

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Roberts, John G.: Files
Folder Title: JGR/Presidential Remarks, Statements,
[& Addresses] June 1984
(1 of 3)
Box: 40

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

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

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

WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

☐ O - OUTGOING☐ H - INTERNAL☐ I - INCOMINGDate Correspondence
Received (YY/MM/DD) 1/1Name of Correspondent: Richard Dauman☐ MI Mail Report

User Codes: (A) _____

(B) _____

(C) _____

Subject: Presidential Speech planning Schedule
6/11/84

ROUTE TO:

ACTION

DISPOSITION

Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
<u>CU Hall</u>		ORIGINATOR	<u>84 106/12</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUAT 04</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84 106/12</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUAT 14</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84/06/12</u>			
<u>CUAT 09</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84 106/12</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUAT 17</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84/06/12</u>			
<u>CUAT 19</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84 106/12</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUAT 02</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84/06/12</u>			
<u>CUAT 18</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84 106/12</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84/06/12</u>			

ACTION CODES:

A - Appropriate Action
C - Comment/Recommendation
D - Draft Response
F - Furnish Fact Sheet
to be used as Enclosure

I - Info Copy Only/No Action Necessary
R - Direct Reply w/Copy
S - For Signature
X - Interim Reply

DISPOSITION CODES:

A - Answered
B - Non-Special Referral
C - Completed
S - Suspended

FOR OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:

Type of Response = Initials of Signer
Code = "A"
Completion Date = Date of Outgoing

Comments: _____

Keep this worksheet attached to the original incoming letter.

Send all routing updates to Central Reference (Room 75, OEOB).

Always return completed correspondence record to Central Files.

Refer questions about the correspondence tracking system to Central Reference, ext. 2590.

Circulate

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 6/11/84 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH PLANNING SCHEDULE (6/11/84)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	McMANUS	☐	☒
MEESE	☐	☒	MURPHY	☐	☒
BAKER	☐	☒	OGLESBY	☐	☒
DEAVER	☐	☒	ROGERS	☐	☒
STOCKMAN	☐	☒	SPEAKES	☐	☒
DARMAN	☐	☒	SVAHN	☐	☒
FELDSTEIN	☐	☒	VERSTANDIG	☐	☒
FIELDING	☐	☒	WHITTLESEY	☐	☒
FULLER	☐	☒	TUTWILER	☐	☒
HERRINGTON	☐	☒	WIRTHLIN	☐	☒
HICKEY	☐	☒		☐	☐
McFARLANE	☐	☒		☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments or suggestions to Ben Elliott, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

1984 JUN 11 AM 11:23

Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
Ext. 2702

June 11, 1984

PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH PLANNING SCHEDULE

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>WRITER RESEARCHER</u>	<u>TOPIC/THEME/PURPOSE</u>
<u>A. SPEECHES</u>			
ADDRESS MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING (NJ)	06/20 Wednesday		
ADDRESS NATIONAL SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION (Hartford, Conn.)	06/20 Wednesday		
ADDRESS NATIONAL ASSOC. OF MINORITY CONTRACTORS (TENTATIVE)	06/27 Wednesday		
ADDRESS NATIONAL SQUARE DANCE CONVENTION (Baltimore, MD)	06/28 Thursday		
<u>B. RADIO TALKS</u>			
RADIO TALK:	06/16 Saturday	Ben	
RADIO TALK:	06/23 Saturday		
RADIO TALK:	06/30 Saturday		

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>WRITER RESEARCHER</u>	<u>TOPIC/THEME/PURPOSE</u>
<u>C. REMARKS</u>			
DROPHY BRIEFING FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES	06/12 Tuesday	Peter KimW	
KICKOFF OPENING OF THE MISSING CHILDREN'S CENTER	06/13 Wednesday	Al KimW	
OPENING DAY FOR INTERNATIONAL GAMES FOR THE DISABLED (Nassau County, NY)	06/17 Sunday	Peter Kim	
MEETING WITH TEENAGE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ATTENDEES	06/18 Monday		
DEDICATION OF NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY'S NEW BUILDING	06/19 Tuesday	Peggy Elizabeth	
1984 PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARS CEREMONY	06/19 Tuesday	Tony Kim	
RECEPTION FOR GOP CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES (Photo Op Only?)	06/19 Tuesday	Ben KimW	
MEETING WITH STUDENTS ATTENDING NATIONAL YOUTH GOVERNORS CONF.	06/21 Thursday	Al Elizabeth	
"FISH FRY" FOR THE CONGRESS	06/21 Thursday	Dana KimW	

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>WRITER RESEARCHER</u>	<u>TOPIC/THEME/PURPOSE</u>
MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR COMMISSION	06/22 Friday	Al Julie	
PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR HUBERT HUMPHREY TO HIS FAMILY	06/25 Monday	Tony Kim	
MEETING WITH REAGAN-BUSH 1984 ADVISORY COUNCIL	06/25 Monday		
AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATORS CONGRESS	06/25 Monday		
SENIOR CITIZEN VOLUNTEER RECOGNITION CEREMONY	06/26 Tuesday		
LUNCH WITH ELECTED GOP WOMEN OFFICIALS	06/29 Friday		

D. FOREIGN VISITS

PRES. SUAZO OF HONDURAS: DEPARTURE STATEMENT (TENTATIVE)	06/13 Wednesday	Al Julie	
STATE VISIT OF PRES. JAYEWARDENE OF SRI LANKA: ARRIVAL CEREMONY, STATE DINNER TOAST, ENTERTAINMENT	06/18 Monday	Dana Julie	

