

# 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/Article on the Presidency –  
Notes, Drafts, Background] (1 of 4)  
**Box:** 4

---

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/>

46TH DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

School Prayer Day

Remarks at a Candle-Lighting Ceremony.

18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1214

September 25, 1982

LENGTH: 855 words

We want to welcome each of you to the White House. We gather together to draw attention to an issue that is as vital to the future of this country as any that we face. No one should doubt that economic and technological progress will have very little impact unless the spirit of our people remains strong.

Calvin Coolidge, a President whom I greatly admire, once said, "The government of a country never gets ahead of the religion of a country." Fostering the faith and character of our people is one of the great trusts of responsible leadership. I deeply believe that if those in government offer a good example, and if the people preserve the freedom which is their birthright as Americans, no one need fear the future.

Unfortunately, in the last two decades we've experienced an onslaught of such twisted logic that if Alice were visiting America, she might think she'd never left Wonderland. [Laughter] We're told that it somehow violates the rights of others to permit students in school who desire to pray to do so. Clearly this infringes on the freedom of those who choose to pray -- a freedom taken for granted since the time of our Founding Fathers.

This would be bad enough, but the purge of God from our schools went much farther. In one case, a Federal court ruled against the right of children to voluntarily say grace before lunch in the school cafeteria. In another situation a group of children, again on their own initiative and with their parents' approval, wanted to begin the schoolday with a minute of prayer and meditation, and they, too, were prohibited from doing so. Students have even been prevented from having voluntary prayer groups on school property after class hours just on their own.

Now, no one is suggesting that others should be forced into any religious activity, but to prevent those who believe in God from expressing their faith is an outrage. And the relentless drive to eliminate God from our schools can and should be stopped.

This issue has brought people of good will and every faith together to make the situation right. We believe that permitting voluntary prayer in public schools is within the finest traditions of this country and consistent with the principles of American liberty. Neither the constitutional amendment that I've endorsed nor the legislative remedies offered by others permits anyone to be coerced into religious activity. Instead, these measures are designed to protect the rights of those who choose to pray as well as those who choose not to.

18 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1214

I want to thank all of you and all of those who'll gather on the Capitol Mall this evening for what you're doing on this vital issue. And a special thanks to Senator Helms and Senator Thurmond and Congressman Kindness for all that they have done.

And today I'd like to take this opportunity to urge the Senate to move directly on the constitutional amendment now awaiting action. But Senate action is not enough. The leadership in the House has the proposed constitutional amendment bottled up and has, thus far, failed to hold the appropriate hearings. Some suggest we should keep religion out of politics. Well, the opposite is also true. Those in politics should keep their hands off of the religious freedom of our people, and especially our children.

Earlier I quoted Calvin Coolidge. He had some other words I'd like to share with you. "It would be difficult for me to conceive," President Coolidge said, "of anyone being able to administer the duties of a great office like the Presidency without a belief in the guidance of Divine Providence. Unless the President is sustained by an abiding faith in the divine power, I cannot understand how he would have the courage to attempt to meet the various problems that constantly pour in upon him from all parts of the earth."

Well, after 20 months I can attest to the truth of those words. Faith in God is a vital guidepost, a source of inspiration, and a pillar of strength in times of trial. In recognition of this, the Congress and the Supreme Court begin each day with a prayer, and that's why we provide chaplains for the Armed Forces. We can and must respect the rights of those who are nonbelievers, but we must not cut ourselves off from this indispensable source of strength and guidance.

I think it'd be a tragedy for us to deny our children what the rest of us, in and out of government, find so valuable. If the President of the United States can pray with others in the Oval Office -- and I have on a number of occasions -- then let's make certain that our children have the same right as they go about preparing for their futures and for the future of this country.

And now I understand that we're to light some candles. I think you children are to go down there and someone is to present me with a -- there it is. These -- [inaudible] -- candles, as I understand it, will start the ceremony tonight on the Mall.

Happy that we've had this opportunity this morning. God bless you all.

Note: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

36TH DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Young Presidents Organization

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session via Satellite to  
the Organization's Arizona '83 University.

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

February 14, 1983

LENGTH: 2977 words

The President. Good morning.

It's a pleasure and a privilege to join such an accomplished group of producers and achievers. I almost thought about wearing snow clothes here, being in Washington. But you all became presidents of sizable corporations by the time you were 40. That says a lot about your energy, drive, and vision -- some of us take a little longer.

You're the people most able to lead the coming economic recovery, increase its momentum, and bring renewed prosperity to America and the world. By definition, you are risk takers, capitalists, and entrepreneurs. Your comparative youth also indicates you're open to new ideas, ready to try new ways of doing things. And that's just the kind of attitude we need to guide American into her next period of economic greatness.

Those of you from the Midwest are well aware that the recession has hit hardest in areas dependent on what has been called our bedrock industries -- autos, steel, chemicals. At the same time, some of our service industries such as banking, computers, and communications are not as affected by the slump. They are becoming pillars of our economy.

We're stepping into a new economic era and one of the most challenging and exciting decades in our history. High technology is revolutionizing our industries, renewing our economy, and promising new hope and opportunity in the years ahead.

America is emerging from a painful period of adjustment. We're paying the price for years and years of big spending, big taxing, and overregulation. We're also suffering the structural problems of an industrial society transforming into more of a service and information society. Our traditional basic industries are not about to die away. America must never abandon them. They're fundamental to our economic base. But each of us, from corporate president to government official to millions of men and women in the marketplace, must recognize what is happening so that we can harness the forces of change to help all of our people.

This technology phenomenon is not new, but it is accelerating. Since 1945 service industries have been providing an increasing share of American jobs. Between 1977 and 1980, jobs in computers and data processing increased by 64 percent. By the year I took office, nearly three-quarters of all Americans worked in the service industries. In 1982 the service and information sector of our economy made up 50 percent of our total gross national product. For this

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

growth to continue, we must both revitalize our industrial complex and encourage the boom in our service industries. They depend on each other, and both have a vital role in tomorrow's free market economy.

Our basic industries must move into this new era by using and catering to new technology. Our factories must be retooled and recharged, and our systems must integrate high technology whenever possible. If we're to compete internationally, we must, as someone once said, "walk forward, not backward into the future."

You, the captains of industry and commerce, and we in government share the responsibility for moving our people and our economies over the threshold. We share an obligation to lift all our people into a new age of prosperity, bringing skills to the untrained and opportunity to those without hope. But as Franklin Roosevelt said, "We cannot attain a lasting prosperity in a nation half boom and half broke."

In the long run, if men and women like you fulfill your visions, economic growth will put our unemployed back to work, revive idle factories, and open the necessary doors of opportunity. As we've seen with the reopening of the Chrysler plants in Fenton, Missouri, and the rehiring of a total of 3,200 workers there, the developing recovery is beginning to provide jobs. But as I've said before, our people continue to hurt. Those of us in government and you in the private sector cannot afford to sit back. We must act. We'll not rest until every American who wants a job can find one.

In the short term, I have twice extended the unemployment benefit of workers whose insurance had run out. And I'm asking all Federal departments and agencies to study the prospects for speeding up already budgeted construction to provide jobs sooner than later. But there are other challenges. We must bridge the growing gap between the skills of today's work force and the future needs of business and industry. That's why last October I signed the Job Training Partnership Act which will train more than 1 million of our citizens every year in skills that local business, civic, municipal, and labor leaders say are needed in their communities.

Shortly, I will submit to the Congress the Employment Act of 1983, designed to get at the special problems of the long-term unemployed as well as aid young people trying to enter the job market. I'll propose extending unemployment benefits, special incentives to employers who hire the long-term unemployed, and support for programs for displaced workers, training, and relocation assistance. Our proposal will also include new incentives for summer youth employment to help young people get a start in the job market.

In our commitment to ensure that all of our people share tomorrow's opportunities, this administration is also moving to assure legal and economic equity for women. We will also seek extension of the Civil Rights Commission. And we will propose measures to contain the skyrocketing costs of health care.

Government must get a hammerlock on the budget monster that threatens the road to recovery. I recently sent to the Congress a budget that is fair, prudent, and realistic. It includes, first, the strong but necessary medicine of a Federal spending freeze; second, specific measures to control the uncontrollable entitlement programs, third, \$55 billion in defense savings; and, fourth, to ensure the reduction and eventual elimination of deficits, a

**LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS**

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

standby tax limited to no more than 1 percent of the gross national product, to start in fiscal 1986, but to start only if Congress has implemented the proposed spending cuts and if the deficit is more than 2 1/2 percent of gross national product.

At the same time, however, this administration will fight to preserve the third year of the tax break coming to working men and women this July and the tax indexing provision which will protect all Americans from inflationary bracket creep. We must not allow inflation to flare up again because of deficit spending, as it has in the past. But let's not lose sight of one vital point: America didn't run up a trillion-dollar debt because government didn't tax enough; we're saddled with a trillion-dollar debt because government spent too much.

I urge you, as leaders of the private sector, to join us in our campaign to forge a working partnership for recovery between business, labor, education, and government. Already, such a partnership is addressing the training needs of American workers. With the help of our Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives, thousands of working people at the community level have already made the shift from dead-end jobs and low-demand skills to the growth areas of high technology and the service economy.

There is so much more to be done. Together, we can claim this new world of technology and innovation for America and all of our people.

Now, I understand you may have some questions for me.

Moderator. Mr. President, first a question from Fritz Groupe, who is president of the Groupe Company.

The President. All right, Jack.

Heavy Industry in the U.S.

Q. Mr. President, you indicated in your address to us that we're seeing a trend towards the high tech and service industries, the information society. What role do you see the U.S. playing in heavy industry?

The President. Well, there's no question that this doesn't mean -- or possibility that this means that we're going to do away with those industries, or see if we can do without them. That would be impossible; they are still a strong base. But this transition we're going through does not so much mean the disappearance of, say, one of the smokestack industries. It means that high technology is moving in, even there.

Recently, visiting the automobile company that I mentioned in my remarks, I stood at an assembly line that once used to be lined with workers -- but the work was all being done by robots. In other words, we will still have the auto industry and the steel industry and all those things that go with it. We must have them. But they will not require the same number of workers they did before.

Moderator. We have a question from Jiggs Davis, president of Baron Data Systems.  
Reduction in Capital Gains Tax

**LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS**

## 19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

Q. Lowering the capital gains tax has increased the formation of new businesses in the United States. What else can be done to really increase the formation and to increase business in the United States and to help compete in the world market?

The President. Well, we have already put some things in place. One of them is that third installment of the income tax [cut] that I mentioned. But in our tax program of 1981, we made great changes, as you know, in business tax, to make it more possible -- faster write-off, and so forth, for replacing plant and equipment. A number of things of that kind were done to have the same effect that the lowering of the capital gains tax has had. And that is the greater investment -- as a matter of fact, government is getting more revenue as a result of the reduction of that tax rate.

So, we have a number of tax proposals in there that are already in place. We're looking at other things of the same kind.

And the improvement that has been made in personal savings -- we're in the best situation in that, that we've been in since 1976. And that has added billions and tens of billions of dollars to the pool of private capital that is available for investment, so that when we can once get at the task of reducing these deficits, which we're going to do, but even with the deficits, there will still be money left for private investors, as well as to fund those government deficits.

Moderator. John Darden, president of Sands and Company.  
Defense Spending

Q. Mr. President, among rising concerns about the cost of the arms race, how can you justify the large increase in your budget for defense spending for the next several decades?

The President. Well, now, I know there's been a constant drumbeat about defense spending, as if that's responsible for all our ills. And it makes me able to understand why such a question would come.

In the first place, we are spending a lower percentage of the gross national product on defense than has been customary in the past, with the exception of just the few years before we came here, when there was a real decline in defense spending and a real decline in our ability to protect the freedoms and the people of America.

Now, not only have we reduced the percentage to about 7 percent of gross national product -- and back in the fifties and sixties, it averaged 9 and 10 percent of gross national product -- but we also are taking a much smaller percentage of the budget as a whole. Defense spending that we've asked for is only 26.7 percent of the budget. Historically, defense spending has been around 50 percent. And in the time of John F. Kennedy, in his administration, it was about 46 percent.

So, we feel that it is necessary to do what we're doing. But the budget that has grown the fastest, that is taking the greatest share, is that of the transfer payments, the so-called entitlement programs, where the money is being taken from workers and earners by way of tax and is being distributed.

## 19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

Now, we are going to be very careful and are careful that we preserve what we call the "safety net" and make sure that those transfers will continue to the people who are truly needy and who must, through no fault of their own, depend on the rest of us. But we have found that those programs had become so loose administratively that there were people that were sometimes better off than those who were being taxed to support them, who were receiving those transfer payments. We have done our best to tighten that up. We are making gains in this '84 budget, if the Congress will pass it, that will remedy the situation with those so-called uncontrollable items, the entitlement programs, these transfer payments.

But again, let me point out that the biggest amount of the defense spending is not, as some believe, the investing in great, new weapons systems. It is the simple fact that we began paying the military something a little more commensurate with the service that they're rendering to our country, and the result has been, in these 2 years, a fantastic improvement in the quality and the quantity in our volunteer military. As of 2 years ago, people were saying it was a failure and that we would have to resort to the draft. Today, we have waiting lines. Today, we have an intelligence level and a number, a percentage of high school graduates in the military that is higher than we've ever had before, even when we were using the draft.

But I don't see how those who are criticizing can justify it that we are spending an inordinate amount on the military. I've given you the figures on that, the percentages, and so forth, and I have to say that -- and, incidentally, I pointed out in my remarks that over the next 5 years, we, ourselves, are cutting \$55 billion out of our original program. We have already cut some 41 voluntarily -- billion dollars -- out of that, and the Congress has cut some more, which I wish they hadn't, because it did throw us off balance.

But we're going to continue to find the efficiencies and the economies wherever we can that will get the best out of every dollar that's being spent on defense.

Moderator. Ed Stanley, the president of Stanley Investment and Management Company.

Reflections on the Presidency

Q. Mr. President, all of us serve as chief executive officers of our companies. You're the chief executive officer of the biggest enterprise on the face of the Earth. We would be interested in your personal reflections on the job, how you deal with the decisionmaking process, and the pressures that make your job as difficult as it really is.

The President. Well, we do have a lot in common. And I think, maybe, one of the things I do that I learned as Governor of California is pretty similar to what you, as chief executives, have to do in your businesses.

First of all, I want all the input I can get. Now, I had learned over the years -- or at least was informed -- that Cabinet meetings in government, in Washington for example, were kind of once-a-month ceremonies where the Cabinet got together and various Cabinet members reported on the doings of their particular agency. Well, I changed that in California and changed it here. Our Cabinet operates as kind of a board of directors. And if the issue involves one particular agency, that individual just doesn't have the floor all to himself.

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 232

Everyone is affected. So, everyone gets into the debate and the discussion as they would around a board of directors table.

Now, the one place where we differ is we don't take a vote. I realize that I have to make the decision. So when I've heard all the pros and cons -- and I insist on hearing all views -- when I've heard enough to feel that I am soundly briefed, I make the decision. Sometimes I wait a little bit and go back in the office and stew around with it myself for awhile; sometimes I make it right there at the Cabinet table.

But that, I have found, is one of the most effective ways to get things done and also to have some confidence that I had had all the input that there is on a particular subject. And, as I say, I think to that extent it's pretty much what you yourselves do. I have a staff just as you also do. And they're involved in all of this, and I hear their views, also.

Yes, it is an awesome responsibility. I am grateful for the 8 years that I had in California in that position, because it probably was the best training that anyone could have for this particular job -- much the same thing on a little different scale. And, of course, we didn't have a foreign policy in California; we have that now. But, once again, the same procedure -- the National Security Council, State, and Defense, and all. And this involves other Cabinet members, also -- Treasury and the Commerce Department and all are involved in a great many of the international aspects of this job. So we've followed the same process with them. That's the way it works.

Moderator. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Thank you.

