND, Gen'l Bousai	Oval Office
9:30 am (30 min)	Meeting with Ambassadors Nitze and Rowley <del>and Rowley</del> BUSH, Em, JB, <del>McFARLAND</del> (Clark) McFARLAND 9:35 - 10:20 (distributed separately) PHOTO opp.	Oval Office
10:00 am (55 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 10:20 -	Oval Office
10:55 am (5 min)	<u>Senator Bennett Johnston, et al</u> (Duberstein) (TAB A)	Oval Office
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs</u> (Fuller) 11:05 - 12:15 (TAB B)	Cabinet Room
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u> 12:15 -	Oval Office
1:00 pm (40 min)	<u>Students TV Show</u> 1:02 - 1:40 (Holmes) (TAB C) 1:40 - 2:29 TOUR EOB OFFICES	450 OEOB
2:10 pm (50 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 2:29 - 3:00 3:00 - 3:05 V.P. BUSH	Oval Office
3:00 pm (20 min)	<u>Meeting with Pro-Life Groups</u> 3:05 - 3:45 (Dole) (TAB D)	Cabinet Room
Afternoon	N <u>To Camp David</u>	

4:00 RESIDENCE

5:15

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

The President has seen \_\_\_\_\_

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE  
Friday, January 21, 1983



9:00 am (20 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:20 am (10 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
9:30 am (30 min)	Meeting with Ambassadors Nitze and Rowny (Clark)	Oval Office  (distributed separately)
10:00 am (55 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:55 am (5 min)	<u>Senator Bennett Johnston, et al</u> (Duberstein)	Oval Office (TAB A)
11:00 am (60 min)	<u>Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs</u> (Fuller)	Cabinet Room (TAB B)
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch and Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
1:00 pm (40 min)	<u>Students TV Show</u> (Holmes)	450 OEOB (TAB C)
2:10 pm (50 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
3:00 pm (20 min)	<u>Meeting with Pro-Life Groups</u> (Dole)	Cabinet Room (TAB D)
Afternoon	N <u>To Camp David</u>	

UNP 1/20/83  
4:00 pm

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

January 31, 1983

TO: DAVE FISCHER  
FROM: PAM TURNER ✓  
SUBJECT: Attendance at Meeting with the President

On January 21, 1983, Senator Bennett Johnston brought in the 1983 King and Queen of Mardi Gras. The following individuals were present at the meeting with the President:

The Vice President  
Senator Bennett Johnston  
Mrs. Bennett Johnston  
Sally Johnston (Mardi Gras Queen)  
Hunter Johnston  
Jake Netterville (Mardi Gras King)  
Mrs. Jake Netterville  
Craig Anderson Netterville  
Leigh Anne Netterville

Pamela J. Turner





THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 19, 1983

MEETING WITH SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON (D-LOUISIANA) AND  
THE MARDI GRAS KING AND QUEEN

DATE: Friday, January 21, 1983

LOCATION: The Oval Office

TIME: 10:55 a.m. (5 minutes)

FROM: Kenneth M. Duberstein *Ker D.*

I. PURPOSE

To respond to Senator Bennett Johnston's (D-Louisiana) request for the President to meet with this year's King and Queen of Mardi Gras.

II. BACKGROUND

Mardi Gras is one of the oldest and most celebrated Louisiana traditions. Senator Johnston is serving as Chairman of this year's Mardi Gras ball here in Washington, and his youngest daughter, Sally, will be the 1983 Queen. Sally is 17 years old, and is a senior at Langley High School in McLean, Virginia. The King of this year's Mardi Gras is Mr. Jake Netterville, who is a certified public accountant in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

During the visit, the Mardi Gras King and Queen will present you with a proclamation making you an honorary Krewe member, a ducal, and also a small piece of jewelry for Mrs. Reagan. All of these are symbols of the Mardi Gras event itself.

Earlier today, some sixty Mardi Gras festival queens and princesses toured the White House. Senator Johnston had hoped that you would have an opportunity to greet this group, but understands that this was not possible.

The King and Queen will be accompanied by their families.

III. PARTICIPANTS

see attached list

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer only

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Senator Johnston and guests to arrive through the Northwest Gate, enter the West Lobby, and be escorted to the Oval Office for a five-minute meeting with the President.