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>WRITER RESEARCHER</u>	<u>TOPIC/THEME/PURPOSE</u>
<u>E. TAPINGS</u>			
TAPING: REAGAN-BUSH ROUNDUP	06/14 Thursday	Peter KimW	
TAPING: COALITION FOR TRADITIONAL VALUES	06/14 Thursday	Al Kim	
TAPING: ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE BENEVOLENT & PROTECTIVE ORDER OF THE ELKS	06/26 Tuesday		
TAPING: NATIONAL LEADERSHIP CONF. OF FUTURE BUSINESS LEADERS OF AM.	06/26 Tuesday		

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR FRED F. FIELDING

FROM: JOHN G. ROBERTS *JGR*

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Dedication of
National Geographic Society's New Building,
Tuesday, June 19, 1984

Richard Darman has asked that comments on the above-referenced remarks be sent directly to Ben Elliott by 9:00 a.m. today. The remarks praise the National Geographic Society and reaffirm the President's commitment to conservation. The conservation discussion at pages 4-5 bemoans the fact that the issue has become politicized, but then speaks of it in stark liberal versus conservative terms. According to the remarks, conservatives are, by definition, in favor of conservation; liberals have politicized the issue and often use it as a guise for their anti-business bias. The discussion strikes me as too manichaeistic and somewhat internally inconsistent; I think the same points can be made in a less confrontational manner by substituting neutral pronouns for "liberals" in several places.

On page 2, lines 4-5, the remarks note that the National Geographic Society was founded at the Cosmos Club. While this may be of some interest, the controversy surrounding the admissions policies of that club suggests that it may be better to delete the reference.

On page 6, lines 19-24, the remarks discuss the private sector initiative of Ducks Unlimited to aid in the protection of waterfowl. According to the remarks, the "non-profit Ducks Unlimited will work with the Fish and Wildlife Service and fund the protection of waterfowl areas." I would change "fund" to "help fund."

The last paragraph on page 7 discusses the acid rain issue, noting that we have supported further research and "once we have the answers we need we will follow it up with a major acid rain program." That's somewhat like the old frontier saying that the defendant would be hung after a jury trial. I would change the offending sentence to "And once we have the answers we need we will act accordingly to protect our lakes," or something similar.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR BEN ELLIOTT

DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: FRED F. FIELDING Orig. signed by FFF
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Dedication of
National Geographic Society's New Building,
Tuesday, June 19, 1984

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced draft remarks. The conservation discussion at pages 4-5 strikes me as too manicheistic and somewhat internally inconsistent. The remarks bemoan the politicization of the issue but then speak of it in stark liberal/conservative terms. This problem can be ameliorated by substituting pronouns for "liberals" in several places. For example, "some" could be substituted for "liberals" on page 5, line 5, and "others" for "liberals" on page 5, line 13.

On page 2, lines 4-5, I recommend deleting the reference to the Cosmos Club. That club has been mired in controversy over its admissions policies, and the reference is in no sense necessary. On page 6, line 23, "fund" should be changed to "help fund." Finally, the penultimate sentence on page 7 appears to pre-judge the results of research on the acid rain problem; perhaps the research will indicate that "a major acid rain program" is not advisable. I would change the sentence to "And once we have the answers we need we will act accordingly to protect our lakes," or something similar.

cc: Richard Darman

FFF:JGR:nb 6/18/84

bcc: FFFielding/JGRoberts/Subj/Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR BEN ELLIOTT

DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: FRED F. FIELDING
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Dedication of
National Geographic Society's New Building,
Tuesday, June 19, 1984

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced draft remarks. The conservation discussion at pages 4-5 strikes me as too manicheistic and somewhat internally inconsistent. The remarks bemoan the politicization of the issue but then speak of it in stark liberal/conservative terms. This problem can be ameliorated by substituting pronouns for "liberals" in several places. For example, "some" could be substituted for "liberals" on page 5, line 5, and "others" for "liberals" on page 5, line 13.

On page 2, lines 4-5, I recommend deleting the reference to the Cosmos Club. That club has been mired in controversy over its admissions policies, and the reference is in no sense necessary. On page 6, line 23, "fund" should be changed to "help fund." Finally, the penultimate sentence on page 7 appears to pre-judge the results of research on the acid rain problem; perhaps the research will indicate that "a major acid rain program" is not advisable. I would change the sentence to "And once we have the answers we need we will act accordingly to protect our lakes," or something similar.

cc: Richard Darman

FFF:JGR:nb 6/18/84

bcc: FFFielding/JGRoberts/Subj/Chron

WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

☐ O - OUTGOING☐ H - INTERNAL☐ I - INCOMINGDate Correspondence
Received (YY/MM/DD) 1/1/Name of Correspondent: Richard Darman☐ MI Mail Report

User Codes: (A) _____ (B) _____ (C) _____

Subject: Presidential Remarks: Dedication of
National Geographic Society's New Bldg.
Tuesday, June 19, 1984.