The President. Well, thank you. And together, let me say, we're turning America away from past policies of despair and stagnation. Yes, we still face tough challenges. But we know they're not insurmountable. Just as our forefathers tamed a wild continent and built unparalleled prosperity with their vision, courage, and hard work, so we can claim the promise of tomorrow. If we listen to our hearts, believe in ourselves, and pull together, nothing can stand in our way.

Thank you all very much, and God bless you.

Note: The President spoke at 12:31 p.m. from the Washington, D.C., studios of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. His remarks were carried live to the organization's meeting at the University of Arizona in Tucson.

The Young Presidents Organization is an international education association limited to chief executives of corporations who reached their positions before the age of 40.

Secretary of State

*Remarks at the Swearing-In Ceremony for  
George P. Shultz. July 16, 1982*

*The President.* Ladies and gentlemen, please. Today, I'm reminded of the old saying, "Let George do it." [Laughter] And, George, from now on, I think I'll have a few things for you to do.

On behalf of the American people, I want to compliment the Senate for its wisdom in approving so rapidly and decisively the nomination of George Shultz as our next Secretary of State. The Senate's swift action augurs well for continued cooperation between the Congress and the executive branch and for strong leadership at the State Department.

I also want to compliment George Shultz on his impressive performance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His articulate and convincing presentation sent a strong signal to friend and foe alike. Our country is fortunate to have a man of exceptional character and qualifications for this vital position.

America's always been blessed in times such as these with citizens of stature who come forward to make certain the job gets done and done right. George Shultz follows in that tradition. He has served three previous Presidents. He has been immensely successful in his endeavors in the private sector, and he's highly respected for his academic achievements. Those who know him testify that he's a man with character and common sense, affable, yet decisive. He's a man who inspires confidence and leaves no doubt that he's capable of the vital task that we're giving him.

Of all the responsibilities of the Presidency, shaping American foreign policy is the most awesome. It's in this arena that we come to grips with the decisions which most directly affect the delicate balance of peace and which secure both the immediate and long-term well-being of the United States.

When looking for the best, sometimes one finds that the paths of talented men cross. Recently, George, there's been some criticism of your similar background to another member of my Cabinet. Now, I admit we

may be dipping from the same well to find quality people. I just want everyone to know that I'm fully aware that George and Don Regan, as well as many other high-ranking members of my administration, are all former Marines. [Laughter] And I don't find that a handicap in any way. [Laughter]

Seriously, George's background gives him a unique opportunity to be of service to his country. Over the last few years in the private sector leading one of the giants of American enterprise, he has first-hand knowledge of the dynamics of economic progress. He brings with him perhaps a deeper understanding of world economics than any previous Secretary of State, having dealt internationally with leaders of commerce as well as heads of state. This experience will, I have no doubt, add depth and meaning to the decisions that he'll be making. I look forward to his counsel.

And with all of that said, George, welcome to the team.

[At this point, Attorney General William French Smith administered the oath of office to Mr. Shultz.]

*Secretary Shultz.* Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I thank you. You have done me a great honor, and I recognize fully the responsibilities placed upon me.

I said in my statement to the Committee on Foreign Relations that I would muster every ounce of energy and intelligence and dedication I could and pour all of it into performance on this job, and I restate that and remake that pledge to you on this occasion, Mr. President.

In the period of time that I've been preparing for this job and preparing for my examination by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of course I've been impressed with the importance and depth and difficulty of the problems that we face. But also, Mr. President, as you so characteristically do, I think it's essential that we take that coin that has "problems" as its label on one side and turn it over and see that on the other side is the word "opportunities." And I certainly want to approach this task fully conscious and realistic about the problems, but even more, conscious of the opportunities which with creative and constructive effort we may be able to do something

wonderful with. I say that with some confidence here, because I am with friends. And I feel the warmth of this gathering and that it's a family affair, and it gives me a certain sense of both humility but also a sense of support.

And in that regard I would like to thank especially the Members of the Congress, the Members of the Senate who gave me such a thorough working-over and examination—and, I think, in a very constructive way and thorough way—and in the end voted promptly and decisively to confirm me as Secretary of State. And I appreciate that, and I recognize it as a kind of marker that we should approach these things together and in the spirit of bipartisanship and in trying to find the broad consensus that sustains our policies abroad and has done so for so many decades.

Mr. President, in your Inaugural Address you said that no arsenal, no weapon in the world "is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women." I think, as you often do, you put succinctly the essence of the matter, and I say to you that I will take these words of yours as my touchstone and foundation as I approach the conduct of this great office.

I thank you very much, Mr. President, and my friends.

*Note: The President spoke at 10 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.*

### Budget Rescissions and Deferral

*Message to the Congress. July 16, 1982*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report two new proposals to rescind \$63.6 million in budget authority previously provided to the Congress and one revision to an existing deferral increasing the amount deferred by \$61.1 million.

The rescissions include \$47.4 million previously deferred for the employment and training assistance program administered by the Department of Labor, and \$16.2 million for the exploration of national petroleum

reserve in Alaska account in the Department of the Interior. The deferral affects the facilities and equipment account (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) in the Department of Transportation.

The details of the rescission proposals and revised deferral are contained in the attached reports.

Ronald Reagan

The White House,  
July 16, 1982.

*Note: The attachments detailing the proposed rescissions and deferral will be printed in the Federal Register.*

### Council on Environmental Quality

*Nomination of Nancy A. Maloley To Be a Member. July 16, 1982*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Nancy A. Maloley to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality. She would succeed Jane Hurt Yarn.

She is currently serving as policy adviser, Office of Policy Development, the White House. She was director for legislation for the EPA transition team. She served as legislative assistant to United States Senator Richard G. Lugar in 1977-1981. She was Special Assistant to the Administrator of the EPA in 1971-1976. Prior to that, she served on the staff of United States Representative E. Ross Adair.

She graduated from the University of Colorado (B.A., 1968). She resides in Washington, D.C. She was born April 13, 1946.

### United Service Organizations, Inc.

*Appointment of Five Members of the Board of Governors. July 16, 1982*

The President today announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to be members of the Board of Governors of

derson from Center High School, and I live in Center, Texas. How do you react to the fairness issue being raised, suggesting that your budget cuts in social services have hurt the poor and those less able to afford, you know, the aid like welfare and day care and like that?

*The President.* Well, this whole charge of fairness, I think, is political demagoguery and is done for political purposes. Having been a Governor for 8 years and thus participated in administering many of the Federal programs, I was aware of what a high percentage of the money for those programs went to the bureaucracy, was spent in administrative overhead.

I give you an example of a program that was supposed to be—Federal program supposed to put 17 unemployed people in one of our counties in California into some jobs helping out in the maintenance of parks. Now it sounds pretty logical, except that half of the budget was going to go to 11 administrators—to make sure that the 17 got to work on time, I guess. But it seemed to me it was out of balance.

What we've been doing is redirecting the aid actually to the truly needy. You would be surprised at how—under the management of those programs—how the ceiling had gone up on earnings to where people who really were self-sustaining were getting government grants and government aid at the expense of their neighbors. And those neighbors weren't making as much money as they were.

We have redirected this. And this is also true in the previous question of aid to the students. We found that people who should normally be expected to be able to send their children to college were getting this help, financial help.

So we have redirected more of these programs to the people who truly need it. And we're actually—this government is providing 95 million meals a day. We are subsidizing housing for more than 10 million families in the country today. There has been no real cutback or decline in aid to the people who through no fault of their own must depend on the rest of us for help. We've just tried to make government a little bit more efficient.

Now some of these who are squealing the loudest are some of the bureaucrats that were proven unnecessary and also some of the people who never should have been on the programs in the first place.

For example, I had a message the other day from a man in a small town down in Mississippi. And he was writing to me about food stamps in his area, because there's a 31-percent unemployment rate in that particular town. And he was telling of some of the things, of people getting \$2,400 a month and receiving food stamps. Well, for them to do that means that someone else who really has need for them is being cheated and is not being able to get the help that they should have.

So I think we are being fair, and I think we're being fair, also, to the working men and women in this country who are sharing their earnings to help those who are unable to take care of themselves.

#### *Views on the Presidency*

*Q.* Mr. President, I am Vicki Kessler from Manzano High School in Albuquerque, New Mexico. What do you feel are the necessary qualities for someone to run for a public office, especially the Presidency?

*The President.* What is the necessary quality? Well, I'll tell you, I would put it this way. I don't think that any public office should be viewed by someone as just a good job that they might like to have for their own personal career. I think you really have to believe in something and think that you can bring about an improvement by serving in public office in order to bring about this reform or to do this good that you think the government should be doing.

Now, I don't know whether that answers your question about me, but I do know that for about 25 years, before I ever dreamed that I would seek public office—never wanted to, was very happy in my previous line of work—but some way, back from being a sports announcer, I guess, I got on the mashed potato circuit, as I call it. [Laughter] And since I didn't sing or dance, I usually wound up being an after dinner speaker at somebody's banquet. And I always did my own speeches. And I, over the years, was talking more and more about the things that I saw wrong in government

that should be corrected. And, then, when through a set of circumstances some people prevailed upon me to run for Governor, I think what finally—and it came about through those speeches—why I saw it as an opportunity to, instead of just talking about these problems, to do something about them. And that's it.

#### *Communication With the Soviet Union*

*Q.* Mr. President, my name is Stephen Carter. I'm from the Law Magnet High School in Dallas, Texas. With Soviet Premier Andropov sick, and with the recent death of Brezhnev a couple years ago, do you see any real, foreseeable problems for the United States in dealing with another Soviet premier should he die?

*The President.* Well, it's true that there's difficulty, and there has been in this period and before his illness. When a new man is just taking over and getting his government organized, there's a period in there in which he's not ready to get out and start talking with someone else about international affairs. So, there would be that period again, if there is a change of leadership.

I will say this, on the other hand, though, that we are in communication at a number of levels with people in the Soviet Union. We're not just incommunicado. We have people that have channels and through the State Department and all, that we're in contact. I have even communicated with personal, handwritten letters, myself.

And we feel that the two superpowers, in the position we're in in the world today, with all the tensions and with all the possibility for a tragic error, that we can't discontinue our conversation and our meetings with them. But because you don't see an awful lot about this in the public media, it is going on.

I happen to be a believer in what I've called quiet diplomacy. For example, if you make a demand on the other government and you say, "You've got to do this; we don't like what you're doing," and it's on the front page of the papers and on the TV news, in the world of politics you've put that person in a position where he can hardly give in, because then in the eyes of their own people they would be accepting orders from another government. So on many of the touchiest points, you deal qui-

etly in the back there. And you to go out making this is a problem affects our relationship you were doing this—what is—believe me much better."

And I have to tell you. Now, I think there are too many

#### *Immigration and*

*Q.* Hello, Mr. Annette Lauredan's High School question is, does develop some kind of policy to help aid by the thousands of shores in South States, year after

*The President.* in this country. immigration is the quotas. We know So people are of countries, dependent quota has been

As for refugees. Our country ferred itself as a persecuted and cution and are people from Vietnam overall figure on

We have legislation right now, get passed—and it passed—having a problem and want to close our borders. I should say, again, immigrants or refugees into the country into the whole picture. There are a great many coming into our country with this legislation immigration and door open for the

1ST DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Foreign and Domestic Issues

Interview With Garry Clifford and Patricia Ryan of People Magazine.

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

December 6, 1983

LENGTH: 3962 words

Q. Thank you very much for having us back. It's a great honor for us to be here.

The President. Well, it's a pleasure.

Q. One of the things I wanted to ask you was I think that most Americans thought the job of being President was impossible when you took office, and I think things have changed, and they feel that you thrive on it. And I sort of wanted to ask you how you disciplined yourself and how you plan your activities so that it won't overwhelm you?

The President. Well, maybe the 8 years as Governor gave me some advance training for this, because I do remember that when I first become Governor there was a period that I went through in which I thought the world had fallen on my head. And I guess I learned there.

\* Q. But isn't this more difficult? I mean --

The President. Oh, yes.

\* Q. -- isn't there more people and more paper, and more -- [inaudible]?

The President. Yes. And yet, I have to say that I think that the Presidency -- the nearest thing to it in the country is a governorship. You don't have a foreign policy, which does add some problems, but it is the same thing. And it used to be -- if you'll look back at earlier days, in which our Presidents were mainly found among the Governors. And I think that is a better training place than, for instance, serving in the legislature or something.

Q. You'd still recommend it?

The President. Yes. But the other thing -- I've never felt better in my life, physically.

Q. You certainly look it, Mr. President.

The President. I have a little gym upstairs that I get to every afternoon before the day is over.

Q. Tell me, would you recommend the job to a friend?

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

The President. Yes. [Laughing] -- He might not be a friend afterwards, but, no, I have to say that for someone who really wants to do some things that he believes strongly in, this is the most fulfilling experience I've ever had in my life.

Q. Mr. President, we were curious. Many times in the last 6 weeks you've been awakened from a deep sleep with a world crisis. How do you get the news? Who brings it to you? Do you have to have coffee? Do you stay up all night? Does Mrs. Reagan get up with you?

The President. No, I try to slip out without her, although -- it's usually the phone.

Q. Is it a special phone?

The President. No, usually, just the bedside phone, that then -- well, when we were -- when it has happened -- it happened at Atlanta, Georgia, when we were on that weekend there. Well, there were two such calls and two such issues. And one of them was the phone, and, simply, it was Bud McFarlane asking could I come up in the living room and meet the Secretary of State there. So I whispered that I was just going out in the living room for a little bit, hoping that she'd go back to sleep, and I put on a robe and went out there. Then the second incident down there, one of the stewards, he just slipped in, tiptoed in and touched me on the shoulder and whispered to me, and I slid out and did the same thing again. But then you stay there and do what has to be done.

Q. Well, are you alert immediately? Do you need coffee or anything?

The President. No, I wake up easy. And then, more recently at Camp David, it was phone calls, not in the middle of the night in this case. I wasn't up yet, but it was --

Q. Do you get to dislike having the phone ring because you think there's a problem when it rings?

The President. Yes. I can't say that I pick it up with dread, because many times it's just a correction or some information on something or other. But it has to be faced.

Q. It's usually a problem, often a problem.

The President. Usually, yes.

Q. I wanted to ask you, do you think the American people are behind the commitment of troops for military action, and do you think -- this is a more serious question -- do you think that the number of casualties influences how they feel about something?

The President. Oh, it has to. This has to be the hardest thing in all of this job, and certainly in my life, and that is committing these splendid young men and women to tasks where you know there is that threat. I've never been so proud of anything as I am of the people in our Armed Forces.

A few years ago there was an entirely different situation. Everyone said the volunteer military wouldn't work. Well, it is working, and there is an esprit

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

de corps, there's a pride out there among them. And this puts a lump in my throat. And then to -- even one of them, to have a horrible accident or incident such as the one in Lebanon, there just is no way to make that easy.

But the thing is to try and -- well, first of all, I think many people jump to events -- not People -- [inaudible] -- such thing as the grassroots. But press and political figures that -- on the Grenada rescue mission -- that immediately jumped to the conclusion that this was some kind of a warlike thing that everyone would be angry at. It was kind of interesting to see so many of them have to try to crawl back in off the end of the limb when they found out that the American people understood very well what we were doing and supported it.

Now it's harder for them to understand Lebanon, because in Lebanon, they were not sent there to fight; that, hopefully, there would be no combat. We knew there was a risk because of the kind of violence that had been taking place in the streets over there for a long time. But the whole idea of a multinational force was in connection with our own peace proposal for the Middle East.

Lebanon was stalling that, if you remember. You had Israel and Syria both in. Israel had crossed the border because PLO terrorist units were attacking villages across their northern border from Lebanon. The Lebanon Government, as of several years ago, was virtually powerless in the face of what can only be termed warlords in their own country, of several factions, each with its own militia, fighting each other and fighting the Government. And you couldn't proceed with the peace mission until we resolved this problem.

