

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**WHORM Subject File Code: JL003**  
**Case file Number(s): 368976**

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

**Collection:** WHORM: Subject Files

**Archivist:** kdb/srj

**File Folder:** JL003 368976

**Date:** 6/23/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. letter 368976	Pat to Mrs. James Brady. 1p., partial	11/28/85	P6 B6
2. letter <hr/>	Mrs. Brady to Pat Buchanan. 1p., partial	11/7/85	P6 MJK 12/18/00

### RESTRICTION CODES

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**

- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

**Collection:** WHORM: Subject Files

**Archivist:** kdb/srj

**File Folder:** JL003 368976

**Date:** 6/23/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. letter 368976	Pat to Mrs. James Brady. 1p., partial	11/28/85	P6
2. letter  _____	Mrs. Brady to Pat Buchanan. 1p., partial	11/7/85	P6

## RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

362976

# RONALD W. REAGAN LIBRARY

THIS FORM MARKS THE FILE LOCATION OF ITEM NUMBER 1 LISTED ON THE  
WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER.

388976

5366

1116

TRC63

FB 63-1

7-11-11

FB 66

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

Mrs. James S. Brady



THE WHITE HOUSE

*Personal*

Nov. 28, 1961

Dear Sarah:

Just a note to say I appreciated -  
and had a chance to read over this weekend -  
your eloquent <sup>OCT 28 85</sup> Torture <sup>re:</sup> However, with something  
like 50 million hand guns in the general population,  
and 23,000 gun laws in the book - I am unsure  
the one or two more federal laws will help. You are  
I will be in my thoughts and prayers during  
the holidays ahead. Hope to see you. Best, Pa

**Mrs. James S. Brady**

November 7, 1985

The Honorable Pat Buchanan  
Assistant to the President and  
Director of Communications  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Buchanan: *Pat*

I wanted you to have a copy of my recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee so you would know what I was up to these days.

While the 1968 gun law may not be perfect, the McClure-Volkmer bill is certainly not the answer -- every major law enforcement organization in the country is opposed to it. I feel confident good legislation can be hammered out that protects the rights of good, law-abiding citizens to purchase guns for sporting or other legitimate purposes but still has enough teeth in it to make it difficult for known felons and other irresponsible people to purchase handguns. Any legislation must reflect the views of our law enforcement officers who are out there in the streets trying to protect us.

I'd love to talk to you about this sometime soon.

Sincerely yours,

*James*

368976

# RONALD W. REAGAN LIBRARY

THIS FORM MARKS THE FILE LOCATION OF ITEM NUMBER 2 LISTED ON THE  
WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER.

Testimony Before  
the  
Judiciary Committee  
U.S. House of Representatives  
by Sarah Brady  
October-28, 1985  
New York, N.Y.



My name is Sarah Brady. I live in northern Virginia with my husband, Jim, and our six year-old son, Scott. Jim and I met through politics and our lives -- very much like yours -- have been on a campaign-to-campaign basis -- hectic, and filled with many ups and downs. We, in fact, both worked on Capitol Hill for awhile -- Jim in the Senate and me in the House.

Let me ask you to think back to the day you won your first election -- the exhilaration -- the culmination of your many days of hard work and handshaking. January 2, 1981, was a day like that for Jim Brady. After many years of toiling in the vineyards, he was called by President-elect Reagan asking him to be his Press Secretary. This was a dream come true for Jim. The top job in his profession. Jim was on a high like you've never seen.

The next two-and-a-half months were almost a blur, with the excitement of the Inaugural and Jim's new job. He was at the height of his career. We would watch him on TV nearly every night before he got home, talking about the President's positions. Even Scott was beginning to catch on that his daddy had an important job, although he couldn't quite keep Ronald Reagan and Ronald McDonald straight.

I remember telling my good friend Stephanie I had everything I ever wanted -- a darling little boy -- a husband I loved who in turn had the job of his choice. We were at the top of the heap.

Then on the morning of March 30, 1981, as Jim was leaving for the White House at about 5:30 in the morning, he decided to go upstairs and get our two year-old son for a romp. It was almost a portent. He saw so little of Scott in those days. It was to be the last time Jim would climb those stairs or to see Scott's bedroom. For at 2:30 p.m. on that day our lives would change forever. On that day my husband was shot through the head by a deranged young man. He nearly died. The President nearly died, and two of his security men were seriously wounded.

It has been more than four and a half years now, and Jim gets better every day, but it has been a long, slow recovery for him, and at times it has been painful. Jim's strong character, his determination and the support of a great many loving, caring people are pulling him through. Still, there have been many times over these years that I have found myself thinking, "Oh, God, why it is possible for the John Hinckleys of this world to walk into a store, buy a handgun and go out and shoot people because they hear voices or have strange visions?"

I've thought it, but I haven't said anything about it until now. Some things happened this summer that resulted in my being here today. I got angry, very angry, because the United States Senate passed S.49, the McClure-Volkmer bill which is opposed by every major law enforcement organization in the country. This bill would make it even easier for the kind of tragedy that struck down my husband to happen again. Now, the same bill is under consideration by the House of Representatives.