ROUTE TO:

ACTION

DISPOSITION

Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
<u>CUHOU</u>		ORIGINATOR	<u>84 06 15</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUINT 18</u>		Referral Note: <u>D</u>	<u>84 06 15</u>		<u>5</u>	<u>84 06 18</u> <u>9:00AM</u>
		Referral Note: _____	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note: _____	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note: _____	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note: _____	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>

ACTION CODES:

A - Appropriate Action
C - Comment/Recommendation
D - Draft Response
F - Furnish Fact Sheet
to be used as Enclosure

I - Info Copy Only/No Action Necessary
R - Direct Reply w/Copy
S - For Signature
X - Interim Reply

DISPOSITION CODES:

A - Answered C - Completed
B - Non-Special Referral S - Suspended

FOR OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:

Type of Response = Initials of Signer
Code = "A"
Completion Date = Date of Outgoing

Comments: _____

Keep this worksheet attached to the original incoming letter.

Send all routing updates to Central Reference (Room 75, OEOB).

Always return completed correspondence record to Central Files.

Refer questions about the correspondence tracking system to Central Reference, ext. 2590.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 6/15/84 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 9:00 a.m. MONDAY 6/18

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: DEDICATION OF NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY'S NEW BLDG.

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1984

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	McMANUS	☒	☐
MEESE	☐	☒	MURPHY	☐	☐
BAKER	☐	☒	OGLESBY	☒	☐
DEAVER	☐	☒	ROGERS	☐	☐
STOCKMAN	☒	☐	SPEAKES	☐	☐
DARMAN	☐	☒	SVAHN	☒	☐
FELDSTEIN	☐	☐	VERSTANDIG	☐	☐
FIELDING	☒	☐	WHITTLESEY	☐	☐
FULLER	☒	☐	TUTWILER	☒	☐
HERRINGTON	☐	☐	HENKEL	☒	☐
HICKEY	☐	☐	ELLIOTT	☐	☒
McFARLANE	☐	☐	WIRTHLIN	☒	☐

REMARKS:

Please forward any edits/comments directly to Ben Elliott by 9:00 a.m. MONDAY, JUNE 18, with an information copy to my office.

Thank you.

RESPONSE:

1984 JUN 15 AM 11:08

Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
Ext. 2702

(Noonan/BE)
June 15, 1984
10:00 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: DEDICATION OF NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC
SOCIETY'S NEW BUILDING
TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1984

Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

There are so many people I want to say hello to here today -- Gilbert Grosvenor [Grovenor], Dr. Payne, Reverend Harper, my friends Judge Clark and Cap Weinberger . . . and, of course, my friend and your Board Member, Lady Bird Johnson. Lady Bird, it's always wonderful to see you, and to be able to say in public what is often said in private: that you were a great First Lady of this Nation, and your Beautification Program made a lasting improvement on the American landscape. You can't be thanked enough for your great, good work.

It's good to see Gil Grosvenor again. I'm afraid the last time we met I gave him quite a start. It was just before I took office, and we were having a reception at Blair House. Gil introduced himself and told me where he worked and I informed him that he was responsible for the biggest problem Nancy and I were having in the transition. He looked at me sort of wide eyed and I told him I was in the middle of a big move from the West to the East. I said, "Gil, I have a few thousand National Geographics at the ranch, and I don't know how the heck I'm going to haul them to the White House."

I am very happy to be here today to help you inaugurate your new building, as President Johnson did just 20 years ago when you inaugurated your last new building. I guess you have some trouble storing your old National Geographics, too.

I noted when I came in here that in the ceiling outside this room there is a little display showing the stars as they were that night in the winter of 1896, when a group of public-spirited scholars, scientists, and adventurers got together at the Cosmos Club to start a society aimed at institutionalizing the study of science in this new experiment called America. It occurs to me that that little firmament is an appropriate symbol for this building. It reflects the outward reaching, no-boundaries impulse that has shaped your Society. It reflects the great respect you have for specifics, for exactitude, for recreating things as they were, dot for dot, star for star. And it reflects the spirit of inquiry that has directed your studies up to the stars, out to the continents, into the heart of man's experience on Earth.

In a world that sometimes seems to have grown sated with all it knows, you still discover. You fund expeditions, you help researchers, you encourage impossible dreams -- and you share the results with all the Society's members in your magazine. I think one of the great reasons for your magazine's success is that it is infused with the romance of discovery -- the romance of history, of seeking out the past and discovering places man has never seen before.

Sometimes we think that there are no journeys anymore -- that yes, man goes places, even into space, but it's done with a kind of clockwork perfection, with our technology clicking away and bringing us from Plainfield, New Jersey, to the Himalayas in less than a day of a man's life. But it sometimes seems there

are no journeys anymore, no more great treks. Remember how, in the movies they made when we were young -- well, the movies they made when you were young -- remember how they'd show a map unfolding and they'd have arrows showing the journey as it progresses -- our hero started here and visited there and now he's just landed in his destination . . . There was the sense of a long journey unfolding. Well, that sense still exists in National Geographic, and somehow you take your readers along on the ride as you climb mountains and cut your way through jungles.

There is another thing: The special sensitivity you bring to your quest. I'm thinking here of a small item in your May issue, a picture of the frozen remains of a woman who died in the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. One of your writers studied the skeleton and said "she was very homely, but somebody cared enough to give her beautiful things" -- delicate gold bracelets and jewels. A small observation perhaps, but it carried a whole world of inference. It evokes. You bring history to life, and you remind us all that civilizations are born and die and are rediscovered in an endless continuum.

I think it should be noted that the National Geographic Society is the kind of organization that only the free world can produce. Only the democracies, with their freedom of inquiry, thought and speech, with their freedom to exercise curiosity and gain passage to undiscovered places -- only the democracies supply the soil in which such Societies can grow.