So we sent a force in with the idea that -- well, first of all, they'd gotten some ten thousand PLO out; now the idea was that both Israel and Syria get out, then a stabilizing force there while the Lebanese Government reformed and created a military force in which it could then take over jurisdiction of its own territory.

Well, the first blow was that the Syrians, after saying, yes, they would get out, said, no, they wouldn't. The Israelis were prepared to get out. Both sides wanted -- the idea was they would go out simultaneously. And so our force is there for that purpose. And there wouldn't have been a shot fired by a marine or by our Navy or Air Force if they had not been shot at. And when that happened, I said wherever we send them, they're going to have the right to defend themselves and fire back.

Q. Mr. President, I'm curious. Your political godfather, or grandfather, if you will, Barry Goldwater, Senator Goldwater, is even calling for the boys to come back from Beirut. I'm wondering, how far are you willing to commit troops, or how far are you willing to escalate?

The President. It isn't a case of whether we will escalate. That is up to the Syrians and to some of those rebel groups that are fighting the Lebanese military. But we have only fired back when we have been attacked. And I am hopeful that after this last exchange that the Syrians will decide that they don't want to go on on that path.

Q. But, Mr. President, if they remain recalcitrant, if they remain -- the Israelis have been bombing them and strafing them and haven't really budged them. If they remain the same and they remain shooting at our reconnaissance

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

flights and downing more fliers, what is the next step?

The President. Well, we're taking the next step right now. Don Runsfeld is on his way back there, and we still are going to try for a political solution. We're going to try to negotiate with the Syrians and make them understand.

Q. But if they don't want to negotiate, if they find it in their best interests to be a thorn in your side, what do you do then?

The President. Well, that becomes a kind of a hypothetical question in which I almost have to wait and see what the circumstances are. Actually, the Lebanese military -- which we have helped to train and have equipped and which is a very good military force -- is supposed to be resolving the situation for themselves as we try to maintain a little stability in Beirut while they can go forward and do this.

Q. Do you see a day, either in your own -- in your next term, for instance, or in the very near future, where President Assad could be a, sort of, the dominant -- the present day dominant force in the Arab world; there he could become something like what Anwar Sadat became to us? I mean, do you ever see that kind of relationship ever being able to develop?

The President. I don't see any reason why not. We've made great progress with the other Arab States, the more moderate states. I think that they are very ready for a negotiated settlement, continuing on with the Camp David accords and the U.N. resolutions. Syria is the big kid and the U.N. resolutions. Syria is the big kid and the bad kid on the block, and the other Arab States have been trying, themselves, to persuade Syria to join in this effort and to withdraw. And now a new element has been introduced by Syria. They hadn't mentioned this before when earlier they said, oh, yes, they would get out, too. They now are not pretending that there is any assault on them or that they're in any danger and that's why they are staying there; they are now claiming that Lebanon properly is a part of a greater Syria. This is outright armed aggression now on their part, hoping to expand their territory at the expense of Lebanon and -- they've even indicated -- at the expense of Jordan.

Q. Mr. President, moving off of that People Magazine question, how did you assess the film "The Day After?" And do you think movies have a way of forming political opinion?

The President. Well, any motion picture or any drama or play is based on one thing: It isn't successful unless it has or evokes an emotional response. If the audience does not have an emotional experience, whether it's one of hating something or crying or having a lot of laughter, then you've got a failure out there.

Well, certainly there was an emotional response to this type of horror film. But apparently it has not had a lasting impact; I haven't seen very much reference to it any more. And maybe one of the reasons was because it was -- [inaudible] -- it was a horror film, showing you what I'm sure all of us all knew, that a nuclear war is unthinkable, it is sheer horror, it must not happen. But it left you with no idea or solution, no suggestion as to what to do about it.

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

And I think that my own reaction to it was, look, if anything, if this can add to what we can say about the fact that there must not be a nuclear war, then maybe the people will understand why we're trying so desperately to get a reduction in those weapons worldwide. And I hope that if we start down the reduction road that the other side will see the common sense in eliminating them totally. Not since 1946 has there been such a suggestion, and that was made by this country. And even then, when we were the only ones, really, with a stock of such weapons, the Soviet Union refused.

Q. Let me ask you this question: If Yuriy Andropov had been in the room with you watching the film that night, would you have said that very same thing to him?

The President. Yes.

Q. And anything else?

The President. Yes, I would have told him that the only way there could be war is if they start it; we're not going to start a war.

Q. Let me ask you this: Do you have any second thoughts about calling the Soviet Union an evil empire? I think you called the Soviet Union that once. Do you have second thoughts about that? Do you wish you hadn't done it?

The President. No. I think that it was high time that we got some realism and got people thinking that for too long we have kind of viewed them as just a mirror image of ourselves, and that maybe we could appeal to their good nature. And we've gone through the experience in a number of years past of saying, well, if we cancel weapons systems, if we unilaterally disarm, maybe they'll see that we're nice people, too, and they'll disarm. Well, they didn't. They just kept on increasing.

Q. So you see them as really a source of evil?

The President. Yes, because you have to look at the impact on what we were just talking about, with Lebanon. There they are with thousands of military advisers and technicians and so forth in Syria, have provided Syria with weapons that are not purely defense weapons -- ground-to-ground missiles that can cover virtually every target from Syria in Israel. And they are the ones that seek, whether it's out of paranoia on their part -- and, believe me, everyone's an enemy, and so they have to be aggressive -- or whether it is the Marxist-Leninist theory, more than a theory -- commitment -- that was handed them, and that was that they must support uprising wherever they take place in the world to bring about a one-world Communist state.

Now, no Russian leader has ever refuted that. As a matter of fact, he hasn't had time yet, but every Russian leader up to Andropov, at some time or other, has publicly restated his commitment to world conquest -- world communizing.

Q. Let me ask you a question out of that In The Jerusalem Post you were quoted -- and I don't know if the quote was accurate -- as saying that this generation might see Armageddon, that a lot of the Biblical prophecies are sort of being played out today, or could be -- [inaudible].

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

The President. Where was that?

Q. In The Jerusalem Post. And I was going to say, is this really true? Do you believe that?

The President. I've never done that publicly. I have talked here, and then I wrote people, because some theologians quite some time ago were telling me, calling attention to the fact that theologians have been studying the ancient prophecies -- What would portend the coming of Armageddon? -- and have said that never, in the time between the prophecies up until now has there ever been a time in which so many of the prophecies are coming together. There have been times in the past when people thought the end of the world was coming, and so forth, but never anything like this.

And one of them, the first one who ever broached this to me -- and I won't use his name; I don't have permission to. He probably would give it, but I'm not going to ask -- had held a meeting with the then head of the German Government, years ago when the war was over, and did not know that his hobby was theology. And he asked this theologian what did he think was the next great news event, worldwide. And the theologian, very wisely, said, "Well, I think that you're asking that question in a case that you've had a thought along that line." And he did. It was about the prophecies and so forth.

So, no. I've talked conversationally about that.

Q. You've mused on it. You've considered it.

The President. [Laughing] Not to the extent of throwing up my hands and saying, "Well, it's all over." No. I think whichever generation and at whatever time, when the time comes, the generation that is there, I think will have to go on doing what they believe is right.

Q. Even if it comes?

The President. Yes.

Q. To ask you a serious question which comes out of this, I see around -- since my last visit here -- many more signs that the government is worried about terrorism, that it's -- [inaudible]. Do you, yourself, think about dying, think about the fear of the position you're in?

The President. Well, you can't help but be conscious, because the security measures are all so evident to you. But if you mean do I go around fearful and looking over my shoulder, no. I have confidence in the security people. I had one taste of --

Q. Yes, and a touch of another.

The President. And I never second guess the security people. When they tell me they're going to do something or change some way of doing things that we're doing, I accept that that's --

Q. Is this something that you talk about, for instance, to Mrs. Reagan or your children?

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

The President. No.

Q. Or is it something you just -- it's better left unsaid?

The President. Yes, very much so, because I think it was harder for them when it did happen than it was for me, and much more difficult for her, especially to get over.

It's a lot easier to worry about someone else than it is to worry about yourself, and so I know what must go through her mind when I set out on some expedition or some public appearance or something. And I wish it didn't have to be.

Q. Does your bullet-proof shirt or jacket or coat or whatever hang in the family quarters? Or do they keep it someplace else?

The President. No, no. They keep it. And they come, having it in hand, and they kind of come in flinching, because they know that I -- [laughing].

Q. What do you say?

The President. I do not accept it with good grace.

Q. What do you say, though, when they put it on you?

The President. Oh, even an occasional unprintable word. [Laughter]

But I also know that they would not be bringing it in unless they felt there was a reason for it. But it isn't a pleasant -- it's uncomfortable. [Laughter] That's the main --

Q. Is it bulky, or is it heavy, or what?

The President. Well, it's bulky. And I work so hard in that gym up there. And they say everybody out there in the audience will think I'm getting fat. [Laughter]

Q. Mr. President, away from Armageddon and all this talk of dying, and back to 1984. Did you cringe when you had to sign the order to have your own aides take a lie detector test? And I'm curious: Have you ever taken one? And how did you feel?

The President. No, I never have. But I didn't sign an order for them to take it. This has been misconstrued, and I bless you for giving me a chance to explain it.

We had a meeting that came up on national security -- rules and regulations of the security of the information there. And there was a leak. And it was a leak which could have cost some Americans their lives. And this is a criminal act when there's a violation of national security. And I called the Justice Department on this -- I thought it was serious enough -- and I said I want an investigation of how this happened, to guard against it in the future.

Now, such an investigation, without my designating it as such -- if it is a violation of national security, it is a criminal investigation. If it is a

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

criminal investigation, the FBI has the right to ask for lie detector tests. But, being a criminal investigation, the individual has the right to refuse them, and that's all. But that's been distorted -- that I suddenly --

Q. Well, have you ever taken one?

The President. No.

Q. No. Okay. Did your aides -- [inaudible]? I mean did they take them --

The President. I don't know. I don't even know whether the FBI even asked them or not. They determine that, and that is within the law. And then if somebody says no, they report that also in their investigating report that they asked and it was refused. But I don't know whether any had been given or any had been asked for.

Q. Mr. President, who do you think the easiest Democrat would be to beat in 1984?

The President. If I answered that question I might be helping them to choose out of that octet they've got out there, and I'm not going to help them in their choice.

Q. But there's not one you'd rather -- you're relishing running against?

The President. [Laughing] Oh, there may be, but I haven't said yet that I'm running.

Q. I have two questions that I would -- not till Christmas. I'd like to ask two questions. What I was thinking, in this year of living dangerously, I wondered how in the world can you maintain the very obvious romance you have with Mrs. Reagan? I mean romance takes time, and it takes mood, and it special things do you do to maintain this togetherness in these tough times?

The President. Well, I don't know. We've always been very close, and there developed, as there would in 30-odd years, little things that kind of -- traditional, or that have a meaning to us from times back.

Q. Can you cite any of them that -- I mean, I think especially in your article in Parade, you showed how much you loved her and how much the romance continues and whatever. I just wondered if there's sort of small things you do to keep this touchingness together?

The President. Well, there are certain occasions when we leave notes for each other and things of that kind that we still do.

Q. Is there a special place you leave them, or --

The President. Oh, no, it just depends on where -- well, things like on the breakfast tray and, on certain occasions, cards -- I always remember.

Q. Could I ask one more question for my mother, who you gave a story to last year, and we kept hearing from our readers about the peg-legged pig. Do you remember the story you told about the pig with the wooden leg?

19 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1708

The President. Oh --

Q. We thought that this has become a tradition for the magazine, and we wondered, do you have a good story to tell the readers and, indeed, my mother, who is now 84 this year -- a very good story?

The President. Well, I can't repeat that because I've done that story. Yes, I have one that I've told in a couple of speeches lately that I kind of enjoy, and that is a young fellow from a small town, and he would make a very good living selling fish to the local restaurants. But the Fish and Game people got a little curious as to where he was coming up with all these fish. And his uncle happened to be the sheriff, so he said, "Why don't you ask your nephew if you can go fishing with him some day, and I'd like to know where he's getting these fish?" So the uncle did. And they were out in the middle of the lake, and the uncle started to put his line in the water. The nephew reached in the tackle box, pulled out a strick of dynamite, lit it, threw it in -- the explosion, and belly up came all the fish. And he started pulling them in. And his uncle said, "Nephew Elmer, do you realize you've just created a felony?" Elmer reached in the tackle box and came up with another stick of dynamite and lit the fuse and handed it to the sheriff and says, "Did you come out here to fish or the talk?" [Laughter]

Q. Very good, Mr. President.

Q. Mr. President, thank you very, very much, once again. I hope you and the First Lady have a merry Christmas.

The President. Well, thank you. The same to you.

Q. We certainly appreciate it.

Note: The interview was conducted on December 6 in the Oval Office at the White House. The transcript of the interview was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 19.

simply create further job loss and more unemployment.

#### Summary

The Employment Act of 1983 is a balanced and realistic approach to addressing our economy's structural unemployment problem. It provides appropriate incentives for employers to hire the long-term unemployed. It provides needed financial assistance to men and women suffering from the hardship of prolonged joblessness, and provides Federal funds for a cooperative effort by industry, labor, and local officials in assisting displaced workers. It gives States the flexibility needed to further assist these workers, and supplements the major effort already underway to provide meaningful training to our disadvantaged youth by establishing a youth employment opportunity wage which will give all our youth a chance to get the work experience they need. Our enterprise zone legislation will stimulate new jobs in economically distressed areas. Together these proposals will provide the foundation for expanding job opportunities for our unemployed. I urge the Congress to enact this legislation promptly.

Ronald Reagan

The White House,  
March 11, 1983.

#### President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities

*Appointment of Two Members.*  
March 11, 1983

The President today announced his intention to appoint the following individuals to be members of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities. These are new positions.

*Schuyler G. Chapin* is serving as dean of the School of the Arts at Columbia University in New York City. He was acting general manager of the Metropolitan Opera in New York City in 1972-1973 and general manager in 1973-1975. He was executive producer, Amberson Enterprises, in New York (1969-1971) and served as vice president for programming for the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts

in 1964-1969. He is married, has four children, and resides in New York. He was born February 13, 1923, in New York, N.Y.

*Susan L. Davis* was designated by the Speaker of the House. She is president of Susan Davis Public Relations in New York City. She was director of public relations for Girls Clubs of America in 1978-1981. She was a public relations consultant in Washington, D.C., in 1976-1977. She graduated from Finch College (B.A., 1969) and George Washington University (M.A., 1979). She was born November 29, 1947, in New York, N.Y.

#### United States Naval Academy

*Appointment of Emil Zselezcky as a Member of the Board of Visitors.*  
March 11, 1983

The President today announced his intention to appoint Emil Zselezcky to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for a term expiring December 30, 1985. He will succeed Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr.

Since 1980 he has been with the Republican National Heritage Groups Council. He was a technical writer for G.P. Technology in 1979-1980 and was with Pinkerton Security in 1977-1978. He was deputy intelligence officer for the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, in 1972-1975. In 1967-1971, he served as executive assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy (B.S., 1955), the U.S. Naval War College (1972), and George Washington University (M.S., 1972). He is married, has three children, and resides in Temple Hills, Md. He was born November 14, 1931, in Staten Island, N.Y.

#### Domestic and Foreign Issues

*Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Reporters.* March 11, 1983

*The President.* As you well know, I've long been urging that Republicans and

Democrats work together in a spirit of bipartisanship to tackle the many great challenges that are facing the country. I'm pleased to note this morning that on two fronts we are making great progress—social security and jobs.

Members of Congress have been working very responsibly in the past few weeks to reach agreement on a major social security bill, and I'm hopeful that I'll have a bill on my desk before Easter.

A bipartisan coalition is also working very hard to produce a responsible jobs bill that will help to put Americans back to work. I strongly support those efforts, but I'm deeply disturbed by the possibility that the jobs bill will suddenly become a Christmas tree for special interest legislation. We must firmly oppose that effort.

