

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT

What is the rumor about the Ellen McCormack Campaign and who is spreading it?

The rumor is that Ellen McCormack is running for President because of a desire to receive publicity—and not because of a desire to advance Right to Life. The rumor is being spread by some pro-life supporters of Ronald Reagan—and is documented by an official of the Reagan campaign itself in an article in the *New York Daily News*.

Ellen's personal decision is to ignore these attacks on her motives. As her friends, we feel differently. We also believe that the best way to respond is to explain the underlying purpose of why the McCormack campaign is not supporting Gov. Reagan.

Why is the McCormack Campaign not supporting Ronald Reagan when he states that he is against abortion?

The purpose is to give Mr. Reagan a message from those who feel strongly about Right to Life. The message is this: "While we appreciate your statements against abortion, it is vital that you follow through with pro-life policies if elected."

Why is it necessary to give such a message?

With all respect to Mr. Reagan, on several occasions in the past he has made anti-abortion statements but then followed through with policy decisions that were a serious setback to Right to Life. Because of one such decision when he was Governor of California, more than 300,000 unborn children lost their lives as a result.

In 1967 Gov. Reagan took an anti-abortion position that was every bit as strong as his present stand. Just as he does today, the 1967 Reagan held the view that the unborn child is a human life and that abortion should be allowed only in "self defense" situations.

Nevertheless, under lobbying pressure from the pro-abortion forces, Ronald Reagan signed one of the most permissive abortion laws in the country. In 1967, the year Gov. Reagan signed the bill, 518 abortions were performed in California. Over the next five years a total of 341,059 recorded abortions were performed. During all these years, Ronald Reagan was Governor of California. During all these years, public officials on the state level had the power to prohibit abortion because the Supreme Court did not make its pro-abortion decision until 1973.

Reagan's strong Anti-Abortion statements did not result in Pro-Life Policies?

Despite his statements, the actual policies were very harmful to the unborn child. In addition to the abortion law itself, another example was Gov. Reagan's policy with respect to the unborn child and welfare.

What was Reagan's policy?

In 1972, as part of Ronald Reagan's attempt to revamp the state's welfare system, Gov. Reagan adopted a policy under which the unborn child of a welfare mother was charged "rent" for the shelter provided in the womb. The baby was also charged for free food, free clothing and free utilities.

How did Gov. Reagan's unborn child welfare policy work?

The free food, housing, clothing and utilities received by an unborn child was counted as "in-kind income." A dollar value was placed on each item the child in the womb was receiving. For example, a typical unborn baby was charged \$20 for food, \$9 for clothing, \$5 for housing and \$1 for utilities monthly. The amount involved was then deducted from the money provided by the state to the welfare family.

In one actual case, for instance, a family was receiving \$235 a month in welfare payments until the mother became pregnant. Because of the unborn child, the Reagan administration reduced the family's welfare payment to \$213. (please see case documentation below.)

Records in the California Department of Social Services show that more than 27,000 pregnant women lost some benefits because of this Reagan policy.

Is there additional evidence of Reagan's policies on abortion?

Each year that Mr. Reagan served as Governor, he signed legislation that triggered the use of government funds for Medicaid abortions. And during his administration 250,000 abortions were paid for by California's Medicaid Program. Thus, a woman on welfare who became pregnant would know that, if she had an abortion under the California law, then the killing of her unborn baby would be paid for by the government and her welfare benefits would improve. On the other hand, if she chose not to have an abortion, her welfare benefits would suffer for the entire term of the pregnancy.

DON'T JUST VOTE



VOTE ROW D AND KNOW ITS IMPORTANCE

Please read this ad . . .

Note: This ad is being placed by friends of Ellen McCormack. While election laws state that the people who work with a candidate cannot make independent expenditures, we felt this message to be so necessary that we have contributed specifically for this ad to the Ellen McCormack campaign. Nevertheless, the idea for this ad is ours and not Ellen's. Our purpose is not just to indicate our support for Ellen McCormack, but also to respond to certain damaging rumors that are being spread about her campaign. We hope that all who are concerned about the Right to Life will read this lengthy but important explanation, since it contains much information that has not been previously publicized.