---

Attachments: Participants List  
Talking Points

PARTICIPANTS

The President

The Vice President

Senator Bennett Johnston (D-Louisiana)

Mrs. Bennett Johnston (Mary)

Sally Johnston (Mardi Gras Queen - Senator's daughter)

Hunter Johnston (Senator's son)

Jake Lee Netterville (Mardi Gras King)

Mrs. Jake Netterville (Mary Nell)

Craig Anderson Netterville (son)

Leigh Anne Netterville (daughter)

Staff

Kenneth M. Duberstein

SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS FOR MEETING WITH  
SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON AND THE KING AND QUEEN OF MARDI GRAS

- Welcome Senator and Mrs. Johnston, their daughter, Sally (Mardi Gras Queen), Jake Netterville (Mardi Gras King), and the Netterville family to the White House.
  
- Mention that you enjoy the colorful tradition of the Mardi Gras, and congratulate Jake and Sally on their reign as King and Queen of this year's Mardi Gras ball.  

(Sally and Jake will present you with commemorative tokens of the Mardi Gras celebration. This will also provide for a photo opportunity with the assembled group.)
  
- Tell Senator Johnston you regret you were unable to meet with the larger group of Mardi Gras princesses which toured the White House this morning. Express the hope that they had an enjoyable tour and that Johnston will convey your greetings to them.
  
- Thank everyone for coming in and for their thoughtful gifts. Mention that you wish you could join in the festivities (you did receive an official invitation which was regretted) and that you wish them an enjoyable Mardi Gras celebration.

*B*


THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 20, 1983

BRIEFING PAPER FOR THE PRESIDENT

MEETING WITH THE CABINET COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

DATE: JANUARY 21, 1983  
TIME: 11:00 A.M. (60 MINUTES)  
LOCATION: CABINET ROOM  
FROM: CRAIG L. FULLER 

I. PURPOSE

The Cabinet Council has been reviewing a proposal from the Department of Education to create an Individual Education Account that would give individuals a special tax advantage if they saved money to pay for a child's education. A decision memorandum is attached and will be discussed at the meeting.

III. PARTICIPANTS

A final list will be attached to the agenda.

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer only.

V. SEQUENCE

Once the group is seated, call on Don Regan who will lead the discussion along with Secretary Ted Bell.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

CABINET COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

January 21, 1983

11:00 a.m.

CABINET ROOM

AGENDA

1. Independent Education Accounts (CM#327)

January 6, 1983

CM# 327

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: THE CABINET COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS  
SUBJECT: Tax Incentives for Education Saving

The Department of Education has advanced a possible initiative for the 1983 legislative program that would provide a tax incentive for education savings. The impetus behind this proposal is the Department's concern over the rising Federal share of support for higher education and the desire to achieve a tradeoff between incentives for greater family support in exchange for lower Federal outlays and subsidies.

Since this initiative involves a major change in the tax system, it was referred to the Cabinet Council on Economic Affairs. A working group including representatives from the Departments of Education and the Treasury, the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Office of Policy Development has identified two issues requiring the Council's consideration: whether the Administration should propose a new tax incentive for education savings and, if so, what form that tax incentive should take.

Issue 1: Should the Administration propose a new tax incentive for saving to pay post secondary education costs?

Background

Modest programs conceived in the late 1960s to assist the needy in obtaining a college education have grown dramatically over the past decade. This year's appropriation set a new record for federal aid for post-secondary education. The growth in federal assistance has far outstripped the growth in college education costs.

As these programs have expanded, they have been transformed from assistance for the needy to include heavily subsidized education assistance for middle income American families. For example, the data below show the proportion of student beneficiaries in Federal Student Financial Aid programs who come from families with incomes above \$25,000.

"Pell" grants	23.9% of student beneficiaries
Supplementary grants	2.1%



College work study	20.0%
National direct student loans	20.6%
Guaranteed student loans	61.9%

In recent years the family share of higher education costs has actually declined. Between 1978 and 1981, annual college costs at a four-year public institution increased slightly less rapidly than disposable family income which rose approximately 10 percent a year. However, virtually none of this increase in family income went toward the increased college costs. The difference was made up by federal and other assistance.

This decline in parental responsibility for post secondary education costs is in large part a response to the availability of public assistance. In general Congress has chosen not to act on Administration proposals to tighten eligibility criteria and reduce the level of federal support.