In the meantime, there are many other areas where we must also achieve bipartisanship—on issues ranging from the budget to providing critical assistance for Central America and the Caribbean. And today, I'm sending to the Congress legislation that is very special to me and certainly deserves strong bipartisan support in the Congress. This is a measure to address the problems of the hard-core unemployed. I know that Congress faces a long and imposing agenda this year, but we should take heart that America is finally climbing out of one of our most difficult recessions.

Because we worked so hard over the past 2 years to lay a foundation for economic recovery, we are definitely on the mend. Now, in order to assure a lasting recovery and a lasting peace, we owe it to the American people to make 1983 another year of great accomplishment in the Congress.

And I'll bet that you have a few questions.

#### **Banking Industry**

**Q.** Mr. President, on the jobs bill, on the threat of adding Christmas trees to it, the banking industry is trying to put in a provision to exempt themselves from that withholding tax. And your administration has also accused the banking industry of having interest rates that are too high. What's going on? Is the banking industry threatening the economic recovery?

**The President.** Well, all I can say is that this intensive lobbying they've done has led to a great distortion of the situation. Now, they've led many people to believe, or to ignore the fact of how many millions of people would be exempt from any withholding, that this would not—as a matter of fact, virtually all senior citizens would be exempt. And I think that the banking industry would do a lot better to spend its time thinking about lowering interest rates than lobbying the way they are with regard to this legislation.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

#### **Jobs Legislation**

**Q.** Mr. President, will you veto any legislation where a Kasten-type amendment is attached?—to the jobs bill, for example?

**The President.** You know, Helen, that I've always said that I resist saying in advance whether I will veto or not. There are always exceptions to rules, and this is an exception. Yes, I would veto such legislation.

#### **Central America and El Salvador**

**Q.** Mr. President, you talk of bipartisanship, but you seem to be a long way from any kind of bipartisan agreement when it comes to the question of aid for Central America. The Speaker called your version of the situation down there "greatly overblown." Democrat Mr. Tsongas talked about blackmail in the idea that you had to get the money or there would have to be more advisers down there. What about that? And what about the idea that we could just keep on sending money down there, as the other side escalated, until we have ourselves another situation where we're in too deep to get out?

**The President.** Well, you know, with regard to the Speaker, us Irish are given to oratory—sometimes flamboyant.

No, I think if you look at this situation honestly, here is a government that has been democratically elected in a country that has had a history back over the decades of military rule and no democracy. It is a government that has embarked on a land reform program, that has moved up an election for the President—to have it this year instead of next year—that had in the last election a greater turnout than this

country has ever been able to muster, in spite of the fact that the voters were threatened with death by the guerrillas if they attempted to vote.

They are improving their justice system with regard to arresting people that are continuing the violence that once was a pattern in that country. And I think that it is an obligation here to try and help, as we have.

Now, our economic help to that country has been 2-to-1 over military help. And the military help has been limited to spare parts and supplies and so forth and individual trainers. We have had a couple of their battalions come to our country and train, and they are the best of the military down there now. There's a great need for training.

There's no blackmail of any kind intended. But I would like to call attention, also, that in our international aid in many other trouble spots in the world, it does seem peculiar that this is the only one where they seem to be raising objections. And yet, here is one that is a threat to the Western Hemisphere, to our own security, in fact.

*Q.* If I can just follow up, sir. People are asking, where does it end?

*The President.* Where it ends with is recognition that the people of El Salvador, given a chance at the ballot box, have made it plain that they want order and peace and democracy. And this government there is making every effort to persuade the guerrillas—to offer amnesty—to persuade them to come in and participate in the democratic process and not try to shoot their way into a ruling position in government.

And where I think it ends is with a political and an economic solution. We're trying to help them economically. The economy is being destroyed by the guerrillas. Every time we read a little note about a power failure because they'd bombed some powerplant or facility; every time they do away with bridges and highways and transportation and so forth in their guerrilla attacks—these leave people unemployed and industry stopped and so forth. And there has to be an end to that and a political solution to this problem. And that's what we're aiming at.

#### *Resignation of EPA Administrator*

*Q.* Mr. President, you said that Anne Burford did nothing wrong, that she can leave EPA with her head held high. But there are allegations that she talked about—admitted holding up the clean-up of one dump site because it might help California Governor Jerry Brown. There are also allegations that one of her top aides, James Burford—rather James Sanderson, was involved in EPA decisions involving his legal clients. When you say that she did nothing wrong while the investigation of those charges is still outstanding, aren't you in effect saying that those practices are all right with you?

*The President.* No, I'm not saying anything of the kind. And I heard her last night on television make that statement about the site. And she said that possibly she made some remark to that effect. But it had nothing to do with the decision that was made. The decision was made on entirely different and practical grounds. And she also pointed out that with the election over, she still, due to those other reasons, still has not made the decision on that particular site in California.

Now, I'm glad that you brought that subject up, because I think that what she did in resigning—I did regret very much. And I never would have asked for her resignation. She was doing a job. And we, this administration, can be very proud of our record in environmental protection. And believe me, it tops what we found when we came here. And the fact that she was able to do it with a reduced budget—well, I've asked everyone in our government to do things with a reduced budget and with fewer employees, if possible. That was what we came in here to do—to make government more efficient, to eliminate waste and extravagance. And she has revealed that she is far more concerned with the national welfare and is a far bigger person than those people who have been sniping at her and who've been going public with unfounded allegations, accusations, and charges.

And she, from the very first, was willing to make every document available to them. It was myself, based on what I believe is—well, I've always described this as, you aren't President; you are temporarily custodian of an institution, the Presidency. And

you don't have any right to do away with any of the prerogatives of that institution and one of those is executive privilege. And this is what was being attacked by the Congress.

And, at the same, we were willing to make available almost 800,000 documents to them and, more recently, to give them access in a kind of controlled way to protect, because of possible litigation, those that were confidential and sensitive. But she was willing to give them all, which shows, in my book, she had nothing to hide. But I don't think that the people who were attacking her were concerned about the environment. I don't think they were concerned about any possible wrongdoing. As a matter of fact, I think this administration and its policies were their target. And, frankly, I wonder how they manage to look at themselves in the mirror in the morning.

*Q.* Mr. President, much of the sniping, though, came from inside the White House—from your staff; other people outside were orchestrated to do it. Governor Kean of New Jersey was not discouraged from coming down here and asking her to resign. How do you react to that? I mean, you didn't put a stop to that.

*The President.* I don't know of anything of that kind. I know that you were all citing these unnamed White House sources that thought that she would resign. And I will admit, there must be people—I still would like to find them out and identify them—there must have been people or they're probably the same people that said that about everyone else who was attacked in some way in our administration, and all of whom have been cleared completely. And yet, the same charges were made: Oh, it might be a political embarrassment. Well, I'm not that easily politically embarrassed. When I know and have faith in the individual, I am not going to yield to the first attack and run for cover and throw somebody off the sleigh.

*Q.* But the Republican polls now show that your policies are perceived by the public, your environmental policies, as being more favorable to polluters than to the public. Are you going to change any of your environmental policies now that Mrs. Burford has gone?

*The President.* That's all they've heard, but no one has given any evidence that that is true. I'd like to call your attention to the fact that in 8 years as Governor, California not only led every State in the Union, we led the Federal Government in environmental protection. We were the forerunners of the whole movement. And how this idea has come, I sometimes suspect that the lobbyists for the environmental interests feel they have to keep their constituents stirred up or they might not have jobs anymore.

*Q.* Well, you think the slowness in getting the Superfund into action at a number of sites has contributed to that perception and the fact that you have been quoted in the past as talking about environmental extremism?

*The President.* Well there is environmental extremism. I don't think they'll be happy until the White House looks like a bird's nest. [Laughter]

*Ms. Thomas.* Thank you, Mr. President.

*The President.* Helen, once, may I digress? There was a young lady here who I missed.

*Ms. Thomas.* Of course.

#### *Central America and El Salvador*

*Q.* Thank you, Mr. President. Back to El Salvador for a minute—the civil war there has been going on for 3 years. With the aid that you're now proposing, do you feel that you have any idea when the conflict will stop, when it will be under control? Or is the United States prepared to make an open-ended commitment?

*The President.* I can't give you a date when a thing of this kind will end. Every effort is being made, as I say, to persuade them to come in and join in a peaceful solution to the problems.

This is also a regional problem. And the other countries, their neighbors—Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, Panama, and others—are holding meetings to see what they, regionally, can do about this. Now, we're not participating in those. We would be an interested observer. We certainly encourage that kind of thing.

But these are other countries that have adopted democracy. Costa Rica. I don't know of any country—they don't even have

an army. They are the most democratic country that you can imagine. Honduras has ended a long tradition of military rule and has a democratic form of government. And they all want to help because they recognize that this is an outside threat, really, to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

And I hope that it'll be a short time. I hope that these appeals and offers of amnesty will bring some of those people down from the hills. But I also have to recognize—not be naive—that these people up there in the hills are not just discontented peasants who have managed to get their hands on a military weapon. These are trained and highly equipped military forces—trained and equipped and backed by outsiders by way, mainly, of Cuba, through Nicaragua.

And so I think that we have to stay with this. And I don't see why there is so much opposition to it. We have no intention of sending combat forces, nor have we ever been asked for combat forces. And there's no intention of us sending the adviser teams to be with combat units or anything. We're talking about simply giving their military some of the fundamental training to enable them to do the job.

#### *Soviet Expulsion of U.S. Diplomat*

*Q.* Mr. President, the Soviets have expelled a spy—

*The President.* Helen said, "thank you." I've got to—

*Q.* Can't you just tell us about the Soviets expelling the spy—

*Mr. Speakes.* Lesley [Lesley Stahl, CBS News], no questions. Sorry.

*Q.* —and was he spying, and what is your reaction?

*The President.* I don't know anything further than any of you know about that.

*Reporters.* Thank you very much, Mr. President.

*The President.* All right. Thank you all.

*Note: The President spoke at 11:02 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.*

*Larry Speakes is the Principal Deputy Press Secretary to the President.*

---

#### Digest of Other White House Announcements

---

*The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.*

---

#### *March 1*

The President transmitted a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concerning the late transmittals of certain international agreements.

#### *March 2*

The White House announced that the President has invited King Birenda of Nepal to pay a state visit to the United States. His Majesty has accepted the invitation and will meet with the President in Washington during the fall.

#### *March 4*

In the afternoon, the President met in his suite at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco with Secretary of State George P. Shultz, Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger, and Secretary of the Treasury Donald T. Regan for a wide-ranging overview of foreign policy, including defense policy and international economics.

In the evening, the President and Mrs. Reagan left the St. Francis Hotel and went to Pier 50, where the royal yacht, *Britannia*, was moored in San Francisco Harbor. They boarded the yacht for a dinner hosted by Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip and a small party commemorating the Reagan's 31st wedding anniversary which followed the dinner. The President and Mrs. Reagan remained overnight on the *Britannia* as guests of the Queen.

#### *March 7*

The President met at the White House with:

- members of the White House staff;
- representatives of the National Coalition for Peace Through Strength;

director and director of the California Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Svahn received a B.A. degree in political science from the University of Washington in 1966. He is married with two children and resides in Severna Park, Md. Mr. Svahn was born in New London, Conn., on May 13, 1943.

## Commodity Futures Trading Commission

*Nomination of Philip F. Johnson To Be a Commissioner, and Designation as Chairman. March 3, 1981*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Philip F. Johnson to be Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Upon confirmation the President intends to designate Mr. Johnson as Chairman for the term expiring April 13, 1984.

Mr. Johnson is a partner with the firm of Kirkland & Ellis of Chicago, Ill., where he has specialized in the Commodity Exchange Act and its regulations for 15 years. Mr. Johnson has been a speaker and a panelist at seminars and conferences on the Commodity Exchange Act sponsored by the Federal Bar Association, the Bureau of National Affairs, American Law Institute, the Futures Industry Association, the Chicago Board of Trade, the American Bar Association, and other groups. He has served as a member of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission's Advisory Committee on the Definition and Regulation of Market Instruments and is a member of the CFTC Advisory Committee on State Jurisdiction and Responsibilities.

Mr. Johnson is a member of the govern-

ing Council of the American Bar Association's Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law, the ABA's largest professional group, and has served as chairman of the ABA's Committee on Commodities Regulation since its creation in 1976.

Mr. Johnson has authored many articles on the Commodity Exchange Act. He serves as a member of the board of directors of the commodity industry's national trade association, the Futures Industry Association.

Mr. Johnson was graduated from Indiana University (A.B., 1959) and Yale Law School (LL.B., 1962). He resides in Chicago, Ill., and is 42 years old.

## Federal Aviation Administration

*Nomination of J. Lynn Helms To Be Administrator. March 3, 1981*

The President today announced his intention to nominate J. Lynn Helms to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. Helms retired in 1980 as chairman of the board of Piper Aircraft Corp., having been elected to that post in September 1978. He served as president of Piper from July 1974 through September 1978 and as chief executive officer from July 1974 through September 1979.

Previously, Mr. Helms was group vice president of the Bendix Corp. and president of the Norden Division of United Technologies.

In 1980 he served as chairman of the board of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association. Mr. Helms is active in many other aviation-related organizations. He is a member of the State of Arkansas National Advisory Board, a fellow in the American Institute of Aeronautics Asso-

ciation, a director of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, and a member of the Society of Experimental Test Pilots Association. He was elected to the Pioneers Club for being the first aviator to exceed 1,000 mph in combat aircraft. Mr. Helms is a regular guest lecturer at the University of Michigan Graduate Business School and the Industrial College in Washington, D.C. He was selected for the General James H. Doolittle award and trophy in September 1980.

Mr. Helms has logged well over 10,000 hours of flight time and holds an active commercial certificate. He continues to log nearly 350 hours annually.

Born in DeQueen, Ark., on March 1, 1925, Mr. Helms attended Oklahoma University. During World War II, he completed U.S. Navy flight training and entered the U.S. Marine Corps. He resides in Westport, Conn.

## Interview With the President

*Question-and-Answer Session With Walter Cronkite of CBS News. March 3, 1981*

### EL SALVADOR

MR. CRONKITE. Mr. President, with your administration barely 6 weeks old, you're involved now in, perhaps, the first foreign policy crisis—if it can be called a crisis yet; probably cannot be, but it is being much discussed, of course—much concern about El Salvador and our commitment there. Do you see any parallel in our committing advisers and military assistance to El Salvador and the early stages of our involvement in Vietnam?

THE PRESIDENT. No, Walter, I don't. I know that that parallel is being drawn by many people. But the difference is so profound. What we're actually doing is, at

the request of a government in one of our neighboring countries, offering some help against the import or the export into the Western Hemisphere of terrorism, of disruption. And it isn't just El Salvador. That happens to be the target at the moment. Our problem is this whole hemisphere and keeping this sort of thing out.

Now, we have sent briefing teams to Europe, down to our Latin American neighbors with what we've learned of the actual involvement of the Soviet Union, of Cuba, of the PLO, of, even, Qadhafi in Libya, and others in the Communist bloc nations to bring about this terrorism down there.

Now, you use the term "military advisers." You know, there's a sort of a technicality there. You could say they are advisers in that they're training, but when it's used as "adviser," that means military men who go in and accompany the forces into combat, advise on strategy and tactics. We have no one of that kind. We're sending and have sent teams down there to train. They do not accompany them into combat. They train recruits in the garrison area. And as a matter of fact, we have such training teams in more than 30 countries today, and we've always done that—the officers of the military in friendly countries and in our neighboring countries; have come to our service schools—West Point, Annapolis, and so forth. So, I don't see any parallel at all.

And I think it is significant that the terrorists, the guerrilla activity in El Salvador was supposed to cause an uprising that the government would fall because the people would join this aggressive force and support them. The people are totally against that and have not reacted in that way.