I am sometimes asked about the philosophical basis of my opposition to governments that deny freedom. Well, Societies

like yours, and seeing how they flourish in a land of freedom, are part of the reason. And you, in turn, give special freedom to your readers, the freedom to form their own conclusions. You tell your stories straight and with a rigorous objectivity. There is a fine, implicit respect for your readers in that -- and it's a public service.

Now, I know that as we near the end of this amazing and troubling century, you, as all of us, are looking to the future. And I know one of your great interests and concerns is the environment -- conservation and the ecology. You are worried about what man has done and is doing to the magical planet God gave us. And I share your concern.

What is a conservative, after all, but one who conserves, who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live. Modern conservatives in America want to protect and preserve the values and traditions by which the Nation has flourished for more than two centuries. We want to protect and conserve the idea that is at the heart of our national experience, an idea that can be reduced to one word: freedom. And we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live -- our countryside, our rivers and mountains and plains and meadows and forests. This is our patrimony, this is what we leave to our children, and our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

But we also know that we must do this with a fine balance. We want, as men on Earth, to use our resources for the reason God gave them to us -- for the betterment of man. And our challenge

is how to use the environment without abusing it, how to take from it riches and leave it rich.

But I think the whole idea of conservation has been obscured the past 20 years, that a great movement has been reduced to a merely political argument. Liberals have attempted to seize conservation as an issue, politicize it, and claim it as their own. And I will admit that there have been times when America's conservatives have not seemed as concerned about the environment -- but it is partly because it is not our way to function as special pleaders and hand wringers who claim the kind of higher moral sensitivity that says: I'm the only one who cares.

I think also that liberals have too often used the conservation movement as an excuse for blind and ignorant attacks on the entrepreneurs who help the economy grow, the farmers who make our food, the businesses that give us heat in winter and coolness in the summer. Fighting liberal antagonism to all things that speak of business has sometimes distracted Conservatives from the battle. All of this has tended to confuse the issue, blur responsibility, and overshadow sincere concern.

But, as I said in my last state of the Union message, "Preservation of our environment is not a liberal or conservative challenge -- it's common sense."

Let me tell you: No one cares more about conservation than conservatives, and we mean to seize that standard back. And, if there is any confusion about our commitment, let me put it to rest today.

I'm going to outline just a few of the conservation initiatives our Administration has begun in the very recent past. Some of it comes down to money, some of it does not.

We have budgeted over \$100 million for 1985 for new national parks. We've budgeted \$58 million for new wildlife refuge and wetland acquisitions. We have closed the door to new mineral leasing in wildlife refuges. We've asked for a 5-year program that will cost \$1 billion to improve and upgrade national park facilities. We've opened a new phase of wilderness protection with the Bureau of Land Management as manager of wilderness areas. Secretary Clark just dedicated the first such wilderness area in the Nation -- the Bear Trap Canyon Wilderness in Montana.

We're keeping close watch on endangered species and we're trying to protect them. We have listed 23 species as endangered so far this fiscal year alone -- including the Wood Stork, the Guam rail and the Woodland Caribou. We don't want what happened to the huge herds of wild bison that once roamed our plains to happen to these animals.

Together, the Federal Government and Ducks Unlimited have created a new program to ensure the protection of American waterfowl nesting areas. This, by the way, reflects our attempts to work closely with the private sector. The non-profit Ducks Unlimited will work with the Fish and Wildlife Service and fund the protection of the waterfowl areas.

Just this past April, the Prudential Insurance Company donated 50 thousand hectares of wetlands to the National Wildlife Refuge system. That's a \$50 million gift. And we rely on

private volunteers in our national parks. Last fiscal year, we had the help of more than 22 thousand volunteers, who in all donated more than 1 million hours of their own time -- at a taxpayer savings of about \$7 million.

There are other problem areas my Administration has been dealing with. We are worried still about clean air -- so we have moved to eliminate all lead in gasoline. We are worried about hazardous wastes -- so we've published the first comprehensive set of regulations to control the disposal of those wastes in landfills. In next year's budget, I have requested an additional \$640 million to clean up abandoned hazardous waste sites and chemical spills. And we have put together a \$1.6 billion trust fund financed by corporate taxes to clean up 500 toxic waste dumps that have already been targeted for cleanup.

Big issues still remain -- and some of them are among the most vexing of our age.

There is acid rain for instance. Everyone knows there's an acid rain problem in the U.S. and Canada. But we don't have a firm handle yet on the exact scope of the problem, its exact cause, and its exact remedy. Controlling acid rain will involve an enormous investment. But it must be a prudent investment, one that we know will give us benefit for all the cost. And so next year, we plan to spend more than \$55 million on acid rain research. And once we have the answers we need we will follow it up with a major acid rain program. We feel that this is a responsible approach, and one that will ensure success down the road.

I hope all of this gives you a sense of our commitment on the problems of conservation. They're very much on my mind. When you're President you feel responsible, and you want what's best for your country and your children and their children.

An old conservative named Teddy Roosevelt summed it all up this way: "Of all the questions which can come before this Nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a war, there is none which compares in importance with the central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us. Conservation is a great moral issue (because) it involves the patriotic duty of ensuring the safety and continuance of the Nation."