At the present time there are approximately 12.5 million degree seeking students in institutions of higher education. Just over five million of them, or roughly forty percent, are receiving assistance from one or more of the six major federal loan or grant programs. The budget impact of a tax incentive for education savings depends on four variables:

1. What portion of the 60 percent of students not currently receiving any federal assistance would take advantage of the tax incentive program, and what would be the associated revenue loss?
2. What portion of the 40 percent of students receiving federal assistance would take advantage of the tax incentive program, and what would be the associated revenue loss?
3. What outlay savings would occur, assuming current eligibility criteria, because students would have higher savings and thus be eligible for aid or eligible for reduced levels of aid?
4. What outlay savings might reasonably be expected to occur because the Congress would agree to Administration proposals for tightened grant and loan program eligibility criteria in return for the education savings tax incentive program?

There are essentially two options: go forward with an education saving tax incentive proposal as part of the 1983 legislative program; or withhold support and continue to seek tighter eligibility criteria and lower funding limits with the Congress for current higher education assistance programs.

Option 1: Propose an education saving tax incentive as part of the 1983 legislative program.

Advantages

- o This proposal would encourage private family saving for education costs and reduce federal outlays for post secondary education costs.
- o Within five years it would help relieve the demand for highly subsidized federal assistance to post secondary education, if the funds in these savings plans reduced eligibility for federal assistance.
- o An education saving tax incentive is among the most popular initiatives the Administration could undertake.

Option 2: Withhold support for an education saving tax incentive and continue to seek tighter eligibility criteria and lower funding levels with the Congress for federal assistance to post secondary education.

Advantages

- o An education tax incentive may do little to increase overall saving but reward those savers who would save in any case for their children's education.
- o A new proposal would create a tax preference that would primarily benefit middle and upper income taxpayers and that other groups would seek to emulate for housing, etc.
- o The Congress may accept the education saving tax incentive proposal but fail to make corresponding cuts in current higher education assistance programs.

Decision

Option 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Propose an education saving tax incentive as part of the 1983 legislative program.

Supported by: Education, Labor, Transportation, U. S. Trade Representative, Council of Economic Advisers.

The CEA supports this option if and only if the proposal is for an Education Savings Account.

Option 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Withhold support for an education saving tax incentive and continue to seek tighter eligibility criteria and lower funding levels with the Congress for federal assistance to post secondary education.

Supported by: Treasury, Commerce, Office of Management and Budget.

Issue 2: If the Administration supports a new tax incentive for education savings, what form should that tax incentive take?

There are a variety of alternative ways a tax incentive could be structured. The principal features involve what tax treatment initial contributions receive, what tax treatment interest and dividends in the account receive, and how withdrawals both for education and noneducation uses are treated. The Cabinet Council has discussed two basic alternatives. The principal features of these alternatives are as follows:

<u>Principal Features</u>	<u>Individual Education Account (IEA)</u>	<u>Education Savings Account (ESA)</u>
---------------------------	---	--

Creation of Trust

Eligible Contributors	Parents or Guardian.	
Maximum Annual Contribution	\$1,000 per child.	
Income Limitation on Contributors	Contributors may not have adjusted gross incomes over \$50,000 during the year they make a contribution.	
Tax Treatment of Contribution	25 percent immediate tax credit.	No deduction or credit when contributed.
Purpose of Trust	Post Secondary Education.	

Rules Governing Trust Prior to Withdrawal

Tax Treatment of Interest and Dividends	No deferral of taxes.	Exempt from Taxation.
Investment Restrictions	No contribution after age 18 of beneficiary.	

Rules Governing Trust During Payout Period

Tax Treatment of Distributions	No tax on amount used for higher education.	
Maximum Annual Payout	Total Cost of attendance.	
Maximum Payout Period	To age 26.	

Non-Education Use

Early Non-Educational Withdrawal	25 percent tax on amount withdrawn. (Recapture tax credit.)	Accumulated interest and dividends are taxable.
Unused Funds Withdrawn after age 26.	25 percent tax on amount withdrawn.	Remaining accumulated interest and dividends are taxable.

Option 1: Propose creation of an Individual Education Account (IEA) Program which would provide a 25 percent tax credit for contributions made by eligible contributors.

This option would have the following estimated revenue impacts over the 1983-1988 period:

<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>
-0.6	-1.8	-2.0	-2.2	-2.3	-2.6

Advantages

- o Provides the same dollar value to contributors regardless of their marginal tax rate. It would be perceived as equitable to low and middle income taxpayers.
- o Provides a strong immediate incentive to establish an Individual Education Account. Since interest and dividends are taxed, the incentive is strongest for contributions made in the years closest to when the funds are withdrawn.
- o The tax credit feature of this proposal is likely to appeal to families of students eligible for federal assistance under current law.