MR. CRONKITE. Well, that's one of the questions that's brought up about the wisdom of our policy right at the moment.

Some Latin Americans feel that President Duarte has control of the situation. The people have not risen. This last offensive of the guerrillas did not work, and therefore aren't we likely to exacerbate the situation by American presence there now, therefore sort of promoting a self-fulfilling prophecy by coming down there and getting the guerrillas and the people themselves upset about "big brother" intervention, and therefore losing the game instead of winning it.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no, and we realize that our southern friends down there do have memories of the great colossus of the North and so forth—but no, his government has asked for this because of the need for training against terrorist and guerrilla activities, has asked for materiel such as helicopters and so forth that can be better at interdicting the supply lines where these illicit weapons are being brought in to the guerrillas, and this is what we've provided. And some of these teams that have been provided are also to help keep those machines in the air and on the water—patrol boats and so forth—to try to interdict the supply by water of weapons and ammunition. They need help in repair. They get laid up for repairs, and they don't have the qualified technicians.

MR. CRONKITE. What really philosophically is different from our going down to help a democratic government sustain itself against guerrilla activity promoted from the outside—Soviet and Cuban aid, as we believe it to be; your administration says it is—and Afghanistan? El Salvador is in our sort of geopolitical sphere of influence. Afghanistan, on the border of the Soviet Union, is certainly in their geopolitical sphere of influence. They went in with troops to support a Marxist government friendly to them. Why isn't that a parallel situation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think there can be a parallel there, because I was in Iran in '78 when the first coup came about, and it was the Soviet Union that put their man as President of Afghanistan. And then their man didn't work out to their satisfaction, so, they came in and got rid of him and brought another man that they'd been training in Moscow and put him in as their President. And then, with their armed forces, they are trying to subdue the people of Afghanistan who do not want this pro-Soviet government that has been installed by an outside force.

The parallel would be that without actually using Soviet troops, in effect, the Soviets are, you might say, trying to do the same thing in El Salvador that they did in Afghanistan, but by using proxy troops through Cuba and guerrillas. And they had hoped for, as I said, an uprising of the people that would then give them some legitimacy in the government that would be installed—the Communist government—but the people didn't rise up. The people have evidenced their desire to have the government they have and not be ruled by these guerrillas.

MR. CRONKITE. Secretary of State Haig has said that we'll not have a Vietnam in El Salvador, because the United States will direct its action toward Cuba, which is the main source of the intervention, in his words. But Cuba is a client state of the Soviet Union. It's not likely to stand by and let us take direct action against Cuba, is it?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, that term "direct action," there are a lot of things open—diplomacy, trade, a number of things—and Secretary Haig has explained his use of the term, the source with regard to Cuba means the intercepting and stopping of the supplies coming into these countries—the export from Cuba of those

arms, the training of the guerrillas as they've done there. And I don't think in any way that he was suggesting an assault on Cuba.

MR. CRONKITE. That intercepting and stopping means blockade. And isn't that an act of war?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, this depends. If you intercept them when they're landing at the other end or find them where they're in the locale such as, for example, Nicaragua, and informing Nicaragua that we're aware of the part that they have played in this, using diplomacy to see that a country decides they're not going to allow themselves to be used anymore—there's been a great slowdown. We're watching it very carefully—Nicaragua—of the transfer of arms to El Salvador. This doesn't mean that they're not coming in from other guerrilla bases in other countries there.

MR. CRONKITE. You've said that we could extricate ourselves easily from El Salvador if that were required at any given point in this proceeding. I assume you mean at any given point. How could we possibly extricate ourselves? Even now, from this initial stage, how could we extricate ourselves without a severe loss of face?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think we're planning on having to extricate ourselves from there. But the only thing that I could see that could have brought that about is if the guerrillas had been correct in their assessment and there had been the internal disturbance. Well, then it would be a case of we're there at the behest of the present government. If that government is no longer there, we're not going there without an invitation. We're not forcing ourselves upon them, and you'd simply leave—and there aren't that many people to be extricated.

MR. CRONKITE. Even if the Duarte

forces begin to lose with whatever military materiel assistance we give them, whatever training advisers we give them, are you pledging that we will not go in with fighting forces?

THE PRESIDENT. I certainly don't see any likelihood of us going in with fighting forces. I do see our continued work in the field of diplomacy with neighboring countries that are interested in Central America and South America to bring this violence to a halt and to make sure that we do not just sit passively by and let this hemisphere be invaded by outside forces.

#### U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

MR. CRONKITE. Moving on. Your hard line toward the Soviet Union is in keeping with your campaign statements, your promises. But there are some who, while applauding that stance, feel that you might have overdone the rhetoric a little bit in laying into the Soviet leadership as being liars and thieves, et cetera.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, let's recap. I am aware that what I said received a great deal of news attention, and I can't criticize the news media for that. I said it. But the thing that seems to have been ignored—well, two things—one, I did not volunteer that statement. This was not a statement that I went in and called a press conference and said, "Here, I want to say the following." I was asked a question. And the question was, what did I think were Soviet aims? Where did I think the Soviet Union was going? And I had made it clear to them, I said, "I don't have to offer my opinion. They have told us where they're going over and over again. They have told us that their goal is the Marxian philosophy of world revolution and a single, one-world Communist state and that they're dedicated to that."

And then I said we're naive if we don't recognize in their performance of that, that they also have said that the only morality—remember their ideology is without God, without our idea of morality in the religious sense—their statement about morality is that nothing is immoral if it furthers their cause, which means they can resort to lying or stealing or cheating or even murder if it furthers their cause, and that is not immoral. Now, if we're going to deal with them, then we have to keep that in mind when we deal with them. And I've noticed that with their own statements about me and their attacks on me since I answered that question that way—it is the only statement I've made—they have never denied the truth of what I said.

MR. CRONKITE. You don't think that name-calling, if you could call it that, makes it more difficult when you do finally, whenever that is, sit down across the table from Mr. Brezhnev and his cohorts?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I've been interested to see that he has suggested having a summit meeting since I said that.

MR. CRONKITE. Let me ask another question about being tough with the Russians. When Ambassador Dobrynin of the Soviet Union drove over to the State Department for the first time after the administration came in, his car was turned away at the entrance to the basement garage, which he had been using, told that he had to use the street door like all the other diplomats had been doing. It was obviously tipped to the press that this was going to happen.

What advantage is there in embarrassing the Soviet Ambassador like that? A phone call would have said, "Hey, you can't use that door any longer." Was that just a macho thing for domestic consumption or—

THE PRESIDENT. I have to tell you, I

didn't know anything about it until I read it in the paper, saw it on television myself. I don't know actually how that came about or what the decision was, whether it was just one of those bureaucratic things in the—

MR. CRONKITE. You didn't ask Secretary Haig about it?

THE PRESIDENT. No, and I just don't know—

MR. CRONKITE. Don't you think the Russians kind of think we're childish when we pull one like that?

THE PRESIDENT. I don't know. I don't know, or maybe they got a message.

MR. CRONKITE. What conditions do have to be satisfied before you would agree to a summit meeting with Brezhnev?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think it isn't a case of—well, there are some things that I think would help bring that about. The main thing is you don't just call up and say, "Yeah, let's get together and have lunch." A summit meeting of that kind takes a lot of preparation. And the first preparation from our standpoint is the pledge that we've made to our allies, that we won't take unilateral steps. We'll only do things after full consultation with them, because they're involved also. And I've had an opportunity to talk a little bit about it just—it only came to light, his statement, a short time ago—with Prime Minister Thatcher when she was here. So, we haven't had the opportunity for the consultations about that that would be necessary.

I have said that I will sit and negotiate with them for a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons to lower the threshold of danger that exists in the world today. Well, one of the things—you say "conditions"—I think one of them would be some evidence on the part of the Soviet Union that they are willing to discuss that. So far, previous Presidents, including my

predecessor, tried to bring negotiations to the point of actual reduction, and the Soviet Union refused. They refused to discuss that. I think that we would have to know that they're willing to do that.

I think it would help bring about such a meeting if the Soviet Union revealed that it is willing to moderate its imperialism, its aggression—Afghanistan would be an example. We could talk a lot better if there was some indication that they truly wanted to be a member of the peace-loving nations of the world, the free world.

MR. CRONKITE. Isn't that really what you have to negotiate? I mean, is it really conceivable that you're going to get such a change of heart, a change of statement that you could believe on the part of the Soviet Union before you ever sit down to talk with President Brezhnev?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, is that subject a negotiation? If you sit at a table and say, "We want you to get out of Afghanistan," and they're going to say, "No," what do you do? Let them go in someplace else if they'll get out of there?

I remember when Hitler was arming and had built himself up—no one's created quite the military power that the Soviet Union has, but comparatively he was in that way—Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a speech in Chicago at the dedication of a bridge over the Chicago River. And in that speech he called on the free world to quarantine Nazi Germany, to stop all communication, all trade, all relations with them until they gave up that militaristic course and agreed to join with the free nations of the world in a search for peace.

MR. CRONKITE. That did a whale of a lot of good.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, but the funny thing was he was attacked so here in our own country for having said such a thing. Can we honestly look back now and say

that World War II would have taken place if we had done what he wanted us to do back in 1938? I think there's a very good chance it wouldn't have taken place.

But again, as I say, some evidence from the Soviet Union, I think, would be very helpful in bringing about a meeting.

MR. CRONKITE. It sounds as if, sir, you're saying that there isn't going to be any summit meeting with Brezhnev.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I haven't put that as a hard and fast condition. I'm just saying that in discussing with our allies, it would make it a lot easier if we were able to say, "Well now, look, they've shown some signs of moderating their real imperialistic course." You know, when we look at where they are and with their surrogates, Qadhafi in Chad, Cuba in Angola, Cuba and East Germans in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, and of course, now the attempt here in our own Western Hemisphere.

MR. CRONKITE. Well, I hate to belabor this, but since the whole world is looking forward, I think, to eventually some negotiations to stop the arms race, to get off of this danger point, it is an important thing, and I gather that the Soviet Union has to make a unilateral move—to their point, it would be backwards, that they'd let's say, get out of Afghanistan. Do they have to get out of Afghanistan before you'd meet?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I haven't said that. And, Walter, I can't really say a specific answer to any of these things unless and until I have met with and discussed this whole problem with allies who, you know, are only a bus ride from Russia.

MR. CRONKITE. They seem to be saying, as near as we can tell, in their press and elsewhere, that they're saying they're anxious for you to meet on arms control. They're anxious to get arms control discussions going. They're terribly concerned about that. They're fearful that you're not

going to want to negotiate until such time as you get your defense program and your economic program through Congress and feel that you're negotiating from strength, and that they're fearful that that's going to be some time—and too late.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, too late for what is the question. No, I don't know, but I do believe this: that it is rather foolish to have unilaterally disarmed, you might say, as we did by letting our defensive, our margin of safety deteriorate, and then you sit with the fellow who's got all the arms. What do you have to negotiate with? You're asking him to come down to where you are or you to build up to where he is, but you don't have anything to trade.

So, maybe realistic negotiations could take place. When? We can say, "Well, all right, this thing that we're building we'll stop if you'll stop doing whatever it is you're really doing."

MR. CRONKITE. You campaigned on lifting the grain embargo—the Soviet Union. You delayed doing that so far, because you, I gather, feel it would send the Russians the wrong message, perhaps, if you did. Senator Helms has suggested perhaps that the grain embargo should be extended to a general boycott of all U.S. trade with the Soviet Union. Is that an option that you're studying?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I don't think you rule out anything. Actually, my campaigning was more on my criticism that the embargo shouldn't have taken place the way it did in the first place, that if we were going to go that route, then it should have been a general embargo. We shouldn't have asked just one segment of our society—and not even agriculture, just the grain farmers—to bear the burden of this, when at the same time we knew we could not enforce or persuade friendly nations to us who would be

tempted to take over that market and many of them did, started supplying the grain that we weren't supplying. So, the question was: Were we hurting ourselves worse than we were hurting them? Certainly it didn't stop the invasion of Afghanistan. And I criticized this.

At the same time—and we have made no decision now on it—I would like to lift the embargo. I think all of us would. But at the same time, now and with Poland added, the situation in Poland to Afghanistan and all, we have to think very hard as to whether we can just go forward unilaterally and do this.

MR. CRONKITE. Because in effect it has been effective. They are having problems with grain supply there, are they not?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think they'll always have problems with supply, because they insist on that collective farm business, which never has worked and isn't going to work in the future.

You know, this is something that I've never been able to understand about the Russian leaders. Wouldn't you think sometime they would take a look at their system and say, "We can't provide enough food to feed our people," to say nothing of other consumer items that are still rationed and scarce in supply under that system? And yet, we can look at these other countries in the world, all the countries that chose this way—not only the United States but South Korea, Taiwan, all the countries that choose the free marketplace—their standard of living goes up and up. Our problem isn't one of not raising enough food; it's not finding enough places to sell it.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

MR. CRONKITE. What place do you think human rights should have in our foreign policy?

THE PRESIDENT. I think human rights is very much a part of our American idealism. I think they do play an important part. My criticism of them, in the last few years, was that we were selective with regard to human rights.

We took countries that were pro-Western, that were maybe authoritarian in government, but not totalitarian, more authoritarian than we would like, did not meet all of our principles of what constitutes human rights, and we punished them at the same time that we were claiming détente with countries where there are no human rights. The Soviet Union is the greatest violator today of human rights in all the world. Cuba goes along with it, and yet, previously, while we were enforcing human rights with others, we were talking about bettering relations with Castro's Cuba.

I think that we ought to be more sincere about our position on human rights.

MR. CRONKITE. Do you believe that our requirements for military allies and bases should take precedence over human rights considerations?

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think what I'm saying is that where we have an alliance with a country that, as I say, does not meet all of ours, we should look at it that we're in a better position remaining friends, to persuade them of the rightness of our view on human rights than to suddenly, as we have done in some places, pull the rug out from under them and then let a completely totalitarian takeover that denies what human rights the people had had.

MR. CRONKITE. Doesn't that put us in the position rather of abetting the suppression of human rights for our own selfish ends, at least temporarily, until such time as we can make those persuasive changes?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, what has the choice turned out to be? The choice has

turned out to be they lose all human rights because there's a totalitarian takeover.

MR. CRONKITE. Your appointment to the head of the human rights section over at the State Department is Mr. Ernest Lefever, of course. He testified to the House Subcommittee in '79, "In my view, the United States should remove from the statute books all clauses that establish a human rights standard or condition that must be met by another sovereign nation." Do you agree with that flat statement?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I've never had a chance to discuss with him just how he views that or what he believes the course would take. I do, however, believe that contrary to some of the attacks against him, that he's as concerned about human rights as the rest of us. But I think what he means is that basic human rights and the violation of them are being ignored by us where they take place in the Communist bloc nations.

MR. CRONKITE. He says also that we should not be concerned with South Africa's racial policies, but should make the country a full-fledged partner of the United States in the struggle against Communist expansion. Should we drop all of our concerns about human rights in South Africa?

THE PRESIDENT. No, no, and I think, though, that there's been a failure, maybe for political reasons in this country, to recognize how many people, black and white, in South Africa are trying to remove apartheid and the steps that they've taken and the gains that they've made. As long as there's a sincere and honest effort being made, based on our own experience in our own land, it would seem to me that we should be trying to be helpful. And can we, again, take that other course? Can we abandon a country that has stood beside us in every war we've

ever fought, a country that strategically is essential to the free world in its production of minerals we all must have and so forth?

I just feel that, myself, that here, if we're going to sit down at a table and negotiate with the Russians, surely we can keep the door open and continue to negotiate with a friendly nation like South Africa.

MR. CRONKITE. The Argentinian Government has just arrested internationally respected heads of the principal human rights organization there, seized their list of 6,000 persons who've disappeared under this government. Is the United States going to protest that?