T.R. said that in 1910. We agree with it today. And I would add only this: We have, all of us, over the past 20 years, reached consensus on the need to conserve our environment. Now we must come to agreement on how to do it. And in coming together on that we must keep in mind the word balance. A balance between the desire to conserve and protect . . . and the desire to grow and develop. A balance between concern for the good Earth and concern for the honest impulse to wrest from the Earth the resources that benefit mankind. A balance between the overall demands of society . . . and the individual demands of the free citizen.

If we rid our minds of cant, of rhetoric, of mere politics, we will strike that balance naturally and together.

That is my great hope; and in this you have my complete commitment.

Thank you, all of you, for inviting me here today. And may you do great new work in your fine new building.

God bless you all.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR FRED F. FIELDING

FROM: JOHN G. ROBERTS 
SUBJECT: Presidential Address: National
Sheriffs Association/Hartford, CT
Wednesday, June 20, 1984

Richard Darman has asked that comments on the above-referenced remarks be sent directly to Ben Elliott by noon today. The remarks review the recent turn-around in crime statistics, and credit the rejection of liberal social philosophy and the return to the view that individuals are responsible for their actions and must bear the consequences. The remarks also review the Administration's anti-crime program: appointment of judges who will not only uphold the rights of the accused but those of the innocent and society as well; improved cooperation between Federal and state and local law enforcement officials; the offensive against narcotics trafficking; the organized crime initiatives; the work of the commissions on violent crime and family violence; the new focus on victims of crime; and the Administration's effort to push anti-crime legislation through Congress.

On page 6, lines 20-22, "the importance of appointing responsible justices to the Federal bench, and to the Supreme Court" should be changed to "the importance of appointing responsible judges to the Federal bench, including the Supreme Court." In line 22, "justices" should again be changed to "judges." The last sentence on page 6 states that "all of us have been pleased" by recent court decisions showing a return to common sense in criminal law matters; I have no objection to the President applauding court decisions -- presumably the recent ones of the Supreme Court -- in this manner.

On page 7 the remarks digress from the criminal area to discuss the recent Supreme Court decision in Firefighters v. Stotts, the affirmative action/seniority layoff case. I see no need for the President to comment on the decision. I certainly see no need for him to do so gratuitously in an anti-crime speech to an audience of sheriffs. The discussion is also flawed: the Court did not declare quotas "unconstitutional;" the opinion only dealt with the interpretation of Title VII. Strictly speaking the opinion did not even concern quotas but rather the question of layoffs after a

quota system had been in effect. I fully agree that the opinion as written seems to be saying that quotas are impermissible under Title VII, but the holding is narrower and I do not think the President should enter the currently raging dispute over the scope of the decision.

The second line on page 8 refers to bringing "sanity back to the courtroom" This strikes me as a bit strong; I would delete "in addition to helping bring sanity back to the courtroom by appointing sound judges."

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR BEN ELLIOTT
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
DIRECTOR, PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHWRITING

FROM: FRED F. FIELDING Orig. signed by FFF
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Address: National
Sheriffs Association/Hartford, CT
Wednesday, June 20, 1984

Counsel's Office has reviewed the above-referenced draft remarks. On page 6, lines 20-22, "the importance of appointing responsible justices to the Federal bench, and to the Supreme Court" should be changed to "the importance of appointing responsible judges to the Federal bench, including the Supreme Court." In line 22, "justices" should again be changed to "judges." The term "justice" refers, in the Federal system, only to the members of the Supreme Court; "judges" is an all-inclusive term referring to a jurist at any level. On page 8, lines 1-3, I recommend deleting "in addition to helping bring sanity back to the courtroom by appointing sound judges." The suggestion that other judges were being "insane" strikes me as a bit much, and the transitional clause is unnecessary, particularly if the following recommendation is adopted.

I recommend deleting all of page 7. The discussion of the Supreme Court's decision in Firefighters v. Stotts is completely out of place in an address on crime to an audience of sheriffs. Furthermore, I do not think it advisable for the President to enter the currently raging dispute over the scope of the decision. On that score, the discussion on page 7 is inaccurate. The decision did not declare racial quotas unconstitutional. It concerned only a statute -- Title VII -- not the Constitution. The case did not even directly involve quotas at all but rather layoffs once a quota system was in effect. It is true that the language of the opinion suggests that racial quotas are not permissible under Title VII, but the holding of the case is much narrower.

cc: Richard G. Darman

FFF:JGR:aea 6/18/84

bcc: FFFielding/JGRoberts/Subj/Chron

WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

☐ O - OUTGOING☐ H - INTERNAL☐ I - INCOMINGDate Correspondence
Received (YY/MM/DD) 1/1Name of Correspondent: Richard Dorman☐ MI Mail Report

User Codes: (A) _____ (B) _____ (C) _____

Subject: Presidential Address: National
Sheriff's Association / Hartford, Conn.
Wed., June 20, 1984

ROUTE TO:**ACTION****DISPOSITION**

Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
<u>CHHOLL</u>		ORIGINATOR	<u>84 06 15</u>			<u>1 1</u>
<u>CUAT 18</u>		Referral Note: <u>D</u>	<u>84 06 15</u>			<u>5 84 06 18</u>
<u>CUAT 17</u>		Referral Note: <u>I</u>	<u>84 06 15</u>			<u>NOON</u>
		Referral Note:	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note:	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>
		Referral Note:	<u>1 1</u>			<u>1 1</u>

ACTION CODES:

A - Appropriate Action
 C - Comment/Recommendation
 D - Draft Response
 F - Furnish Fact Sheet
 to be used as Enclosure

I - Info Copy Only/No Action Necessary
 R - Direct Reply w/Copy
 S - For Signature
 X - Interim Reply

DISPOSITION CODES:

A - Answered
 B - Non-Special Referral
 C - Completed
 S - Suspended

FOR OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:

Type of Response = Initials of Signer
 Code = "A"
 Completion Date = Date of Outgoing

Comments: _____

Keep this worksheet attached to the original incoming letter.