After the bill passed the Senate, I began to think about speaking out about the need to keep handguns out of the hands of irresponsible people. The memory of an incident a year ago kept coming back to me. We were in Centralia, Illinois, Jim's hometown, for a visit. A friend invited my son Scott and I to go for a ride in his pickup truck. We got in. Scott picked up what looked like a toy pistol and pointed it toward himself. My father was an FBI agent and taught us from an early age to have a very healthy respect for guns, so I said, "Scott, don't ever point a gun at anyone, even if it's only a toy." Then, to my horror, I realized it was no toy. It turned out to be a fully-loaded "Saturday Night Special" that our friend kept on the seat of his truck for what he called "safety" reasons.

The memory of that incident in Centralia, combined with the Senate action, did it for me. I wondered how many other careless adults left handguns laying around for children to pick up. My mind went back to the day Jim was shot, then further back to the day one of my best friends was murdered -- with a handgun -- by her enraged boyfriend. I decided the time had come for me to join the movement to keep handguns out of the wrong hands and to ensure that people who have handguns for legitimate reasons know how to keep them safely. Recently, I became a member of the Board of Directors of Handgun Control, Inc., a citizens organization whose purpose is to pass legislation to keep handguns out of the wrong hands.

Politically, I am a Republican and a conservative. A good many people whose political views are similar to mine say they are against what they call "gun control." As they define it, so am I. Their definition would include more controls on hunting weapons, gun bans or gun confiscation. I am against these things, too.

What I am for is keeping handguns out of the wrong hands. By "the wrong hands," I mean the hands of the mentally incompetent; the hands of small children; the hands of someone who has just had a fierce argument with a relative, friend or neighbor; the hands of drunks, drug users and criminals.

The National Rifle Association's leadership wants legislation that would weaken the few controls we now have to keep handguns out of the wrong hands. But, I can't believe that their several million members across America would want to make it easier than ever for handguns in the wrong hands to cause death and injury.

Certainly, the case of John Hinckley, who shot the President and my husband, is as vivid reminder as any of how easy it is for a handgun to get into the wrong hands. He walked into a pawnshop, purchased a cheap Saturday Night Special -- no questions asked; no waiting period to see if he had a criminal or mental illness record -- and a few minutes later he was on his way, ready to shoot the President of the United States -- and anyone around him

because he thought it would make a popular actress fall in love with him!

Had a waiting period and background check for handgun purchasers been in effect, John Hinckley could have been stopped. He lied about his address and used an old Texas driver's license to purchase that handgun. He was not a Texas resident. Had there been a Federal law requiring a waiting period police would have stopped him from buying a handgun in Texas. In fact, by lying on the Federal form John Hinckley might well have been in jail instead of on his way to Washington.

Who in Congress thinks that a John Hinckley should be able to buy a handgun? Surely there can be none, yet, under present law, this could all happen again tomorrow, and the Senate passed the McClure bill that would make it even easier. Now, the House is being asked to do the same thing. To pass it would be sheer madness.

I am here to ask you to do something different; something that will help make it possible for tragedies such as my husband's to not happen again.

I believe, as many do, that government should play a limited role in our lives; to leave us, as individuals and families, alone to pursue those opportunities which will let us reach our full potential. Yet, if government's role is to protect for us "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," it must provide a framework in which we can be safe on our streets, in our homes and in our

neighborhoods. Keeping handguns out of the wrong hands is an essential part of such a framework.

Many people who share my political outlook say that the way to keep handguns out of the wrong hands is to add mandatory long sentences to those who are convicted of crimes involving handguns. That helps, and I am for mandatory sentences in such circumstances, but it addresses only part of the problem. And, in any case, locking up John Hinckley did not take back the bullet that nearly killed Jim Brady, nor did it spare him years of pain.

What is needed, beyond mandatory sentencing, is a series of steps that, together, will keep handguns out of the wrong hands. Among these would be licensing of handgun owners so that law enforcement agencies can trace the owner as easily as they can the owner of an automobile. Another would be safety training for new handgun owners and safety locks on all new handguns. Another step would be to halt the manufacture and sale of snub-nosed handguns -- the Saturday Night Specials -- that are favored by criminals.

Perhaps the most important single step would be to require a reasonable waiting period between the time one walks into a store to buy a handgun and the time one takes possession of it. Law enforcement wants such a law. It would allow time for a check of criminal records and would provide a cooling-off period for the person who, on the spur of the moment, wanted to buy a handgun to "settle" an argument.

I firmly believe that if a reasonable waiting period and a provision for background checks had been in effect when John Hinckley walked into that Dallas pawnshop, my husband Jim would be spending his days pursuing a successful career and, in his spare time, climbing trees with our six year-old, rather than in hours of painful and rigorous physical therapy.

You are being asked by the leaders of the National Rifle Association to turn the clock back; to make it easier for handguns to get into the wrong hands. I am one wife and mother who hopes the day will come when no American family has to go through what we have been through and who asks that you provide the leadership that will finally begin to make it possible for us to keep these terrible weapons out of the wrong hands.

Thank you.

# # #