THE PRESIDENT. I have not had an opportunity—that just happened, as you know, and I haven't had an opportunity to meet with Secretary Haig on this. In fact, the only information that so far has been presented to me is that it did happen.

#### PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

MR. CRONKITE. Let's move to some domestic affairs, which I think you're rather interested in these days—and the whole country is of course. Now that they face the stone-hard reality of it all, 150 liberal organizations have gotten together to campaign against your budget cuts in social welfare programs. Middle Western and Eastern, Northeastern States are concerned that the programs favor the Sunbelt. Some farm organizations are concerned that the subsidies are being cut, of course, all across-the-board. Now these people who are beginning to see that they're going to get hurt a little bit on these cuts. Are you still optimistic in the face of all of this opposition that it can be done?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I expected that

opposition. And one of the reasons I'm optimistic is because we've received 100,000 letters and telegrams since I made the speech on the 18th. We so far have only been able to open and read and catalog about 5,339, I think the figure is. And of that first 5,000-plus messages, 92-and-a-fraction percent are totally in support of our program of what we want to do. I know that polls have been taken, and a national poll recently has shown an even higher percentage of people in support of the program. I know from my own experience in the few times that I get out of here and can meet the citizenry, I find the same thing. It just is true, you feel it, you sense it, you hear it among the people out there.

It's, I'm afraid, a little bit like Senator Long said, that when you start to cut in the budget the slogan in Washington has been for too many years, "Don't cut you and don't cut me, cut that fellow behind the tree." And I think these various groups are representing a lot of people behind the trees.

MR. CRONKITE. Your targeted ceiling on Federal spending is \$695½ billion with a \$45 billion deficit. How much higher than that in that budget can Congress go without seriously endangering your program?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I have to say that I believe our package has been so carefully worked out that they endanger it if they start picking off any parts of it. Our program is aimed not only at reducing a budget but, with the tax feature of it, at stimulating the economy, increasing productivity, which means more jobs for our people, and which will reduce inflation. And I believe in our program. Yes, there'll be a \$45 billion deficit, but just think what that means. That means that that deficit would be double that without

our program. And this is why we're presenting it literally in a package.

As a matter of fact, Prime Minister Thatcher told me that she regretted in her own attempts that she has been unable to cut government spending as she knew she would have to to cure their ills. And she said one of the reasons was that she tried piecemeal, tried piece by piece to get this reduced, that reduced, and one by one, they just knocked it off and turned it down.

MR. CRONKITE. I'm just curious. Did she volunteer that, or did you ask her what went wrong with her program?

THE PRESIDENT. No, she volunteered that, yes.

MR. CRONKITE. Well, do you see a parallel there? There is a conservative government, came in with much the same sort of a plan you did to turn back the clock on socialistic advances, a revolutionary approach to change, and it has failed miserably there. Unemployment is higher than any time since the Great Depression. Thousands of small businesses have folded.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

MR. CRONKITE. Industrial production is low. Why isn't that a parallel to your problem?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, you see, I think in her case, we have to recognize how much farther down the road England had gone. She has great industries now that are government-owned monopolies and losing their shirts as a result, because government doesn't run businesses very well. She was up against—well, we've now seen the Labor Party split in its own convention, and the left wing take over—she was up against that powerful left wing element that was sabotaging. I don't think her experiment is over. I have confidence in her, and I admire her greatly and her courage, and she's still going at it.

I think we might have the same problems, but we still have the infrastructure. We still have this great industrial capacity of ours here. And if people would only look at it, what we're trying to correct that's gone wrong is: Some years ago when things were going better, government was only taking 19 percent of the gross national product; it's now taking 23 percent, and it's been increasing, it's on an upward line if we don't head it off. And so that cost of government plus the fact that the only way we can maintain that is by continued borrowing to the point that we're close to having a trillion dollar debt—a trillion.

MR. CRONKITE. I understand you're still trying to visualize a trillion dollars.

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

MR. CRONKITE. Mr. President, let me ask you about Congress again though. This is the whole core of the thing right now, of course, is getting that program through. Now, you say you need 100 percent of it. Of course you do. That's what you're after. But realistically—and you're a realistic man—you can't really expect to get all of it through. I mean, there's got to be some failure somewhere along the line of getting it all through there. Are you going to be in the position, politically at any rate, of saying all those thousands out there who are for you to get the cuts made that if Congress cuts this one cent or adds one cent to it, that it's not your responsibility any longer. Congress has failed you and failed the people.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Walter, I virtually have to say that because if I said anything else—I played in the line when I played football—it's like giving the play away and indicating to your opponent where the play's going.

No, I can't—I have to stay with it. I think our package is designed—and the thing that is significant to me about all

those people that you mentioned a moment ago that are opposed to the plan, as well as some of those on the Hill who are opposed: No one has brought up an alternative. Those are the people who have been dictating the policies of this country for the last three or four decades, that have put the country in the economic position it is in. Unless they can come up and say, "We are now recommending a change in this direction or that direction to cure what has happened," how can they stand and oppose a program that is designed to cure the economic chaos that they created?

MR. CRONKITE. The supply-siders feel that their program, your program, should get its first results through psychology, that the mere approach to these problems being made in a frontal assault by your administration will encourage people to get out and do the things necessary—invest and save and do the things necessary. They'll have faith in this. Do you see any early results of that yet?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, one of the things that the mail we get and one of the things that I hear from pollsters and so forth is to the effect that there is a different attitude, that there is a kind of glow out there among the people and a confidence that things are going to be all right, where, a short time ago, polls were revealing that the people didn't think things were going to get better. Now, maybe that's what they meant.

But also there is this in our package that isn't just psychology. Maybe by a stretch you could call it that. But our program gives a stability down the road ahead. A person can say, "I know what's going to happen for the next few years," even in the 3-year implementing of the tax program. Someone can say, "I have confidence to do this, because I have been told and I know that this is what's going

to happen to my tax situation in the years ahead." Business will know that they can invest in plant and that they're going to be allowed a better break in writing off the depreciation and so forth.

MR. CRONKITE. The cuts to be announced March 10th—we've seen some advance information on it. Whether it's entirely correct or not, we have no way of knowing, but the agricultural cuts to be announced, we understand, will cut back Agriculture Department's Supplemental Food Programs, which include milk to children and pregnant women and that sort of thing, dairy products, fruit, to low-income families. Is that in there? Is that the cut?

THE PRESIDENT. I can't tell you. We're still going at this, and the program is going to be presented. But, no, what we're talking about, though, in programs of that kind—and this has to do with food stamps too—is not taking those things away from the people who would have no other means of getting them. But programs have a way to expand. Bureaucracy has to justify its existence. So, they spread and they accumulate barnacles, and what we're doing is taking a look at some of those barnacles. And you suddenly find and say, "Well, why are we, at taxpayers' expense, providing milk for this particular segment, who are perfectly able to provide it for themselves and other people of no better circumstances are providing it for themselves." The same true of food stamps. These are where we're trying to make the cuts.

I believe that in our seven programs that we call the safety net, below which no one should be allowed to fall, we have not. We have preserved that safety net. We have not cut that and—

MR. CRONKITE. How far below the present standard of living, even for the

poverty groups in the country, is the safety net beyond where it is today?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, the safety net is where it should be. But it isn't so much of lowering or raising it, it is a case of finding that around the edge of that safety net, we had acquired a group of people who were benefiting from it who didn't need to be there.

MR. CRONKITE. Well, they say in New York, now—of course, these figures are suspect too in a way because nobody knows precisely—but they're talking about a cut of 20,000 children off the Aid to Dependent Children; there's 30,000 old people off the help to the elderly. Is it your intention that that many people are on this fringe area? And even if they are, isn't it going to create a considerable hardship for them? They're not that much above poverty level.

THE PRESIDENT. Walter, I hadn't seen those figures of people doing that. But let me just tell you an experience from California, again which is one that we're going to ride herd on very closely. The permanent structure of government, what we commonly call the bureaucracy, has a great ability of self-defense, to preserve itself. And we found sometimes in our own welfare reforms there that in an effort to focus attention and try to build a case against what we were trying to do, they would deliberately pick out the people who could be harmed the most and interpret what you were trying to do as denying aid to that particular person.

Now, we've had a little example of that: the so-called retroactive freeze on employment and suddenly the terrible stories—and I'm sure many of them true—about people who sold their homes, gave up their jobs, and came to Washington to get a job. But I can't deny the fact or overlook the fact that before November 4th I was saying that one of the first things

I would do in the first 24 hours is put a freeze on the hiring of replacements—Federal employees. And, indeed, in the first hour, when after I took the oath and walked back into the Capitol building, I signed that executive order, and suddenly we find thousands of people who were recruited, beginning November 5th, and yet for some reason had not yet been put in their jobs by January 20th. And then the uproar that this was retroactive to November 5th—we didn't say anything about November 5th, but we also didn't realize that they could actually hold people for that long, leaving them to think they had jobs, and yet had not processed them and put them in the jobs. I have to be suspicious of this.

Now, the truth is, many of those people were victims, not of us, they were victims of what I think was a bureaucratic trick. And where we are finding real cases of distress because of that, we are making exceptions, because it wasn't their fault. They didn't know they were being victimized.

Now, I think, when I hear figures like this about who will have to be cut, this again, is the bureaucracy saying, "Okay, where can we make it?" It's like the old Washington story that if you cut the Park Service's budget, the first thing they fire is the elevator man at the Washington Monument and tell the people they've got to walk up 600 feet instead of ride. We're going to be on guard for that.

MR. CRONKITE. On your tax cuts, you cite the experience of the 1961 Kennedy tax cut to prove that it will hype up the economy. But that cut was specifically to stimulate buying, whereas your objective is to stimulate savings and investment. Now, how do you justify that?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, whether he said to stimulate buying or not, remember he brought down the top bracket from 91

percent to 70 percent in that—it was over a 2-year period. Actually, he didn't implement the tax cuts, they followed his tragic death and were implemented, but they had been passed.

There is a page from a June issue of U.S. News and World Report, 1966, that I recommend as must reading, because the whole article on that page is about the strange paradox that the 2-year period of phased-in tax cuts, which is somewhat similar to what we're trying to do over 3 years, did not result, as the economists said they would, in an \$83 billion loss of revenue to Government. They couldn't explain the paradox that ever since the cuts went into effect the Government itself was getting more revenue, because the economy, the economic base, had been broadened and stimulated so each individual had the benefit of the cuts. But there were more individuals involved, so the government even profited. And as I say, that's 1966, in this 2-year program.

We can come up to 1978. The Steiger-Hansen bill that cut the capital gains tax, and the very first year, the Government got more revenue from the capital gains tax at the lower rate than it had gotten at the higher. Why? Because suddenly capital gains, we'd removed some of the penalty, and capital gains, for those people who could invest and use capital gains for revenue, had become attractive again. And they did more of it.

MR. CRONKITE. But also, if I may pursue that issue, a 2-percent inflation, 1.2 percent, less than 2-percent inflation was the case in the sixties, mid-sixties. Now it's over 10 percent, it's double-digit. Certainly, with a 10-percent of the tax rate, which isn't a full 10-percent cut, as we know, 10 percent of 50 percent, 10 percent of 20 percent, whatever, 2-percent cut perhaps—but all of that certainly when you've got a 10-percent inflation or more,

it's got to go into making up for the inflation among most of the population. Only the very rich can afford to save and invest under these circumstances.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, no. Some polls have been taken on that, and they find at the very bottom of the ladder, yes, people say there are things that they will use it for in buying. But from there on up, the overwhelming majority in those polls reveal that they will use it for savings and investment.

MR. CRONKITE. Secretary of Treasury Regan argues that this is not so, because the tax cut will benefit the upper bracket, and the rich will be saving and investing. And yet, the propaganda has been, oh, now, it's going to benefit the lower brackets more than the upper. So, isn't there a dichotomy there?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, it's across-the-board. And there's no question about it. If it's 10 percent, it's a reduction of the rates, the tax rates, 10 percent right from the basic rate of 14 percent now right on up to the top rate and then 10 percent the following, 10 percent the next. And a cut in the tax rates does not follow that dollar-for-dollar there will be a reduction in Government's revenues as these other things that I've given illustrate. But, it's where you define the rich.

The simple truth is that in the income bracket between \$10,000 and \$60,000—now, I think you have to say, in today's inflated world, we're talking about the great middle class of America, the people who really make this country go—that bracket from ten to sixty thousand is paying today 72 percent of the income tax. They are going to get 73 percent, which I guess is about as close as you could get it, of the benefits of our tax bill. Now, I would say that in there, maybe when you get to 15, and from there up, you're going

to be talking to people who will be able to save, invest, buy insurance, things that they're perhaps not able, and then that money becomes capital in the hands of the financial institutions for reinvestment.

MR. CRONKITE. Are you in favor of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy and high interest rates?

THE PRESIDENT. I have to say that those high interest rates, I'm afraid, are the result of inflation, because it's as simple as this if you really look at it, although they're going to cooperate in a monetary policy that is geared to what we're trying to do. But if you're asking someone to lend money, when you look down the road and see nothing being done to curb inflation and inflation is running in double digits, as it has back-to-back now for 2 years, the person that's lending the money has to get an interest rate that will show that when he gets his money back he's getting back as much or more than he loaned. So, it is inflation that dictates that high interest rate. The interest rate has to be higher than the inflation rate or no one can afford to lend the money.

MR. CRONKITE. But if we cut the high interest rate then that would dampen inflation—if you could do it that way, but we can't do it.

THE PRESIDENT. No, I think the other came first.

MR. CRONKITE. If I may, we are running kind of out of time. I've got a few that if we can keep it real short—

THE PRESIDENT. All right.

MR. CRONKITE. —well, maybe we can still get a few more in.

#### ILLEGAL ALIENS

MR. CRONKITE. Illegal immigration is one of the major problems we have in the country today, and the congressional task force has just come in with a study on it.

One of its recommendations, besides putting responsibility on employers not to hire illegal aliens, is to provide some means of identification for the aliens so that the employer will know who he's hiring. Would you support some form of national identification that could help attack this problem?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, now, I'm very intrigued by a program that's been suggested by several border State Governors and their counterparts in the Mexican States on the other side of the border. They have met together on this problem. We have to remember we have a neighbor and a friendly nation on an almost 2,000-mile border down there. And they have an unemployment rate that is far beyond anything—a safety valve has to be some of that that we're calling "illegal immigration" right now. What these Governors have come up with—and I'm very intrigued with it—is a proposal that we and the Mexican Government get together and legalize this and grant visas, because it is to our interest also that that safety valve is not shut off and that we might have a breaking of the stability south of the border.

At the same time, that would then make these people in our country—an employer could not take advantage of them and work them at sweatshop wages and so forth under the threat of turning them in. They at the same time, then, would be paying taxes in this country for whatever they earned. They would be able to go legally back across the border if they wanted to, and come back across. But the border would become a two-way border for all our people.

And I'm very intrigued with that I'd like to talk about it and intend to, in April when I meet with President López Portillo.

## VIEWS ON THE PRESIDENCY

MR. CRONKITE. Final question. What's the greatest surprise that you've experienced in the Presidency?

THE PRESIDENT. Walter, that's a—I know you're running out of time, and here I am hemming and hawing. I guess it's every once in a while realizing that you are—you know, it isn't as if suddenly something happens to you. I don't feel any different than I did before, and then now and then something happens, and you're caught by surprise. You say, "Well, why are they doing that?" And maybe that's it.

I'm not surprised by the amount of work. As I've often said, I'm not surprised about the confinement of living in the White House. I lived above the store when I was a kid, and it's much like that. So, I guess I can't find anything other than that.

Maybe it all started due to some of you gentlemen on the air on Election Day. You'd think that that'd be a very dramatic moment, and I was worrying that it was going to be a moment that would last all night, waiting for the returns to come in. I was in the shower and was called out of the shower, just getting ready to go out, late afternoon, when the President was on the other end of the phone. I was wrapped in a towel and dripping wet, and he told me that he was conceding. And that wasn't the way I'd pictured it.

