

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

WHORM Subject File Code: FO006-01
(Foreign Affairs: Economic Summit, Ottawa,
Canada, 07/19/1981-07/20/1981)
Case file Number(s): 035823 (4 of 10)
Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
(WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer

DLB 11/13/2019

File Folder FO006-01 (035823) (4 OF 10)

FOIA

F16-011

Box Number

BIERGANNNS

52

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
243528	PAPER	RE: CANADA	4	6/19/1981	B1
243529	PAPER	BULLET PAPER ON THE UK	1	6/19/1981	B1
243530	PAPER	BILATERAL BRIEFER - UNITED KINGDOM	5	6/19/1981	B1
243531	PAPER	UNITED KINGDOM	4	6/19/1981	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing

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

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

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

REFUGEES

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

BULLET PAPER ON REFUGEES

--Refugees and displaced persons number 12-16 million, primarily in depressed and underdeveloped countries. Pakistan supports almost 2 million Afghan refugees.

--The Summit partners share a global interest in lessening the political tensions created by the mass migration of people, and supporting international relief efforts as an instrument of maintaining stability.

--The US supports the efforts of Canada and the FRG to examine the human rights and political causes of refugee flows, and seeks a common ground between the two initiatives.

--It is the obligation of those countries opposed to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan to aid Pakistan shelter Afghan refugees.

--The EEC and Japan should be encouraged to bear a greater share of the Pakistani relief effort, but without cost to the Indochinese relief effort.

--The willingness of ASEAN countries to provide first asylum to Indochinese refugees remains contingent upon tangible evidence from developed countries of continued commitment to provide relief and resettlement alternatives.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
Authority State Waiver
BY dlr DATE 11/5/2019

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TALKING POINTS ON REFUGEES

-- THERE ARE BETWEEN 12 AND 16 MILLION REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN THE WORLD, PRIMARILY IN AFGHANISTAN, AFRICA, AND INDOCHINA.

-- WE SHARE YOUR CONCERN THAT THE MIGRATION OF LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE TO COUNTRIES WHICH THEMSELVES SUFFER SERIOUS ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND SOCIAL STRAINS, WILL INCREASE THE DANGER OF DESTABILIZATION.

-- WE MUST WORK TOGETHER TO DEAL WITH THE ENORMOUS COSTS OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF EFFORT IN AFGHANISTAN, AFRICA, AND INDOCHINA, AND TRY TO FIND AND DEAL WITH THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND HUMAN RIGHTS CAUSES OF MASS MIGRATION.

-- THE WEST CAN TAKE PRIDE IN THE PLEDGES OF MORE THAN \$435M MADE AT ICARA -- \$285M BY THE U.S. -- IN CONTRAST WITH THE NON-PARTICIPATION OF THE SOVIET UNION. WE HOPE THESE PLEDGES WILL ENABLE AFRICAN COUNTRIES TO CONTINUE THEIR GENEROUS SUPPORT OF THE REFUGEES ON THEIR SOIL.

-- THE JAPANESE SHOULD BE CONGRATULATED FOR THE \$33M PLEDGED BY THEM AT ICARA, AND FOR PRIME MINISTER SUSUKI'S PLEDGE RECENTLY TO CONTINUE JAPAN'S AID TO INDOCHINESE, AFGHAN, AND AFRICAN REFUGEES AT CURRENT OR GREATER LEVELS.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

GDS, 6/19/87

DECLASSIFIED
State Waiver
BY *dlr* MARADATE 11/5/2015

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 2 -

-- IT IS IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT ALL OF US WHO OPPOSE RUSSIAN INTERVENTION IN AFGHANISTAN MUST SUPPORT PAKISTAN'S EFFORT TO HELP THE AFGHAN REFUGEES.

-- ALTHOUGH THE MEDIA HAVE NOT BEEN FOCUSING RECENTLY ON THE PLIGHT OF THE INDOCHINESE, INDOCHINA'S PROBLEMS HAVE NOT BEEN RESOLVED. THE ASEAN COUNTRIES WHICH OFFER FIRST ASYLUM DO SO ONLY BECAUSE WE HAVE PROMISED ECONOMIC RELIEF AND RESETTLEMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR THE MANY THOUSANDS WHO SEEK ASYLUM BY LAND OR BOAT.