#1. Because we are answering questions raised by Reagan supporters, this ad will not discuss the abortion position of Jimmy Carter. Nevertheless, we wish to make it clear that Mr. Carter does not support a pro-life amendment. For that reason, we ourselves oppose his candidacy as much as we did in 1976 when he first sought the Presidency.

#2. Unborn child welfare policy. . . The name of the family involved—who had their welfare benefits reduced from \$235 to \$213 because of the presence of an unborn baby—was Mr. and Mrs. Robert Shelton. The Sheltons challenged Mr. Reagan's policy in court, and the facts we have listed in this ad can be verified by consulting the decision of the California Supreme Court that was handed down on April 16, 1974, or the St. Louis Post-Dispatch article of August 4, 1980.

While implementing these policies, was Mr. Reagan making Anti-Abortion statements?

He was, and that is the reason we believe the Reagan record on abortion is relevant to the present. What people hear about Gov. Reagan's policies in California, they sometimes assume that he must have held pro-abortion views during that period, but has now changed his thinking. As Mr. Reagan himself stated in a recent CBS-TV interview, that is not the case. During his term as Governor, Mr. Reagan held views on abortion similar to those he holds today, and he expressed them just as strongly. The problem was and is his policies.

Did Reagan promise a Pro Life running mate?

On February 15, 1980, Ronald Reagan sent the following telegram to the National Pro-Life Political Action Committee:

"My strong position that protection of the unborn is a major issue facing our nation is well known to your movement. Additionally, I have stated that it is my intention to have a vice presidential running mate whose beliefs are consistent with my major principles and who would support and carry out my policies and programs.
Sincerely,
Ronald Reagan"

Notice that the telegram was written in such a way as to emphasize the Vice Presidential question and to leave Right to Life with the impression that Mr. Reagan was promising to choose a pro-life running mate. This news of a pro-life running mate was well publicized and Mr. Reagan's campaign never attempted to make a retraction or clarification.

When the time came to choose his Vice President, however, Mr. Reagan first offered the post to Gerald Ford, a strong opponent of the pro-life amendment. He then chose George Bush, another opponent of the pro-life amendment. Most of the other possible nominees had a good Right to Life position but all were by-passed in spite of his earlier statements.

What do Reagan's contradictions mean for the future?

It would be of great benefit to the Right to Life effort if a President were to appoint pro-life judges to the Supreme Court. Until recently it was generally believed that Ronald Reagan had promised through the Republican platform to do this. When questioned by the pro-abortion lobbyists, however, Ronald Reagan has now stated that he has made no such promise about the judiciary. According to Mr. Reagan himself, he is open to nominating pro-abortion judges.

Should Right To Life support Ronald Reagan and hope for the best?

That simply hasn't worked for Right To Life in the past. A politician's heart shows through by his actions, and Mr. Reagan's actions are inconsistent with pro-life principles.

Should you vote for Reagan for other reasons?

If you vote for Mr. Reagan for non-pro-life reasons, there is a good chance your vote will not have any impact. If Mr. Carter does carry New York, and there are strong indications that he will, then your vote does not count because Mr. Carter wins all of New York's Electoral Votes. Your vote for Reagan then becomes insignificant and the only one that loses is the Right to Life movement.

Is a vote for McCormack really a vote that counts?

A vote for Ellen McCormack is one that can really have impact. Your support for a Right to Life candidate can bring national recognition and that sense of importance to our issue. If something is truly to be done, then your support must show in the best way that it can be counted, and that is your vote. A vote for any other candidate leaves the Right to Life Party uncountable and therefore ununited and unnecessary to be acknowledged. Without this commitment by you, a baby's Right to Life will be another unaccomplished cause. If, for this reason only, let your vote be counted and our plea for a baby's right of survival not to be ignored. Let the next telegram from a presidential candidate be one that he must continue to support.

A Vote That Counts—Vote Ellen McCormack

Right To Life-Row D

Paid for by the Ellen McCormack for President Committee, P.O. Box 239, New Hyde Park, New York 11040

A copy of our report is filed with and available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C. 20463.