MR. CRONKITE. That was the biggest surprise?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes.

MR. CRONKITE. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, thank you, Walter. It's good to be here again. And I know you must be having a little nostalgia, the many Presidents that you've covered in this very room.

MR. CRONKITE. Indeed so, sir. It's been

a long time now. I was counting back. It's eight Presidents. It's been a remarkable period in our history.

THE PRESIDENT. Well, may I express appreciation. You've always been a pro.

MR. CRONKITE. I only regret that I'm stepping down from the evening news at the time when you are bringing such drama to our Government again in your efforts to turn it around.

Thank you, sir.

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 1:22 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. It was taped for later broadcast on the CBS television network.

## World Trade Week, 1981

*Proclamation 4823. March 3, 1981*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

## A Proclamation

International trade is an important means of furthering America's friendly international relations and of bettering the lives of all Americans.

Trade stimulates competition, stirs our creative energies, rewards individual initiative and increases national productivity. Among nations, it speeds the exchange of new ideas and technology.

As products made in this country compete successfully in world markets, we contribute to the strength and stability of our dollar, the expansion of our industry and fuller employment of our labor force.

For these reasons, the United States remains firmly committed to an active world trade role in the context of an increasingly interrelated international econ-

omy. A reciprocal spirit of world cooperation, permitting fair trade and investment between our country and the rest of the world, is indispensable to all of us.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning May 17, 1981, as World Trade Week, and I urge the people of the United States to cooperate in observing that week with activities that promote the importance of trade to our national well-being at home and abroad.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of March in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fifth.

RONALD REAGAN

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:35 p.m., March 4, 1981]

NOTE: The text of the proclamation was released on March 4.

## Department of Housing and Urban Development

*Nomination of Stephen May To Be an Assistant Secretary (Legislation).  
March 4, 1981*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Stephen May to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (Legislation).

Mr. May was with the firm of Branch, Turner and Wise of Rochester, N.Y., for the past 12 years. He served as mayor of Rochester in 1970-73. He was commissioner and chairman of the New York State Board of Elections in 1975-79, and a member of the Republican State Platform Committee in 1978. He was a

Rochester city councilman in 1966-73. Mr. May was executive assistant to Representative, and later, Senator Kenneth B. Keating in 1955-64.

Mr. May has been vice president, New York State Conference of Mayors; chairman of the Committee on Housing, White House Conference on Aging; and chairman of the board, Empire State Report (the journal of government and politics in New York State).

Mr. May is a graduate of Wesleyan University and Georgetown University. He is a veteran of the U.S. Army. Mr. May was born on July 30, 1931, in Rochester, N.Y.

## Urban Mass Transportation Administration

*Nomination of Arthur E. Teele, Jr., To Be Administrator. March 4, 1981*

The President today announced his intention to nominate Arthur E. Teele, Jr., to be Urban Mass Transportation Administrator.

Mr. Teele was team leader of the Department of Transportation Transition Group. He was national director of the voter groups division of the Reagan-Bush Committee in August-November, 1980.

Mr. Teele practiced law in Tallahassee, Fla., from 1976 to 1980. He is an expert on tax, regulatory, and labor-management relations. He served as a congressional intern in the U.S. House of Representatives, and developed legislative and taxation proposals for the Florida State Legislature.

He is a member of the Florida and American Bar Associations. Mr. Teele was an officer in the U.S. Army in 1967-76.

87196-331-0

>\$29.95

AMERICA

### The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence

"America is the only nation in the world that is founded on a creed. That creed is set forth with dogmatic and even theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence; perhaps the only piece of practical politics that is also theoretical politics and also great literature."

G.K. Chesterton  
*What I Saw in America*  
1927

\*\*\*

"The British race have always abhorred arbitrary and absolute government in every form. The great men who founded the American Constitution expressed this same separation of authority in the strongest and most durable form. Not only did they divide executive, legislative and judicial functions, but also by instituting a federal system they preserved immense and sovereign rights to local communities and by all these means they have maintained—often at some inconvenience—a system of law and liberty under which they thrived and reached the physical and, at this moment, the moral leadership of the world."

Winston Churchill  
Speech in Woodford, England  
Jan. 28, 1950

\*\*\*

"The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity."

Henry Clay, U.S. senator  
Speech in Senate  
1850

\*\*\*

"When we look down upon 100 years and see the origin of our Constitution, when we contemplate all its trials and triumphs, when we realize how completely the principles upon which it is based have met every national need and national peril, how devoutly should we say with Franklin, 'God governs in the affairs of men,' and how solemn should be the thought that to us is delivered this ark of the people's covenant, and to us is given the duty to shield it from impious hands."

President Grover Cleveland  
Speech at Constitutional Centennial celebration,  
Philadelphia  
September, 1887

\*\*\*

"Liberalism has . . . been too ready to associate itself with the promise in the Constitution of the right to property, instead of with the promise in the Declaration of Independence of the right to the pursuit of happiness. The balance between these is today upset, and it needs to be restored by an imaginative display of political energy."

Henry Fairlie  
*The Spoiled Child of the Western World*  
1976

\*\*\*

"... there are only two 'sides' in American history, those who are for the Declaration and those who are for the Constitution. Of course the two cannot be completely separated; they are twins, but they are not identical twins. Eleven years after the proclamation of the Declaration of Independence that men have a right to the 'pursuit of happiness,' the Constitution substituted for that pursuit the right to 'property.' From that moment, the meaning of the American idea was in dispute; the materialist was set against the idealist."

Henry Fairlie  
*The Spoiled Child of the Western World*  
1976

\*\*\*

"I doubt, too, whether any convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution; for when you assemble a number of men, to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected?"

Benjamin Franklin  
Speech to Constitutional Convention, Philadelphia  
1787

\*\*\*

"The Antifederalists of the American Revolution, preferring the Articles of Confederation to the nation-binding Constitution, also had obviously dreamed of a land which might never be a great and powerful nation but which could be a sweet and free country of towns and villages and farms."

Karl Hess  
*Dear America*  
1975

\*\*\*

"From [the Bill of Rights comes] the fullest flowering of individual human personality."

Herbert Hoover  
Speech in San Diego, Calif.  
1935

\*\*\*

Truman: "The first sin in the world."

Father: "Let us remember that revolution does not destroy established freedom."

Carlyle: "He will be more against it" asked what a deeper reality or sin had said.

Over Cleland's content: God governs

433 - "sure he act his own opinion & his own desire"

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 6, 1984

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT  
TO THE GEORGETOWN CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL AND STRATEGIC STUDIES

International Club, Washington, D.C.

9:57 A.M.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ann Armstrong. Thank you, Co-chairman Sam Nunn. I am honored to have this opportunity to take part in your National Leadership Forum. The CSIS reputation for distinguished scholarly research is well-deserved, and your organization rightly enjoys that great respect.

I'd like to address your theme of bipartisanship with a view toward America's foreign policy -- the challenges for the eighties.

All Americans share two great goals for foreign policy: a safer world, and a world in which individual rights can be respected and precious values may flourish. These goals are at the heart of America's traditional idealism, and our aspirations for world peace. Yet, while cherished by us, they do not belong exclusively to us. They're not made in America. They're shared by people everywhere.

Tragically, the world in which these fundamental goals are so widely shared is a very troubled world. While we and our allies may enjoy peace and prosperity, many citizens of the industrial world continue to live in fear of conflict and the threat of nuclear war. All around the globe terrorists threaten innocent people and civilized values. And in developing countries, the dreams of human progress have too often been lost to violent revolution and dictatorship.

Quite obviously the widespread desire for a safer and more humane world is, by itself, not enough to create such a world. In pursuing our worthy goals, we must go beyond honorable intentions and good will to practical means. We must be guided by these key principles: Realism -- the world is not as we wish it would be. Reality is often harsh. We will not make it less so, if we do not first see it for what it is. Strength -- we know that strength alone is not enough, but without it there can be no effective diplomacy and negotiations, no secure democracy and peace. Conversely, weakness or hopeful pacifity are only self-defeating. They invite the very aggression and instability that they would seek to avoid.

MORE

Now, economic growth -- this is the underlying base that ensures our strength and permits human potential to flourish. Neither strength nor creativity can be achieved or sustained without economic growth, both at home and abroad.

Intelligence -- our policies cannot be effective unless the information on which they're based is accurate, timely, and complete.

Shared responsibility with allies -- our friends and allies share the heavy responsibility for the protection of freedom. We seek and need their partnership, sharing burdens in pursuit of our common goals.

Non-aggression -- we have no territorial ambitions. We occupy no foreign lands. We build our strength only to ensure deterrence and to secure our interests if deterrence fails.

Dialogue with adversaries -- though we must be honest in recognizing fundamental differences with our adversaries, we must always be willing to resolve these differences by peaceful means.

Bipartisanship at home -- in our two-party democracy, an effective foreign policy must begin with bipartisanship and the sharing of responsibility for a safer and more humane world must begin at home.

During the past three years, we've been steadily rebuilding America's capacity to advance our foreign policy goals through renewed attention to these vital principles. Many threats remain. And peace may still seem precarious. But America is safer and more secure today because the people of this great nation have restored the foundation of its strength. We began with renewed realism, a clear eye to understanding of the world we live in and of our inescapable global responsibilities.

Our industries depend on the importation of energy and minerals from distant lands. Our prosperity requires a sound international financial system and free and open trading markets. And our security is inseparable from the security of our friends and neighbors.

I believe Americans today see the world with realism and maturity. The great majority of our people do not believe the stark differences between democracy and totalitarianism can be wished away. They understand that keeping America secure begins with keeping America strong and free.

When we took office in 1981, the Soviet Union had been engaged for twenty years in the most massive military buildup in history. Clearly, their goal was not to catch us, but to surpass us. Yet the United States remained a virtual spectator in the 1970s, a decade of neglect that took a severe toll on our defense capabilities. With bipartisan support, we embarked immediately on a major defense rebuilding program. We made good progress in restoring the morale in our men and women in uniform, restocking spare parts and ammunition,

replacing obsolescent equipment and facilities, improving basic training and readiness and pushing forward with long-overdue weapons programs.

The simple fact is that in the last half of the 1970's, we were not deterring, as events from Angola to Afghanistan made clear. Today we are. And that fact has fundamentally altered the future for millions of human beings. Gone are the days when the United States was perceived as a rudderless super power, a helpless hostage to world events. American leadership is back. Peace through strength is not a slogan. It's a fact of life. And we will not return to the days of hand-wringing, defeatism, decline and despair.

We have also upgraded significantly our intelligence capabilities, restoring morale in the intelligence agencies and increasing our capability to detect, analyze and counter hostile intelligence threats.

Economic strength, the underlying base of support for our defense buildup, has received a dramatic new boost. We've transformed a no-growth economy, crippled by disincentives, double-digit inflation, 21½ percent interest rates, plunging productivity and a weak dollar, into a dynamic growth economy bolstered by new incentives, stable prices, lower interest rates, a rebirth of productivity and restored our confidence in our currency.

Renewed strength at home has been accompanied by closer partnership with America's friends and allies. Far from buckling under Soviet intimidation, the unity of the NATO Alliance has held firm and we're moving forward to modernize our strategic deterrent.

The leader of America's oldest ally, French President Francois Mitterrand, recently reminded us that peace, like liberty, is never given. The pursuit of both is a continual one. In the turbulent times we live in, solidarity among friends is essential.

Our principles don't involve just rebuilding our strength. They also tell us how to use it. We remain true to the principle of non-aggression. On an occasion when the United States at the request of its neighbors, did use force in Grenada, we acted decisively, but only after it was clear a blood-thirsty regime had put American and Grenadian lives in danger, and the security of neighboring islands in danger. As soon as stability and freedom were restored in the island, we left. The Soviet Union had no such legitimate justification for its massive invasion of Afghanistan four years ago. And today, over 100,000 occupation troops remain there. The United States, by stark contrast, occupies no foreign nation, nor do we seek to.

Though we and the Soviet Union differ markedly, living in this nuclear age makes it imperative that we talk with each other.

If the new Soviet leadership truly is devoted to building a safer and more humane world, rather than expanding armed conquest, it will find a sympathetic partner in the West.

In pursuing these practical principles, we have throughout sought to revive the spirit that was once the hallmark of our postwar foreign policy: bipartisan cooperation between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government. Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done. If Republicans and Democrats will join together to confront four great challenges to American foreign policy in the eighties, then we can and will make great strides toward a safer and more humane world.

Challenge number one is to reduce the risk of nuclear war, and to reduce the levels of nuclear armaments in a way that also reduces the risk they will ever be used. We have no higher challenge, for a nuclear war cannot be won, and must never be fought. But merely to be against a nuclear war is not enough to prevent it. For thirty-five years the defense policy of the United States and her NATO allies has been based on one simple premise: we do not start wars, we maintain our conventional and strategic strength to deter aggression by convincing any potential aggressor that war could bring no benefit, only disaster. Deterrence has been, and will remain, the cornerstone of our national security policy to defend freedom and preserve peace.

But, as I mentioned, the 1970s were marked by neglect of our defenses. And nuclear safety was no exception. Too many forgot John Kennedy's warning that only when our arms are certain beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt they will never be used.

By the beginning of this decade, we face three growing problems: the Soviet SS-20 monopoly in Europe and Asia; the vulnerability of our land-based ICBM, the entire force; and the failure of the arms control agreements to slow the overall growth in strategic weapons. The Carter administration acknowledged these problems. In fact, almost everyone did.

There is a widespread, but mistaken impression, that arms agreements automatically produce arms control. In 1969, when SALT I negotiations began, the Soviet Union had about 1,500 strategic nuclear weapons. Today, the Soviet nuclear arsenal can grow to over 15,000 nuclear weapons and still stay within all past arms control agreements, including the SALT I and SALT II guidelines.

The practical means for reducing the risks for nuclear war must, therefore, follow two parallel paths -- credible deterrence and real arms reduction with effective verification. It is on this basis that we've responded to the problems I just described.

This is why we've moved forward to implement NATO's dual-track decision of 1979. While actually reducing the number of nuclear weapons in Europe, it is also why we have sought bipartisan support for the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission and the build-down concept and why we've proposed deep reductions in strategic forces at the strategic arms reduction talks.

Without exception, every arms control proposal that we have offered would reverse the arms buildup and help bring a more stable balance at lower force levels.

At the START talks, we seek to reduce substantially the number of ballistic missile warheads, reduce the destructive capacity of nuclear missiles and establish limits on bombers and cruise missiles, below the levels of SALT II.

At the talks on intermediate-range nuclear forces, our negotiators have tabled four initiatives to address Soviet concerns and improve prospects for a fair and equitable agreement that would reduce or eliminate an entire class of such nuclear weapons.

Our flexibility in the START and INF negotiations has been demonstrated by numerous modifications to our positions. But they have been met only by the silence of Soviet walkouts.

At the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction Talks in Vienna, we and our NATO partners presented a treaty that would reduce conventional forces to parity at lower levels.

To reduce the risks of war in time of crisis, we have proposed to the Soviet Union important measures to improve direct communications and increase mutual confidence.

And just recently, I directed Vice President Bush to go to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to present a new American initiative, a worldwide ban on the production, possession and use of chemical weapons.

Our strategic policy represents a careful response to a nuclear agenda upon which even our critics agreed. Many who would break the bonds of partisanship, claiming they know how to bring greater security, seem to ignore the likely consequences of their own proposals. Those who wanted a last-minute moratorium on INF deployment would have betrayed our allies and reduced the chances for a safer Europe. Those who would try to implement a unilateral freeze would find it unverifiable and destabilizing because it would prevent restoration of a stable balance that keeps the peace. And those who would advocate unilateral cancellation of the Peacekeeper Missile would ignore a central recommendation of the bipartisan Scowcroft report and leave the Soviets with little incentive to negotiate meaningful reductions. Indeed, the Soviets would be rewarded for leaving the bargaining table.