-- UNFORTUNATELY, THOSE OF US WHO HAVE ACCEPTED MANY THOUSANDS OF INDOCHINESE FOR RESETTLEMENT NOW FIND OURSELVES TROUBLED BY ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AT HOME. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT WE SEEK ALTERNATIVES TO RESETTLEMENT IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES -- PERHAPS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES OR BY HELPING PEOPLE TO RETURN HOME WHERE POSSIBLE -- WITHOUT SEEMING TO WEAKEN OUR SUPPORT OF THE ASEAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO ASYLUM..

-- IT IS A HOPEFUL SIGN THAT BOTH THE CANADIANS AND FRG ARE SEEKING INTERNATIONAL SOLUTIONS TO THE BASIC CAUSES OF REFUGEE FLOWS. WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH BOTH COUNTRIES AT THE UNITED NATIONS TO FIND THE MOST APPROPRIATE MEANS BY WHICH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CAN PREVENT FUTURE REFUGEE FLOWS WHILE PROTECTING THE ACCEPTED LEGAL RIGHTS OF REFUGEES.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

1. Background

The intrusion of refugee questions in a major way distinguished the agenda of the two most recent Economic Summits - Tokyo, 1979 and Venice, 1980 - reflecting special circumstances at the time and the mutual interests of the participants. In 1979, President Carter raised the problem of Indochinese boat people, then at crisis proportions; in 1980, Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the refugees in Pakistan took center stage. The Ottawa Summit faces the continuing Pakistani burden of close to 2 million Afghan refugees, as well as major refugee problems in Africa and Indochina.

Although it is difficult to be precise, current estimates indicate there are between 12 and 16 million people in the world today who can be categorized as refugees or displaced persons. In recent years, the most persistent problems have occurred in depressed and underdeveloped areas, complicating economic development, exacerbating political tensions, and making relief efforts more difficult and costly.

Since 1975, 1.2 million Indochinese have fled their homeland and one million of these have been resettled outside Southeast Asia. International relief efforts have sustained the Indochinese, as well as the 1.7 million Afghans now estimated in Pakistan, approximately one-tenth of Afghanistan's total population.

Each of the Summit partners has contributed a share to relief of this problem. For example, of the \$560 million pledged at the International Conference for the Assistance of Refugees in Africa (ICARA), \$285 million was pledged by the United States and over \$150 million by our Summit partners, including \$33 million from Japan. Therefore, ICARA proved to be a great political benefit for the United States and other Summit contributors.

Both the Canadians and the FRG are seeking international support for separate, but overlapping, initiatives now before the United Nations to determine the basic causes of refugee flows and to develop machinery for moderating the drastic impact of mass migration. The United States shares with its Summit partners concern over the dangers of destabilization inherent in the migration of large numbers of people to countries which suffer serious economic, political, and social strains. Any hope for success in resolving these problems requires the cooperative efforts of the international community in dealing with common concerns: the enormous cost of the relief effort, growing danger to regional stability, including the Middle East, and the root causes of the international migratory phenomenon. Both Canada and the FRG have indicated interest in raising this issue at the Ottawa Summit.

GDS, 6/19/87

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

'DECLASSIFIED'
Authority State Waiver
BY dh 11/5/2019

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-2-

2. U.S. Objectives

The United States seeks a reaffirmation of international concern for refugee problems throughout the world, with particular emphasis on the Horn of Africa, Afghanistan, and Southeast Asia. The reaffirmation should (1) include language in the Communique, underscoring the special responsibilities of the developed world, (2) stimulation of financial support and resettlement alternatives, and (3) discussion of root causes, if raised by others, without committing ourselves to either the FRG or Canadian positions at this time.

3. Discussion of Issues

We have prepared draft Communique language which stresses the special responsibility of the developed world to share its resources and expertise to facilitate regional solutions to refugee problems and, where necessary, to offer opportunities for resettlement

Increasingly, the United States and its Summit partners are focussing their concern on Southwest Asia, which now bears the largest refugee population in the world. We can expect continuing requests from Pakistan to major donors.