Send all routing updates to Central Reference (Room 75, OEOB).

Always return completed correspondence record to Central Files.

Refer questions about the correspondence tracking system to Central Reference, ext. 2590.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 6/15/84 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: NOON MONDAY, 6/18

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1984

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	McMANUS	☒	☐
MEESE	☐	☒	MURPHY	☐	☐
BAKER	☐	☒	OGLESBY	☒	☐
DEAVER	☐	☒	ROGERS	☐	☐
STOCKMAN	☒	☐	SPEAKES	☐	☐
DARMAN	☐	☒	SS SVAHN	☒	☐
FELDSTEIN	☐	☐	VERSTANDIG	☒	☐
FIELDING	☒	☐	WHITTLESEY	☐	☐
FULLER	☒	☐	<u>TUTWILER</u>	☒	☐
HERRINGTON	☐	☐	<u>WIRTHLIN</u>	☒	☐
HICKEY	☐	☐	<u>HENKEL</u>	☒	☐
McFARLANE	☐	☐	<u>ELLIOTT</u>	☐	☒

REMARKS:

Please forward any edits/comments directly to Ben Elliott in room 100 by NOON MONDAY, June 20, with an information copy to my office.

18

Thank you.

RESPONSE:

Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
Ext. 2702

1984 JUN 15 PM 2:20

1984 JUN 15 PM 1:58

(Dolan/BE)
June 15, 1984
1:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1984

I want to begin by saying how much I've looked forward to this chance to be here with you today. In America's frontier days, the sheriff's badge was a symbol of our Nation's quest for law and justice; and today that badge still stands for dedication to justice and commitment to the law. Those of you in the sheriffs' association are in the forefront of America's law enforcement community; all of you have firsthand experience with the problem of crime and lawlessness in our society: The jobs you hold are dangerous and difficult ones. Believe me, I know. I mean no irreverence when I mention that I once played a sheriff on T.V. who thought he could do the job without a gun. I was dead in the first 27 minutes of the show.

So may I say to all of you today what millions of Americans would say if they had the chance: Thank you for standing up for this Nation's dream of personal freedom under the rule of law; thank you for standing against those who would transform that dream into a nightmare of wrongdoing and lawlessness. Thank you for your service to your communities, to your country, and to the cause of justice.

Now I know many of you at this convention have served the public interest for lengthy periods of time and that you lived through the grim years of the 60's and the 70's when crime became an epidemic in America. In those decades, violent crime more than tripled. By the start of the 80's, crime was costing

uncountable billions in financial losses, touching nearly a third of America's homes, and taking the lives of 25,000 Americans a year.

Along with the rise in crime came a dangerous and widespread loss of faith by the American people in their criminal justice system. Nine out of ten Americans were saying the courts in their home areas weren't tough enough on criminals; eight out of ten were saying our criminal justice system just wasn't deterring crime.

The reason was simple: The American criminal justice system was failing and failing badly. While our justice system was weighed down with excessive litigation and the courts were becoming arbiters of disputes they were never intended to handle, the criminal justice system wasn't carrying out its most important function: the punishment of the guilty and protection of the innocent. In some jurisdictions and major cities, less than 1 percent of reported crimes were ending in prison terms for offenders. A small percentage of repeat offenders were responsible for a large percentage of crimes committed; one study showed that half of all serious crimes were being committed by 10 percent of the criminals.

This rise in crime caused by a hardened criminal class was fostered partly from a liberal social philosophy that too often called for lenient treatment of criminals. Because this misguided social philosophy saw man as primarily the creature of his material environment, it thought that through expensive, Government social programs it could change that environment and

usher in a great, new egalitarian utopia. Yet even while Government was launching a rash of social engineering schemes in a vain attempt to remake man and society, it wasn't dealing with the most elementary social problems like rising crime.

Individual wrongdoing, they told us, was always caused by a lack of material goods, an underprivileged background or poor socio-economic conditions. And somehow -- I know you've heard it said -- I heard it many times when I was Governor of California -- it was society, not the individual, that was at fault when an act of violence or crime was committed. Somehow, it wasn't the wrongdoer -- but all of us -- who were to blame.

Is it any wonder then that a new privileged class emerged in America; a class of repeat offenders and career criminals who thought they had the right to victimize their fellow citizens with impunity? And today we still pay the price of those years of liberal leniency. I mean the growth in the ranks of career criminals, criminals who are contemptuous of our way of justice, who do not believe they can be caught and, if they are caught, are confident that once the cases against them enter our legal system the charges will be dropped, postponed, plea bargained away, or lost in a maze of legal technicalities that make a mockery of our society's longstanding and commendable respect for civil liberties.

Well, at last we're making progress against these criminal predators in our midst. Reported crime dropped 4.3 percent in 1982, the first decline since 1977. And reported crimes for last year showed an even more remarkable 7 percent decrease. This is

the sharpest decrease in the history of the crime statistics and the first time the serious crime index has shown a decline for 2 years in a row.