These simplistic solutions and others put forward by our critics would take meaningful agreements and increased security

best help us move closer to the goals that we share, by accepting practical means to achieve them. Granted, it's easy to support a strong defense. It's much harder to support a strong defense budget. And granted, it's easy to call for arms agreements. It's more difficult to support patient, firm, fair negotiations with those who want to see how much we will compromise with ourselves first.

Bipartisanship can only work if both forces, both sides, face up to real world problems and meet them with real world solutions. Our safety and security depend on more than credible deterrence and nuclear arms reductions. Constructive regional development is also essential. Therefore, one -- or a second great challenge is strengthening the basis for stability in troubled and strategically sensitive regions.

Regional tensions often begin in long-standing social, political, and economic inequities and in ethnic and religious disputes. But throughout the 1970s, increased Soviet support for terrorism, insurgency, and aggression coupled with the perception of weakening U.S. power and resolve greatly exacerbated these tensions.

The results were not surprising. The massacres at Kampuchia followed by the Vietnamese invasion, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the rise of Iranian extremism, the holding of Americans hostage, Libyan coercion in Africa, Soviet and Cuban military involvement in Angola and Ethiopia, their subversion in Central America and the rise of state-supported terrorism -- taken together, these events defined a pattern of mounting instability and violence that the U.S. could not ignore. And we have not.

As with defense, by the beginning of the '80s, there was an emerging consensus in this country that we had to go do better in dealing with problems that effect our vital interest. Obviously, no single abstract policy could deal successfully with all problems or all regions. But as a general matter, effective, regional stabilization requires a balanced approach, a mix of economic aid, security assistance, and diplomatic mediation tailored to the needs of each region.

It's also obvious that we alone cannot save embattled governments or control terrorism. But doing nothing only ensures far greater problems down the road. So we strive to expand cooperation with states who support our common interests -- to help friendly nations in danger and to seize major opportunities for peacekeeping.

Perhaps the best example for this comprehensive approach is the report and recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. It is from this report that we drew our proposals for bringing peaceful development to Central America. They are now before the Congress and will be debated at

MORE

length. I welcome a debate; but, if it's to be productive, we must put aside mythology and uninformed rhetoric. Some, for example, insist that the root of regional violence is poverty but not Communism. Well, three-fourths of our requests, and of our current program is economic and humanitarian assistance. America is a good and generous nation. But, economic aid alone cannot stop Cuban and Soviet-inspired guerrillas determined to terrorize, burn, bomb, and destroy everything from bridges and industries to electric power and transportation. And neither individual rights nor economic health can be advanced if stability is not secured.

Other critics say that we shouldn't see the problems of this or any other region as an East-West struggle. Our policies in Central America and elsewhere are, in fact, designed precisely to keep East-West tensions from spreading -- from intruding into the lives of nations that are struggling with great problems of their own.

Events in Southern Africa are showing what persistent mediation and an ability to talk to all sides can accomplish. The states of this region have been poised for war for decades. But there is new hope for peace. South Africa, Angola, and Mozambique are implementing agreements to break the cycle of violence.

Our administration has been active in this process and we'll stay involved -- trying to bring an independent Namibia into being, end foreign military interference, and keep the region free from East-West conflict. I have hoped that peace and democratic reform can be enjoyed by all the peoples of Southern Africa.

In Central America we've also seen progress. El Salvador's presidential election expresses that nation's desire to govern itself in peace. Yet the future of the region remains open. We have a choice. Either we help America's friends defend themselves and give democracy a chance, or we abandon our responsibilities and let the Soviet Union and Cuba shape the destiny of our hemisphere. If this happens, the East-West conflict will only become broader and much more dangerous.

In dealing with regional instability, we have to understand how it is related to other problems. Insecurity and regional violence are among the driving forces of nuclear proliferation. Peacekeeping in troubled regions and strengthening barriers to nuclear proliferation are two sides of the same coin -- stability and safeguards go together. No, no one says this approach is cheap, quick or easy. But the cost of this commitment is bargain-basement compared to the tremendous sacrifices we will have to make if we do nothing, or do too little.

The Kissinger Commission warned that an outbreak of Cuban-type regimes in Central America will bring subversion closer to our own borders, and the spectre of millions of uprooted refugees fleeing in desperation to the north.

In the Middle East, which has so rarely known peace, we seek a similar mix of economic aid, diplomatic mediation and military assistance and cooperation. These will, we believe, make the use of U.S. forces unnecessary, and make the risk of East-West conflict less.

But, given the importance of the region, we must also be ready to act when the presence of American power and that of our friends can help stop the spread of violence. I have said, for example, that we'll keep open the Straits of Hormuz, the vital lifeline through which so much oil flows to the United States and other industrial democracies. Making this clear beforehand, and making it credible, makes a crisis much less likely.

We must work with quiet persistence and without illusions. We may suffer setbacks, but we musn't jump to the conclusion that we can defend our interest without ever committing ourselves. Nor should other nations believe that mere setbacks will turn America inward again. We know our responsibilities and we must live up to them. Because effective regional problem solving requires a balanced and sustained approach, it is essential that the Congress give full, not piecemeal, support. Indeed, where we have foundered in regional stabilization, it has been because the Congress has failed to provide such support. Half-way measures, refusing to take responsibility for means, produce the worst possible results.

I'll return to this point when I discuss the fourth challenge in just a few minutes.

Expanding opportunities for economic development and personal freedom is our third great challenge. The American concept of peace is more than absence of war. We favor the flowering of economic growth and individual liberty in a world of peace. And this, too, is a goal to which most Americans subscribe.

Our political leaders must be judged by whether the means they offer will help us to reach it. Our belief in individual freedom and opportunity is rooted in practical experience. Free people build free markets that ignite dynamic development for everyone. And in America, incentives, risk-taking and entrepreneurship are reawakening the spirit of capitalism and strengthening economic expansion and human progress throughout the world.

Our goal has always been to restore and sustain non-inflationary worldwide growth, thereby ending for good the stagflation of the 1970s which saw drastic weakening of the fabric of the world economy. We take our leadership responsibilities seriously, but we alone cannot put the world's economic house in order.

At Williamsburg, the industrial countries

consolidated their views on economic policy. The proof is not in the communique; it's in the results. France is reducing inflation and seeking greater flexibility in its economy. Japan is slowly but surely but steadily, we will insist, liberalizing its trade and capital markets. Germany and the United Kingdom are moving forward on a steady course of low inflation and moderate sustained growth.

Just as we believe that incentives are key to greater growth in America and throughout the world, so, too, must we resist the sugar-coated poison of protectionism everywhere it exists. Here at home we're opposing inflationary, self-defeating bills like Domestic Content. At the London Economic Summit in June, I hope that we can lay the groundwork for a new round of negotiations that will open markets for our exports of goods and services and stimulate greater growth, efficiency and jobs for all.

And we're advancing key initiatives to promote more powerful worldwide growth by expanding trade and investment relationships. The dynamic growth of Pacific Basin nations has made them the fastest growing markets for our goods, services and capital. Last year I visited Japan and Korea -- two of America's most important allies -- to forge closer partnerships. And this month I will visit the People's Republic of China, another of the increasing significant relationships that we hold in the Pacific.

I see America and our Pacific neighbors as nations of the future going forward together in a mighty enterprise to build dynamic growth economies and a safer world.

We're helping developing countries grow by presenting a fresh view of development -- the magic of the marketplace -- to spark greater growth and participation in the international economy. Developing nations earn twice as much from exports to the United States as they received in aid from all the other nations combined.

And practical proposals like the Caribbean Basin Initiative will strengthen the private sectors of some 20 sectors -- or I should say 20 Caribbean neighbors -- while guaranteeing fairer treatment for U.S. companies and nationals and increasing demand for American exports.

We've recently sent to the Congress a new economic policy initiative for Africa. And it, too, is designed to support the growth of private enterprise in African countries by encouraging structural economic change in international trade. We've also asked the Congress to increase humanitarian assistance to Africa to combat the devastating effects of extreme drought.

In building a strong global recovery, of course, nothing is more important than to keep the wheels of world commerce turning

With bipartisan support, we implemented a major increase in IMF resources. In cooperation with the IMF, we're working to prevent the problems of individual debtor nations from disrupting the stability and strength of the entire international financial system. It was this goal that brought nations of North and South together to help resolve the debt difficulties of the new democratic government of Argentina.

Because we know that democratic governments are the best guarantors of human rights, and that economic growth will always flourish when men and women are free, we seek to promote not just material products, but the values of faith and human dignity for which America and all democratic nations stand. Values which embody the culmination of five thousand years of Western civilization.

When I addressed the British Parliament in June of 1982, I called for a bold and lasting effort to assist people struggling for human rights. We've established the National Endowment for Democracy, a partnership of people from all walks of life dedicated to spreading the positive message of democracy. To succeed we must oppose the double-speak of totalitarian propaganda. And so we're modernizing the Voice of America and our other broadcasting facilities and we're working to start up Radio Marti, a voice of truth to the imprisoned people of Cuba.

Americans have always wanted to see the spread of democratic institutions, and that goal is coming closer. In our own hemisphere, twenty-six countries of Latin America and the Caribbean are either democracies or formally embarked on a democratic transition. This represents ninety percent of the region's population, up from under fifty percent a decade ago.

Trust the people. This is the crucial lesson of history, and America's message to the world. We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole possession of a chosen few but the universal right of men and women everywhere.

President Truman said, "If we should pay merely lip service to inspiring ideals, and later, do violence to simple justice, we would draw down upon us the bitter wrath of generations yet unborn." Well, let us go forward together, faithful friends of democracy and democratic values, confident in our conviction that the tide of the future is a freedom tide. But let us go forward with practical means.

This brings me to our fourth great challenge. We must restore bipartisan consensus in support of U.S. foreign policy. We must restore America's honorable tradition of partisan politics stopping at the water's edge. Republicans and Democrats standing united in patriotism and speaking with one voice as responsible trustees for peace, democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

In the 1970s, we saw a rash of Congressional initiatives

in the areas of trade, human rights, arms sales, foreign assistance, intelligence operations, and the dispatch of troops in time of crisis.

Over 100 separate prohibitions and restrictions on Executive Branch authority to formulate and implement foreign policy were enacted. The most far-reaching consequence of the past decade's Congressional activism is this: bipartisan consensus-building has become a central responsibility of Congressional leadership as well as of Executive leadership. If we're to have a sustainable foreign policy, the Congress must support the practical details of policy, not just the general goals.

We have demonstrated the capacity for such jointly responsible leadership in certain areas; but we've seen setbacks for bipartisanship, too. I believe that once we established bipartisan agreement on our course in Lebanon, the subsequent second-guessing about whether we ought to keep our men there severely undermined our policy. It hindered the ability of our diplomats to negotiate, encouraged more intransigence from the Syrians, and prolonged the violence.

Similarly, Congressional wavering on support for the Jackson Plan, which reflects the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, can only encourage the enemies of democracy who are determined to wear us down. To understand and solve this problem -- this problem of joint responsibility -- we have to go beyond the familiar questions of who should be stronger, the President or the Congress. The more basic problem is, in this post-Vietnam era, Congress has not yet developed capacities for coherent, responsible action needed to carry out the new foreign policy powers it has taken for itself.

To meet the challenges of this decade, we need a strong President and a strong Congress. Unfortunately, many in the Congress seem to believe they are still in the troubled Vietnam era, with their only task to be vocal critics, and not responsible partners in developing positive, practical programs to solve real problems. Much was learned from Vietnam -- lessons ranging from increased appreciation of the need for careful discrimination in the use of U.S. force or military assistance, to increased appreciation of the need for domestic support for any such military element or policy.

Military force, either direct or indirect, must remain an available part of America's foreign policy. But clearly the Congress is less than wholly comfortable with both the need for a military element in foreign policy, and its own responsibility to deal with that element. Presidents must recognize Congress as a more significant partner in foreign policymaking, and, as we've tried to do, seek new means to reach bipartisan Executive, Legislative consensus. But legislators must realize that they, too, are partners.

They have a responsibility to go beyond mere criticism to consensus-building that will produce positive, practical and effective action.

Bipartisan consensus is not an end in itself. Sound and experienced U.S. foreign policy leadership must always reflect a deep understanding of fundamental American interests, values and principles. Consensus on the broad goals of a safer and more humane world is easy to achieve. The harder part is making progress and developing concrete, realistic means to reach these goals.

We've made some progress, but there is still a Congressional reluctance to assume responsibility for positive bipartisan action to go with their newly claimed powers. We've set excellent examples with the bipartisan Scowcroft Commission, bipartisan support for IMF funding and the bipartisan work of the Kissinger Commission. But it's time to lift our efforts to a higher level of cooperation, time to meet together with realism and idealism, America's great challenges for the '80s.

Distinguished ladies and gentlemen, we have the right to dream great dreams, the opportunity to strive for a world at peace enriched by human dignity and the responsibility to work as partners so that we might leave these blessed gifts to our children and to our children's children.

We might remember the example of a legislator who lived in a particularly turbulent era, Henry Clay. Abraham Lincoln called him "my beau ideal of a statesman." He knew Clay's loftiness of spirit and vision, never lost sight of his country's interest; and, election year or not, Clay would set love of country above all political considerations.

The stakes for America for peace and for freedom demand every bit as much from us in 1984 and beyond. This is our challenge.

I can't leave without a little lighter note that maybe points to some of the intricacies of diplomacy and how seemingly small they can be. I just in leaving want to give you a little experience that occurred and could have been a diplomatic crisis at the recent state dinner for President Mitterand.

Nancy and the President started toward their table in the Dining Room with everyone standing around their tables waiting for us. Mrs. Mitterand and I started through the tables, butler leading us through the people. And suddenly Mrs. Mitterand stopped and she calmly turned her head and said something to me in French, which, unfortunately, I did not understand. (Laughter.) And the butler was motioning for us to come on, and I motioned to her that we should go forward, that we were to go to the other side of the room. And, again, very calmly she made her statement to me.

- ADMINISTRATION:

X RESPONSIBILITY

X AUTHORITY (APPOINTMENTS CLAUSE)

- COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

RESPONSIBILITY

AUTHORITY

- FOREIGN AFFAIRS

RESPONSIBILITY (CONG. UNABLE)

AUTHORITY (TREATY, ETC.)

- LEGISLATOR

RESPONSIBILITY (INTERESTS OF ALL)

AUTHORITY (VETO) (INTRODUCE LEGIS)

CORRECTIVE (LINE ITEM)

- MISC: PARDONS

- LIMITS

BUDGET, EST OFFICES, <sup>A+C</sup> (CONG)

JUDICIAL REVIEW - ACQUIESCE (DIST. JACKSON)

- PREZ QUOTES SHOW BUDGET, RESP.

933: consult, sense, but have to act

GROVER CLEVELAND: Line Procedure (CENTENNIAL)

(REVENUE AM).

- JEFF TRUMAN - ROSS GOR  
- 439: personal  
1877

↓  
as we  
celebrate  
Finnis  
Parade

WEBSTER

✓ 1. Constitution and Bicentennial (garnish from  
Law Day remarks + Const. Day Proclamation).  
Success: genius of Framers + of Free People;  
wise restraints that make us free.

DILEMMA:  
STRONG,  
YET  
SUBJECT  
TO  
PEOPLE

✓ 2. Separation of powers theme. Unamended  
Constitution is itself a bill of rights.  
limited government, deriving power from consent  
of the governed; rather than people deriving  
rights from the government. Why referendum  
proposals off binding. Federalism ~~with~~

AS IF  
DEC,  
derive just  
power from  
consent of the  
governed

↓ — EMERGENCY KEY IS EXEC

3. Art II, § 1, L. 1: only ~~shall~~ elected  
by all the people (+ Vesp, elected College)

4. Powers

5. Limits: budget; judicial review

6. Reflections on office (Foreword)

7. WHA / Holmes on founders + vision