The Ottawa Summit will provide a timely opportunity for the donor countries to develop a coordinated and cohesive response to Pakistan's appeals. In mid-June, at the World Bank Consortium in Paris, Pakistan sought to raise \$165 million to meet refugee related expenses not covered by international organizations, and in separate appeals the UNHCR hopes to raise \$98 million in cash and \$120 million in food assistance through the World Food Program. The United States is preparing to more than double its earlier contribution of \$45 million for a total of \$93 million in cash and food to the Pakistan relief effort this year. The EEC and Japan should be encouraged to continue aid to Afghan, African, and Indochinese refugees at current or greater levels.

The Indochinese refugee problems are in some ways more complex. International assistance has taken the form of third country resettlement as well as ongoing relief assistance to countries of first asylum and contributions to international organizations for care, maintenance, and protection. The United States, Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and France have taken the lead in offering resettlement opportunities to the Indochinese. Increasingly, however, economic difficulties and social strains in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain have made it more difficult to maintain the levels or resettlement needed to persuade the ASEAN countries to act as countries of first asylum. As resettlement opportunities become more difficult to provide in traditional resettlement

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-3-

countries, it is particularly important for the Summit states to discuss alternatives. Such alternatives might include financial support for projects for the resettlement of refugees in certain developing nations and the encouragement of voluntary repatriation in those limited cases where this is possible. However, in view of the fact that the Thais are not prepared to be left to resettle large numbers of refugees in Thailand, it is important to avoid any perceived lessening of international interest and support on refugee and relief issues

4. Other Leaders' Objectives/Views

Canada and the FRG are both expected to seek US support for their respective refugee initiatives. The Canadians sponsored a UN Human Rights Commission resolution in 1980 and 1981, which the US supported, to investigate human rights causes of mass exoduses. Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan was appointed Special Rapporteur of the UN Human Rights Commission to further the project. He met recently with the Vice President, Members of Congress and Ambassador Kirkpatrick to discuss his plan to develop a dispassionate analysis of mass exoduses in order to devise strategies for their prevention. The FRG initiative is on a likely collision course with the Canadian project. Foreign Minister Genscher personally introduced the FRG proposal at the UN General Assembly last year to look into political root causes of mass refugee flows, in order to avert future flows. The FRG resolution was also adopted, with US co-sponsorship, after the overly-ambitious German proposal was pared back. This year, however, the FRG has reinstated its proposal to create a special UN body to look into political root causes of refugee flows. Since for financial considerations the US is generally opposed to the creation of new UN bodies, and because the German proposal could possibly undermine existing international laws and principles providing protection to refugees, we are proceeding warily with the German proposal.

There are also at stake elements of national pride. The Canadians may wish to have the Special Rapporteur's mandate expanded to include all root causes of refugees. Genscher and the FRG feel that they have carved out a totally separate, important area of concern in which they can play a lead role. It is important for the US to avoid being caught in the middle in this potential clash. We clearly favor the course being followed by the Canadians but we also see merit in the German emphasis on the political causes of refugee problems. We should indicate to the FRG that we are still studying possible alternate means to deal with the political issues raised in their proposal.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Drafter: S/R: BZweiben: eb
6/17/81 X21318

Clearances:

P: DWeisz

S/P: PKaplan

RP: JPurcell

S/R: ADewey

IO: GSmith

EA: SSchwartzstein

BULLET PAPER ON UN BUDGETS

-- UN assessed budgets are rising out of control (to \$1.3 billion in 1980), and the Summit Governments pay 60% of the bills.

-- At a time when Governments are controlling their spending by cutting programs, international organizations are continuing low priority and/or obsolete programs while adding new programs sometimes of dubious value.

-- The failure of UN system organizations to recognize that they, too, are affected by economic realities and to act accordingly undermines their credibility and threatens the confidence the major donors have placed in them.

-- The United States is supportive of the important work performed by the UN system. But, since the resources are limited, they must be managed more wisely.

-- By eliminating the unnecessary, by terminating obsolete programs, and by adhering to a strict schedule of priorities and objectives, the UN system could actually improve its performance while maintaining the same level of required resources.