Option 2: Propose creation of an Education Savings Account (ESA) Program which would exempt from taxation interest and dividend income on contributions made by eligible contributors.

This option would have the following estimated revenue impacts over the 1983-1988 periods:

<u>(\$ Billions)</u>					
<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>
*	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.5	-0.7

Since the tax benefit of this proposal is an exemption from taxes on interest and dividend income the losses in Federal revenues would increase substantially in the period following 1988.

Advantages

- o By relying on exempting interest and dividends from taxation, the benefit to contributors increases the longer the funds are in the account. Thus, this proposal would encourage families to establish an account early in the child's life and contribute to it over an extended period of time.
- o The revenue costs to the Federal Government would be minimal in the early years following the Program's establishment.
- o Revenue costs would increase at a time more closely matching the hoped for savings in education outlays from fewer families qualifying for current federal assistance programs.

Decision

Option 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Propose creation of an Individual Education Account (IEA) Program which would provide a 25 percent tax credit for contributions made by eligible contributors.

Supported by: Education, Transportation,  
Labor, U. S. Trade  
Representative.

Option 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Propose creation of an Education Savings Account (ESA) Program which would exempt from taxation interest and dividend income on contributions made by eligible contributors.

Supported by: Commerce, Treasury, Office  
of Management and Budget,  
Council of Economic  
Advisers.

Donald T. Regan  
Chairman Pro Tempore

File: *Education Subsidy*

**Income Distribution of the Tax Savings from  
Education Savings Incentives and Various  
Federal Education Aid Programs**

*1981 2.4 b*

Adjusted gross income	IEA (25%)	Education savings account	Family income	Pell grants	SEO grants	College work study	National defense student loan	Guaranteed student loan
(..... percent .....)			(..... percent .....)					
0 - 5	*	*	0 - 6	15.2%	14.3%	8.3%	4.9%	2.9%
5 - 20	7.1%	3.7%	6 - 15	37.5	35.1	26.3	21.3	12.7
20 - 30	28.8	20.1	15 - 25	28.1	30.1	32.5	33.5	26.1
30 - 50	45.5	45.6	25 - 40	15.0	16.3	25.9	29.7	36.3
50 and above	18.5	30.6	40 and above	4.2	3.9	6.9	10.6	22.1
<b>Total</b>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>		<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury  
Office of Tax Analysis

January 5, 1981

Note: Federal aid distribution is that of the freshman class for 1980-1981.

C



# THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 18, 1983

## STUDENTS AND LEADERS PROGRAM

DATE: January 21, 1983  
LOCATION: Room 450 OEOB  
TIME: 1:00 p.m. (40 minutes)  
FROM: Joseph R. Holmes

### I. PURPOSE

To participate in a 30 minute Q and A with high school seniors from around the country.

### II. BACKGROUND

C-SPAN is the cable consortium which televises proceedings of the House of Representatives and Q and A sessions with Administration leaders.

The Close-Up Foundation is a privately financed foundation which brings hundreds of high school students to Washington to participate in governmental seminars and other activities.

These programs are beamed by satellite to 2,000 schools and over 10 million subscribers.

### III. PARTICIPANTS

The students for this program are from Houston, Atlanta, New Orleans and St. Louis.

### IV. PRESS PLAN

No Press. White House Photographer.

### V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

Format: You will sit on a stool on the stage. One student will be selected to ask the first question. The show will close 30 minutes after a pre-selected student has been cued by the stage manager and he or she will thank you.

Prior to your leaving the stage, four executives from C-SPAN and Close-Up will be briefly introduced to you.


*D*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 20, 1983

MEETING WITH PRO-LIFE LEADERSHIP

DATE: January 21, 1983  
LOCATION: Cabinet Room  
TIME: 3:00 p.m. - 3:20 p.m.  
FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

I. PURPOSE

To show your continued support for the pro-life cause.

II. BACKGROUND

Saturday's March for Life is on the 10th anniversary of the pro-abortion Roe vs. Wade decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. In the past, this march has drawn about 100,000 grassroots supporters of legislation in behalf of human life. All pro-life groups support the annual March for Life, although the groups differ in their preferred legislative remedies. Last year at a similar meeting, you urged this group to unite behind a course of action in the Congress and promised your support. They did, and you made calls and wrote letters to Senators in behalf of Senator Helms' amendment to the debt ceiling bill. The Helms proposal was tabled by a one-vote margin. At that time, you committed to support the Hatch (states rights) Human Life Amendment to the Constitution, which has no realistic chance of getting two-thirds of both Houses now, although supported by the Catholic Bishops.