Now I know there are a few people who want to attribute the encouraging downward trend in crime to a statistic -- the fact is that fewer members of the population are now in the crime-prone age group. Well, a coincidence isn't a correlation. The truth is that crime sometimes has risen with population growth and sometimes not; there's nothing historically inevitable about it. For example, between 1970 and 1982, the numbers in the crime-prone age group did drop slightly by about 1 percent, but serious crime went up 40 percent.

So I think the real explanation for the recent drop in crime lies elsewhere than in mere statistics; in fact, I think that explanation is right here in front of me today. I don't think there's any question that America's law enforcement community and her courts are now carrying out a new mandate from the American people. Throughout the Nation there is a new consensus on the crime issue, which you've helped form. It's a consensus that utterly rejects the counsels of leniency toward criminals and the liberal philosophy that fostered it. The increase in citizen involvement in fighting crime through such initiatives as neighborhood watch programs, the tough, new State statutes directed at repeat offenders, the widespread public outcry against leniency in our court system, and the sweeping new steps we have taken at the Federal level show that the years of the pseudo-intellectual apologies for crime are now over. The

American people insist today that judges and Government officials recognize what common sense has always taught: that right and wrong matters; that individuals are responsible for their actions; that retribution must be swift and sure for those who prey on the innocent.

It's interesting, too, to note that common sense about crime is making its impact in the very field which once accounted for so much of the misguided advice about crime, that of the social sciences. The work of one psychologist, Stanley Samenou, for example, has won wide attention and confirms what many of us have been saying about the crime problem for many years: Choosing a career in crime is not the result of poverty of an unhappy childhood or of a misunderstood adolescence; it is the result of a conscious, willful, selfish choice made by those who consider themselves above the law and who seek to exploit the hard work, and sometimes the very lives, of their fellow citizens.

The real reason for the decrease in crime then is tied directly to this growing toughness toward criminal offenders. In the 60's and the 70's, the probability of being arrested for a crime fell off dramatically; in the 60's and most of the 70's the probability of being sent to jail for a crime also fell off dramatically. But in the 80's, these two critical trends have been reversed. For the last few years, both the probability of arrest and the probability of incarceration have been increasing. So crime is coming down, because -- and thank heavens for this -- the public's demands for justice are finally being heeded: More criminals are being arrested; and more career criminals are being

put behind bars for longer periods of time than ever before. And let's not forget that taking these career criminals off the streets doesn't just mean they're prevented from committing other crimes; it also means that their punishment acts as a strong deterrent to others who might choose a life of crime.

Now, obviously, those statistics are hardly worth celebrating over. None of us like the idea that our prison population is increasing. But we can and we must take legitimate satisfaction in the fact that more wrongdoers are being brought to justice: not out of a sense of vindictiveness or revenge, but because incarcerating these criminals means that fewer and fewer innocent Americans are being victimized by criminal wrongdoing.

I believe our Administration's commitment to the war on crime has definitely helped to bring down the crime rate; and I assure you today, our commitment to fighting crime will continue to grow. Let me just briefly report on how our efforts at the Federal level have been helping, and why I think they've helped to complement your crucial efforts at the State and local levels.

First, from day one of our Administration, the Attorney General and I have emphasized the importance of appointing responsible justices to the Federal bench, and to the Supreme Court. I'm talking about justices who will not only uphold the rights of the accused, but the rights of the innocent and the right of society to protect itself from criminal wrongdoers. I know all of us have been pleased by recent court decisions that show common sense once again returning to legal deliberations on criminal justice matters.

And let me make an aside here on one recent decision in particular that affects many of you in the law enforcement community. I believe the recent Supreme Court decision declaring racial quotas unconstitutional is a strong reaffirmation of this Nation's commitment to equal treatment of all races under the law. Racial quotas like those recently struck down by the Court were a danger to the legitimate cause of civil rights; they were a bogus claim, one that would have institutionalized a new kind of racial discrimination, jeopardized public support for real civil rights enforcement, and seriously set back race relations in America. ✓

I know some have criticized this decision in very emotional terms; and that's why I want to say a word on this today, especially to America's black citizens. This decision does not mean a step backward because, let me assure you, there will be no going backward. Since the days of my boyhood -- when my father forbade me from going to a film with a racist theme -- through my days as a college student, actor, governor and President, racial discrimination has been abhorrent and reprehensible to me. I consider enforcement of our Nation's civil rights laws a sacred duty and our Administration has a strong record of enforcing these laws. In this matter the political considerations -- whether it means winning votes or losing them -- have been and always will be treated as completely irrelevant. Our Administration's commitment to ending racial discrimination in America will continue and continue unabated.

Now, getting back to the war on crime, in addition to helping bring sanity back to the courtroom by appointing sound judges, we have also moved to strengthen cooperation with local and State law enforcement agencies. Our U.S. Attorneys have set up law enforcement coordination panels in every Federal district and I'm proud that some of you are now serving on them. Through our surplus Federal property program, we've helped State and localities in expanding prison space; we've strengthened and broadened training for State and local law enforcement agents both at the F.B.I. Academy and at a new Federal facility in Glynco, Georgia.

And today, I'm pleased to announce two new initiatives to assist local law enforcement. First, the Department of Justice is establishing a new National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, whose mission will help law enforcement agencies identify and track the menace of serial killers in America's communities. Second, in order to help eliminate a direct threat to the lives of America's sheriffs and policemen, legislation will be introduced this week to restrict the sale of armor-piercing bullets.