-- We believe the major donors must work together for a pause in the growth of UN system assessed budgets.

UNCLASSIFIED

TALKING POINTS FOR UN BUDGETS

-- IN THE DECADE FROM 1971 TO 1980 ASSESSED BUDGETS OF UN ORGANIZATIONS INCREASED MORE THAN THREEFOLD TO A LEVEL OF \$1.3 BILLION IN 1980.

-- THE SEVEN GOVERNMENTS REPRESENTED AT OTTAWA PAY 60% OF THE UN BUDGETS AND SIMILAR PROPORTIONS OF OTHER UN AGENCY BUDGETS.

-- AT A TIME WHEN GOVERNMENTS ARE CONTROLLING THEIR SPENDING BY CUTTING PROGRAMS, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE CONTINUING LOW PRIORITY AND/OR OBSOLETE PROGRAMS WHILE ADDING NEW PROGRAMS THAT ARE SOMETIMES OF DUBIOUS VALUE.

-- THERE IS LITTLE EVIDENCE THAT THE ORGANIZATIONS FEEL AFFECTED BY THE SAME ECONOMIC REALITIES WHICH HAVE SUCH AN IMPACT UPON THEIR MEMBER GOVERNMENTS. AS A RESULT: THE BUDGETS OF UN SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS ARE GROWING MUCH FASTER THAN THE MAJOR DONORS CAN SUPPORT.

-- BY IGNORING THE ECONOMIC REALITIES OF THE WORLD IN WHICH THEY LIVE, THE UN ORGANIZATIONS ARE UNDERMINING THEIR CREDIBILITY AND THREATENING THE CONFIDENCE OF THE MAJÓR DONORS HAVE PLACED IN THEM.

-- THE UNITED STATES IS SUPPORTIVE OF THE IMPORTANT WORK PERFORMED BY THE UN SYSTEM. WE ARE COMMITTED TO MAKING THE SYSTEM WORK ON THOSE THINGS WHICH CAN BENEFIT GLOBAL STABILITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND WHICH CAN LEAD TO PRACTICAL BENEFITS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE OF THE THIRD WORLD.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

-- HOWEVER, WE BELIEVE THAT, SINCE THE RESOURCES ARE LIMITED, THEY MUST BE MANAGED MORE WISELY.

-- IT IS THUS IMPERATIVE THAT THE UN SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS RECOGNIZE THAT THEY, TOO ARE AFFECTED BY ECONOMIC REALITIES AND ACT ACCORDINGLY.

-- WE BELIEVE THAT THE TIME HAS COME FOR A PAUSE IN THE GROWTH OF THE ASSESSED BUDGETS OF UN SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS. BY ELIMINATING THE FRILLS AND FAT, BY TERMINATING OBSOLETE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES AND BY ADHERING TO A STRICT SCHEDULE OF PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES, THE PERFORMANCE OF THE UN SYSTEM ACTUALLY COULD IMPROVE WHILE MAINTAINING ITS LEVEL OF REQUIRED RESOURCES.

-- GIVEN THE VOTING PATTERNS OF THE UN AGENCIES, THE MAJOR DONORS MUST WORK CLOSELY TOGETHER.

-- WE HOPE THAT THE OTTAWA MEETING CAN AGREE TO COORDINATE TO ACHIEVE A PAUSE IN THE GROWTH OF THE BUDGETS OF UN SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

BRIEFER - UN BUDGETS

Setting:

The United States is increasingly concerned about the problem of growth of United Nations system assessed budgets (non-Bretton Woods organizations), a concern we believe is increasingly shared in other donor countries. The issue was recently debated at the meeting of the Geneva Group Consultative Level meeting (12 major Western donors, including all of the seven governments at the Summit) and agreement was achieved to press the UN Specialized Agencies for a "pause" in the growth of future budgets. But, since this agreement was reached at the Assistant Secretary level in Foreign Offices, it could come unraveled when Ministers attend the conferences of organizations of special interest to them (e.g. Ministers of Agriculture to FAO) where budgets are adopted, particularly if, as expected, the Secretariats and LDC representatives will press for sharp budget increases.

U.S. Objectives:

We are seeking to get high level understanding and commitment to a concerted effort to hold down UN assessed budgets.