Tip O'Neill's change in the House rules may make it impossible to pass Representative Henry Hyde's appropriation riders which now prevent Federal funding of abortions. These groups fear there will soon be hundreds of thousands of Federally-funded abortions resumed under your Administration.

Your nomination of Peggy Heckler to serve as HHS Secretary is cautiously supported by pro-life leaders. She opposes Federal funding of abortions but has never endorsed any Human Life Amendment.

III. PARTICIPANTS - (List Attached)

IV. PRESS PLAN - White House photo

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

3:00 p.m. You arrive in the Cabinet Room and circle the table, greeting guests as you move to your chair. On taking your chair, you offer brief remarks and conclude by asking to hear from the group.

3:20 p.m. You thank your guests and depart.

ATTENDEES - Cabinet Room Meeting with Pro-Life Leaders

Friday, January 21, 1983

John D. Beckett, President  
Intercessors for American

Judie Brown  
American Life Lobby

Paul Brown  
Life Amendment PAC

Dr. Jerry Falwell  
The Moral Majority

Mrs. Sandra Faucher, Director  
National Right to Life PAC

Peter Nassetta  
National Pro-Life PAC

Dennis Horan, Chairman  
Americans United for Life

John Mackey  
Ad Hoc Committee in Defense of Life

Ed McAteer, President  
The Religious Roundtable

Mark Gallagher  
National Committee for a Human Life Amendment

Prof. Victor Rosenblum  
Americans United for Life

Dr. Jack Willke  
National Right to Life Committee

Dr. Mildred Jefferson  
Right to Life Crusade

Mrs. Geline Williams  
National Right to Life Committee

Rev. Curtis Young  
Christian Action Council

Mr. David O'Steen  
Committee for a Pro-Life Congress

Mrs. Randy Engel  
U.S. Coalition for Life

Gordon Jones  
United Families of America

Mrs. Denise Cocciolone  
Birthright

Dr. William Pierce  
National Committee for Adoption

Rabbi Lewis Y. Levin  
Jewish Coalition for Traditional American Values

Mrs. Ann O'Donnell .  
Missouri Citizens for Life

Miss Nellie Gray  
March for Life Committee

Albert Lesperance  
March for Life Education Division

Michael L. Foley  
Rose PAC

ADMINISTRATION

The Honorable Donald Devine, Director  
Office of Personnel Management

The Honorable Margaret Heckler  
Secretary-Designate, Health and Human Services

Morton Blackwell  
Office of Public Liaison

Dee Jepsen  
Office of Public Liaison

SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS FOR JANUARY 21  
MEETING WITH PRO-LIFE LEADERS

- I am honored to welcome pro-life leaders to Washington on the occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the Roe vs. Wade decision. Your March for Life here each year keeps national attention focussed on the need for a solution to the tragic abortion problem.
- Last year I urged you to close ranks behind a unified strategy to get protective human life action through the Congress. You did unite behind Senator Helms' amendment to the debt limit bill last fall. But after a long fight, our unified effort was tabled in the Senate by a one-vote margin.
- This year the pro-life cause is in greater danger than ever before. The Democratic leadership in the House has just forced through a change in the House rules to prohibit the kind of appropriation bill rider which our friend Henry Hyde has used so successfully to prohibit Federal funding of abortions. I was pleased that every Republican House Member opposed this rules change. Unless we quickly unite on a strategy to prevent it, this House rules change could result in massive Federal funding of abortions.
- I want to assure you that I continue to support any reasonable and effective pro-life measure. Specifically, I support the well-known measures proposed by Senator Hatch, Senator Helms, and Representative Hyde. I think it is vital now, however, that our first step be to get into statute law, the prohibition

on Federal funding of abortions which has previously been passed as Hyde amendments to appropriations bills. If you agree that this is a proper course of action, I will support your efforts to work with the pro-life Congressional leaders to achieve this objective.

-- My current view is that our chance of victory is increased by keeping such a bill as simple as possible. If passed, an abortion funding prohibition can lead to victories on other valid, major concerns such as fetal experimentation, infanticide and sex-selection abortions. We must not lose sight of our goal of reversing the devastating effect of the Roe vs. Wade decision, but we need the momentum of clear-cut pro-life victories now.

-- As a general rule, I think we should from now on try to plan all our pro-life battles in the Congress long enough in advance for us in the Administration to win with your organizations generating a maximum effort from your grass-roots activists back home.