



The Washington Flyer
August 7, 2009

"To the kindly influence of Christianity, we owe that degree of civil freedom, and political and social happiness which mankind now enjoy. In proportion, as the genuine effects of Christianity are diminished in any nation, either through unbelief, or the corruption of its doctrines, or the neglect of its institutions; in the same proportion will the people of the nation recede from the blessings of genuine freedom and approximate the miseries of complete despotism"

Dr. Jedidah Morse, 1799

Early Education Tax-Credit Program

In an attempt to put to practice what the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, has stated over and over again, the Cato Institute set out to make an analysis of "what works" when it comes to early childhood education. Adam B. Schaeffer, policy analyst with the Cato Institute's Center for Educational Freedom, published the study, "The Poverty of Preschool Promises: Saving Children and Money with the Early Education Tax Credit" in the August 3, 2009, edition of *Policy Analysis*. In summary, the analysis looked closely at the political momentum surrounding the nation's preschool programs and the models being used to promote such programs. According to the study, "the growing popularity of state-run preschool programs rests on a remarkably thin foundation." With full support from the current Administration devoting \$5 billion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act "to an expansion of Early Head Start, Head Start, and other early childhood initiatives, with a promise of more to come," and funding for these programs at an all-time high, one should hope evidence proving the success of these programs be available. However, that is not the case.

Three programs being held on a pedestal to promote a universal Pre-K program are the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project, the Carolina Abecedarian Project, and the Chicago Child-Parent Centers. While leading advocates of universal preschool hold these as incredibly successful examples of why a massive expansion is needed, the Cato analysis found the studies lacked "reliable evidence that current and proposed large-scale preschool programs are cost-effective." In fact, the report states a number of methodological problems along with no regard to a certain number of variables. For instance, the programs suggested included "home visitations" and a number of other services that would not necessarily be available through a universal preschool program. "When the impact of preschool is studied in a realistic setting, rather than as part of an intensive whole-family intervention program, academic achievement effects evaporate by the second grade," the analysis stated.

The analysis did offer some good news, by finding "family characteristics and parenting quality have a greater lasting impact on a child's education than large-scale preschool programs." It also clearly outlined and evidenced the success of an Early Education Tax Credit, stating the "the best way to ensure that our early education system is strengthened is to expand school choice and competition in that system. The analysis detailed the success that "school choice not only saves children from inadequate schools, it saves huge amounts of money" along with the reasoning that "donation tax credits ensure that education funds will be spent wisely because taxpayers, scholarship organization, and parents will be in control."

The analysis is well documented with accurate and current information that looks not only at the ills and negatives involved with universal pre-k education, but also offers solutions which will help Congress and the current Administration to pursue programs and initiatives which are known to be successful and work.

To read the full Analysis: [The Poverty of Preschool Promises](#)

Silence on Abortion

As the White House seeks to push their healthcare reform through Congress, despite the blatant outcries by millions of Americans, many conservatives are concerned about how the bill will affect the life issue, and whether [abortions will be funded](#) by the hands of every American through taxes. For months, pro-life organizations have worked hard to ensure that healthcare reform will contain specific language which will protect not only the conscience of doctors, nurses, insurance companies, and other medical staff from participating or aiding in the act of abortion, but will also protect the conscience of every single American citizen who is required to pay taxes. While conservatives and every-day Americans have spoken boldly about this issue, both at town-hall meetings around the country and through meetings with conservative Democrats, the White House and pro-choice organizations have remained silent, leaving many worried and suspicious of their intentions.

In an effort to combat “disinformation” the White House launched a new website called “[Reality Check](#)” this week to answer any questions or concerns Americans may have about the recent “rumors” and “scare tactics” that have been circulated. While the website mentions each concern from the threat of euthanasia to the concern private insurers will be eliminated, there is no mention of anything related to a mandate for abortion, or a conscience protection being placed in the bill. In fact, every time a question has been asked to the Administration or at a town hall meeting, the response has been mute, or neutral on the issue. So what are the answers? Will healthcare include mandated abortion coverage? Will there be a protection clause? It is well documented that the current Administration has been very supportive of the pro-choice agenda and has stated several times the “right” of every woman to have access to full reproductive healthcare. Yet, why has there been no statement or even acknowledgement of what exactly is in the proposed legislation? Again, no response.

Perhaps another concern mounting is the silence coming from groups such as Planned Parenthood, the largest recipient of Title X funding and also the largest abortion provider, when asked to debate the issue of Life within the context of Health Care reform. Tony Perkins, President of the Family Research Council, contacted and asked the President of Planned Parenthood to “debate the question of taxpayer-funded abortion and whether or not citizens would be forced to fund abortion under the current health care reform bills,” nearly two weeks ago. The [response](#): silence. Under most circumstances, Planned Parenthood has been more than gracious and willing to jump into the arena and debate on such issues, but in a rather cold manner has not simply rejected the invitation, but has remained silent. With the Gallup Poll, released nearly a month ago, providing evidence that the majority of American’s identify themselves as Pro-Life, it is logical to see why these groups along with the Administration would keep silent, while pressing other issues and changing their tune to focusing on “Health Insurance” reform rather than “Health Care” reform. While this strategy is not new, it needs to be understood that the American people want a debate, not silence. They want answers, not rhetoric. They want information, not “fishy” responses.

Update: Employment Non-Discrimination Act introduced in Senate

On August 5, 2009, Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR) introduced the Employment Non-Discrimination Act ([ENDA](#)) with 39 co-sponsors. ENDA would prohibit employers from discriminating when hiring based on a person’s “perceived sexual orientation.” For years, conservatives have fought against this legislation based on the rights of an employer to hire whom they wish and the concerns of the regulations this legislation would impose on faith-based institutions who believe homosexuality is immoral.

The legislation will prohibit employers from discriminating against an individual’s “sexual orientation,” which includes not just homosexuals but pedophiles and other appalling sexual acts. Not only will this affect secular

institutions and business but it will also affect religious organizations. While in the past a religious exemption has been offered, the concerns still linger on the impediment of regulations and infringement of constitutional liberties and freedoms.

The bill has already been introduced in the House by Barney Frank (D-MA) who is a well-known activist and outspoken homosexual himself.

In Case You Missed It:

[Give Parents a Choice: Expanding the Charter Option](#)

[Is the Bible a Banned Book?](#)

[Challenges Facing Sotomayor](#)



Editor: Maureen Wiebe
Staff Writer: Elizabeth Wiebe
Legislative Office, 119 C Street SE, Washington, DC 20003
Phone: 202.547.2991 • Fax: 202.547.2992