Discussion of Issues:

Budgets of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies have increased from \$402 million in 1971 to \$1,313 million in 1980, or more than tripled in a decade.

The Governments represented at Ottawa pay 60.34% of the assessed budget of the United Nations and similar proportions of the assessed budgets of the Specialized Agencies and IAEA.

While the Governments at the Summit are endeavoring to control their spending by cutting programs, international organizations demonstrate no awareness that they are affected by the same economic realities. The organizations continue low priority and/or obsolete programs, using resources that could be deployed for higher priority programs and activities. And in fact they are sometimes adding activities of dubious value. Budgets are growing faster than the major donors can support. As a consequence, the UN organizations are undermining their credibility and threatening the confidence the major donors have placed in them.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

The United States is supportive of the important work performed by the UN system. We are committed to making the system work on those things which can benefit global stability and economic development and which can lead to practical benefits for the disadvantaged people of the Third World.

However, because the resources are limited, they must be managed more wisely. The UN system organizations must recognize that they are affected by the same economic realities confronting governments and must act accordingly.

A time has come for a pause in the growth of assessed budgets of UN system organizations. The organizations can maintain the level of required resources and improve their performance by eliminating the unnecessary frills and fat, by terminating obsolete programs and activities and by adhering to a strict schedule of priorities and objectives.

UN system votes are on the basis of one member - one vote. The strong numerical advantage of the developing country members is reversely proportionate to the share of assessments borne by the major donors. To enhance their ability to influence budgets, the major donors must work closely together.

Other Leaders' Objectives/Views:

The other Governments had agreed at a meeting in Geneva the end of April that "the time has come for a pause in the growth of the budgets" of the organizations of the United Nations system.

UNCLASSIFIED

Drafted: IO/SB: JAMcGrath ¹¹

Clearances: IO/S: JD Fox *JDFox*

P: DAWeisz *J*

S/P: Kaylen *PKaylen*

IO: MVCreekmore *MVC*

FUTURE SUMMIT

TO BE PROVIDED

BILATERAL BOOK

CANADA

BULLET PAPER ON CANADA

-- On the National Energy Program, we appreciate Canada's cooperation to date, and look forward to future consultations on remaining issues.

-- We recognize Canada's concern over transboundary air pollution, particularly acid rain. We are committed to continuing the process of analyzing scientific information on this issue, and to negotiating a bilateral agreement.

-- We are reviewing the sponsoring companies' request for waivers to facilitate the construction of the pipeline. We remain committed to creating the framework necessary for the private construction of the pipeline.

-- We appreciate Canada's position on the Sinai Multinational Force, and will be in touch with Canada as the situation evolves.

-- We want to take advantage of Canada's successful experience in the Caribbean, and to consult on our proposal for a regional economic development. Military security issues would not be involved.

EUR/CAN:WLloyd:jkb

6/22/81 x 22170 doc 948

Clearances: ARA - Mr. Eddy
OES - Dr. King
EB/IEP - Mr. Burns
NEA - Mr. Kattouf
EUR - Mr. Niles
S/P - Mr. McCormick
P - Ms. Patterson

BILATERAL BRIEFER - CANADA

Setting:

US-Canadian relations are generally good, but the close and continuous interaction of the two countries inevitably raises problems. The President's March visit to Ottawa successfully underscored the importance the US attaches to Canada. Additionally, the visit fostered the development of personal rapport between the President and Trudeau, and between US Cabinet officers and their Canadian counterparts. Still, there are substantial differences between the US and Canada on issues of major importance: energy policy, transboundary air pollution, the Alaska Gas Pipeline, and investment policy. We work constructively together on international issues; it would be useful to discuss the Sinai and the Caribbean.

Issues:

Canada's National Energy Program

US Objectives: To demonstrate our appreciation for Canada's cooperation in taking account of some US concerns with the National Energy Program. Also, to make clear

that we remain concerned by discrimination, compensation issues and the effects of low energy prices in Canada.

Canadian Objectives: To demonstrate a cooperative attitude, without giving up more of the National Energy Program than is necessary. Also, to resist efforts by the US to weaken major elements of the Program.