Our third major effort against crime has been a full-scale offensive against illegal drug trafficking. For the first time, we've brought the F.B.I. into this fight. We've increased our law enforcement budget by 50 percent and added 1,768 new investigators and prosecutors -- most of this as a result of our efforts in drug-related fields. Our highly successful Florida task force has led to the establishment of task forces in

11 other regions throughout the country. These twelve task forces have already initiated some 600 cases and indicted more than 2,500 individuals. And one hundred forty of these indictments have been under the new "Drug Kingpin" law which carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Fourth, we have declared war on organized crime in America. I'm proud to tell you that organized crime convictions are up from 515 in fiscal 1981 to 1,331 in 1983; we are getting longer prison sentences and for the first time making a serious effort to confiscate the financial assets of the mobsters. Our new Organized Crime Commission has already held informative hearings on the structure of the mob today in America and its money-laundering techniques; and its work will be greatly broadened when it receives subpoena powers in this session of the Congress.

I repeat what I have said before: We have it within our power to shatter the regional and national syndicates that make up organized crime in America. This Administration seeks no negotiated settlement, no detente with the mob. Our goal is to cripple their organization, dry up their profits, and put their members behind bars where they belong. In this campaign, State and local law enforcement must play a critical role. For only when the mob is being hurt at the local level -- when the revenue from illegal gambling, pornography, drug pushing, and other kinds of racketeering is dried up will the mob be permanently put out of business.

Fifth, through a series of Presidential task forces, we have brought much-needed attention to critical law enforcement problems. Our Commission on Violent Crime in 1981 led to a widespread series of proposed reforms -- 83 percent of which have now been implemented. Similarly, we have just appointed a panel on family violence, a problem that has been badly in need of full national airing for many years.

Sixth, this Administration has brought long overdue attention to the plight of the victims of crime. I know this is an area of special interest to all of you, and I commend you on the special attention you'll be paying this week to ways of aiding victims of crime. Many of you have seen our Victims of Crime task force report, and you will hear Assistant Attorney General Lois Herrington report later this week on how our Administration has implemented many of the commission's recommendations. We're especially proud that our Victims of Crime Assistance Act is now approaching passage in the Senate. This is an act that will assist the States in helping compensate the victims of crime but -- and this is very important -- this assistance will be paid for by criminal fines, not by hard-earned tax dollars.

The mention of this legislation brings me to the seventh and final point about this Administration's crime program: our all-out legislative effort to get those in Federal law enforcement the tools they need to deal with the criminal threat. We have already scored some important breakthroughs: We have succeeded in getting repeal of tax legislation that made it

difficult for the I.R.S. to assist in organized crime investigations; and we have changed the Posse Comitatus law to permit the military to assist us in cracking down on the drug smuggling. And, as I just mentioned, we are pushing ahead with victims of crime legislation. But our largest and most important initiative remains where it has been for the last 3 years -- becalmed in the House of Representatives. This vital crime package includes bills calling for bail reform, tougher sentencing, justice assistance to States and localities, improvement in the exclusionary rule and the insanity defense, and major reforms affecting drug trafficking, prison crowding, capital punishment, and forfeiture. All of these reforms are constitutionally sound and badly needed. In fact, our core crime package has already passed the Senate once -- by a vote of 91 to 1; but in the House of Representatives the liberal leadership keeps it bottled up in committee; one member of the Judiciary Committee there even claimed the package was "dead on arrival."

Well, forgive me, but those liberals in the House are out of touch with reality, and they're out of touch with the American people. This is a perfect example of how Americans are forced to suffer ill effects of crime because too many of our political leaders stick to old, discredited, liberal illusions about crime.

Americans overwhelmingly favor changes in the exclusionary rule, the insanity defense, the re-institution of capital punishment, and the tightening up of parole and bail procedures. And of all places the people's voice deserves to be heard, it is

in the House of Representatives. So today I'm asking you to use your influence with your elected Representatives to make the House act on our crime package. At the very minimum, the liberal leadership in the House owes the American people a floor debate and a vote on this vital crime package. If the Members of the House feel our package is unwise legislation, let them have the courage to stop hiding behind parliamentary maneuvers and say so publicly; let them vote against these measures in full view of the people; and let them explain what gives them the right to ignore the will of the people -- this they should have the courage to do.

Now, ladies and gentlemen during the last 3-1/2 years, this Administration has faced the serious problems of rebuilding America's economic strength here at home, and restoring our prestige and stature abroad. Today, we are in the midst of a sound and strong economic expansion and America's national security has been restored and enhanced.

But I also believe that the record I have just presented to you shows that, while this Administration was coping with the crises of our economy and our national security, we were also making great efforts to help you and all our fellow citizens deal with the problem of crime in American society.

I believe I can say that in doing this, all of us sought only to speak for a new consensus in American politics: A consensus that said Government had involved itself in areas where it was neither competent nor needed, while it had wrongly ignored its traditional and most fundamental obligations: the

maintenance of public order and the preservation of domestic tranquility.

Today the fight against crime continues but, for the first time in years, we can say that we are making headway. On behalf of all America, I want to thank all of you again for all you have done, and are doing, to make this possible. I pledge to you my continued support even as I seek your assistance in continuing to eradicate the drug menace, fight organized crime, make our streets and homes safe again, and return America to the days of respect for the law and for the rights of the innocent.

Thank you and God bless you all.