Transboundary Air Pollution

US Objectives: To demonstrate sensitivity to Canadian concerns, despite the constraints of evolving US environmental policy and to minimize the impact of Canadian disappointment on this issue and on other aspects of US-Canadian relations. Additionally, to continue negotiation of an air pollution agreement, carrying out the President's undertaking in Ottawa last March.

Canadian Objectives: To induce the US to strengthen air pollution law and regulation, with emphasis on transboundary air pollution.

Alaska Gas Pipeline

US Objectives: To reassure Canada that the

Administration remains firmly committed to creating the necessary legal and administrative framework for private financing of the pipeline.

Canadian Objectives: To ensure that the US understands the degree of Trudeau's political vulnerability as a result of his decision to move ahead on the pipeline in 1980, based on US assurances. Also, to ensure that the US obtains the necessary legislative and administrative waivers for the early completion of the entire line.

Investment

US Objectives: To induce Canada not to take steps to tighten restrictive investment practice under the Foreign Investment Review Agency.

Canadian Objectives: To allay US concerns by offering to consult, to avoid damage to Canada's investment climate.

Sinai Multinational Force

US Objectives: To obtain Canadian participation in the Multinational Force, if Canadian participation is

necessary. In any event, to forestall early negative action by Canada, which would have an adverse effect on participation by others.

Canadian Objectives: To avoid entanglement in an enterprise which appears to lack either a UN umbrella or substantial third world participation. Also, to avoid appearing to be a US agent, and to avoid tarnishing Canada's image as an effective international peacekeeper.

Caribbean Basin Initiative

US Objectives: To engage Canada (as well as Mexico, Venezuela and other industrialized states) in an effort to develop support toward the vulnerable economies of Central America and the Caribbean.

Canadian Objectives: To accommodate US interests, at the same time avoiding entanglement in a enterprise which may associate Canada to an unwanted degree with US policy in the Caribbean and Latin America.

EUR/CAN:WLloyd:jkb

6/22/81 x 22170 doc 948

Clearances: ARA - Mr. Eddy

OES - Dr. King

EB/IEP - Mr. Burns

NEA - Mr. Kattouf

EUR - Mr. Niles

S/P - Mr. McCormick

P - Ms. Patterson

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
(WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer

DLB 11/13/2019

File Folder

FO006-01 (035823) (4 OF 10)

FOIA

F16-011

BIERGANNNS

Box Number

52

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
243528	PAPER RE: CANADA	4	6/19/1981	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing
Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

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

UNITED KINGDOM

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
(WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer

DLB 11/13/2019

File Folder

FO006-01 (035823) (4 OF 10)

FOIA

F16-011
BIERGANNNS

Box Number

52

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
243529	PAPER BULLET PAPER ON THE UK	1	6/19/1981	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing
Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

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

Drafted:EUR/NE:JCampbell/KSmith
ext. 22622 6/19/81

Clearances:EUR/NE:RLFunseth
S/P:RMcCormick
P:DWeisz

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
(WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer

DLB 11/13/2019

File Folder

FO006-01 (035823) (4 OF 10)

FOIA

F16-011

BIERGANNIS

Box Number

52

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
243530	PAPER BILATERAL BRIEFER - UNITED KINGDOM	5	6/19/1981	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing
Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

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

nc
Drafted:EUR/NE:JCampbell/KSmith
Ext. 22622 6/19/81

Clearances:EUR/SOV:Mark Parris
EUR/EE:Victor Gray
NEA/IAI:John Hirsch
NEA/RA:George Lambrakis
NEA/PAB:William Simmons
EUR/RPM:John King
ARA/PPC:Robert Morley
AF/S:Paul Hare
EA/C:D. Johnson
EUR/NE:RLFunseth
PM/RSA:Peter Cressy

P:David Weisz *3/8*
S/P:R.McCormick *3/8*

EUR - H.Allen Holmes

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
(WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer

DLB 11/13/2019

File Folder

FO006-01 (035823) (4 OF 10)

FOIA

F16-011
BIERGANNNS

Box Number

52

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
243531	PAPER UNITED KINGDOM	4	6/19/1981	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing
Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

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

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