

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 21, 1982

Dear Paul:

Your letter to Secretary Regan in connection with holding the Economic Summit in Lake Tahoe has been referred to me.

At present many sites are under consideration, and I can assure you some thought will be given to Lake Tahoe. When the final selection is made, I will notify you.

Paul, thank you for your interest and that of your constituents in Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. DEAVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

The Honorable Paul Laxalt
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 21, 1982

Dear Jody:

Enclosed are the cigarettes I promised you, as well as the diet - very informally done.

I enjoyed our conversation the other day, and was delighted for the opportunity to see you again. Hope you enjoyed the Marcos dinner. Shirley tells me that you have agreed to send along the article you did on that State dinner. I'd appreciate it.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. DEEVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

Jody Jacobs
459 S. Lucerne Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90020

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 22, 1982

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

Thank you so much for the wonderful books you have provided for my information and enjoyment. Both books are beautiful, and I look forward to the time when I'll be able to give them my undivided attention.

I sincerely look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. DEEVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

His Excellency
Bernardo Sepulveda
Ambassador of Mexico
2829 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

BRYCE RHODES

P. O. BOX 750
RENO, NEVADA 89504

SECURITY NAT'L BANK BLDG.
ONE EAST LIBERTY STREET
RENO, NEVADA 89501
702 - 786-4646

1016 SKYLINE BLVD.
RENO, NEVADA 89509
702 - 826-1926

September 22, 1982


Dear Mike:

Thank you for your very thoughtful letter and the buckle. I don't think, however, that I'll be wearing the buckle for the Mackinaw trout but will save it for more important occasions.

I enjoyed our all-too-short get together. I hope there will be occasions for further visits, particularly at Lake Tahoe.

Best wishes to all your family. Maybe Blair can help me pursue the Mackinaw trout on your next visit.

Sincerely,



Bryce Rhodes

Mr. Michael K. Deaver
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington



MICHAEL K. DEAVER

Dear Allen

Thanks for remembering the clips.
I have passed them on to Bill
Clark and The President.

Many Thanks.

Mike

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

His Excellency
Allan Gotlieb
Ambassador of Canada
1746 Mass. Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Copy sent to
July Clark only
E

Canadian Embassy



Ambassade du Canada

Personal

22. IX. 82.

Dear H.H.

As promised last night, I am enclosing some excerpts from three recent interviews that my Prime Minister gave recently to James Reston, Joe Kraft & a Canadian journalist. He makes some very positive comments about the state of Canada-US relations, the Parliament, and a Trilateral Summit.

I thought you might like to see these and that the President might be interested.

Sincerely,

Allan.

P.S. - The Reston interview will be published in full in the N.Y. Times Magazine.

Excerpt from a transcript of the Prime Minister's interview with Joseph Kraft, Toronto, September 6, 1982.

..... Q. Are we (the United States) tough to live with these days, tougher than in the past?

A. I have never found the Americans tough to live with and I don't find them tough to live with now. To the extent that you are having economic difficulties and we are too, we will find increasing numbers of people or critics on both sides who will point out the areas of disagreement and who, no doubt, will rightly say that it will be harder to solve those disagreements when we are going through tough times than when we are going through buoyant times. I think I have said this before to you in interviews, Joe, I have found the American administrations, the successive ones, singularly open to solutions which involve the management of our differences and the creative solution of them. I am talking of the administrations. That doesn't mean that the media or, for that matter, our legislators or your congressmen have those views. When times are tough, elected representatives have their constituencies that they must defend, whether it be on the drawing of international boundaries on the east coast or whether it be over attacking problems of acid rain or questions having to do with pipelines or the NEP (the National Energy Policy) you are talking about. So, the constituencies become more skittish when times are tough but I think there has been a consistent effort on both sides of the border to manage our relationship in a way which is conducive to ...

Q. You are satisfied that the trucking problem and the uranium problem and the acid rain problem and the fishing and all of those things that I don't really know very well, are going to sort themselves out?

A. I am confident they will sort themselves out. You have correctly named several very difficult problems we have had in the past ... probably bigger in the past than we have now. What are the big problems we have now, I mean the new ones? The trucking one maybe? But what else? The rest is the inheritance of the past: the fishing, the pipeline... maybe the acid rain is relatively new but not ...

Q. Uranium, I guess, is really old.

A. Uranium is old, it goes back to the early seventies. Although its effect in the courts and all that has dragged out over the decades, it has its origin in Nixon's day. And the same thing with these old chestnuts about trans-border television and, what's the other one, Time-Life? You know, that goes back to ... when? 1970, I suppose, or 1971. You know, putting a more optimistic light on it, even your current problems with the Soviet gas pipeline...I think they are serious, I don't think they are tragic. The response on both sides hasn't reached the degree of escalation that could have been possible, in view of the fact that, as I say, both in Europe and on this side there are deeply held differences of opinion on East-West relations and serious economic difficulties on both sides of the Atlantic. We really haven't had a screaming war yet. We have had some firm resolve on both sides and I suspect a lot of behind-the-scenes attempts to see if there is some face-saving, honourable way out of this difficulty. So, there has to be lasting, enduring problems between a country as powerful as yours-which is, after all, one of the two poles of the planet-and a small country like ours. They go back all through the piece of extra-territorial effect of American laws and so on. We were talking about that when I was just out of university: the multi-nationals imposing their will on their subsidiaries here and operating for the benefit of the head office as opposed to that of the Canadian consumer and taxpayer and so on. But these are problems that we have been wrestling with and I think we have been improving the regime over the years, rather than seeing it worsen. So I am not at all pessimistic about it....

..... Q: My primary question to you is whether you are worried about the state of the Alliance at the present time.

A. Perhaps "worried" is too strong a word, but concerned I am. It is not stronger than that because I perceive a very clear determination on the part of the government leaders, various members of the Alliance, to minimize the disruptions and to iron out the difficulties.

Just talking of the Canada-U.S. aspect of it, since it is closest to home, I have no great quarrel with the United States administration, the present one -- nor indeed the previous one or ones. I believe, by and large, that these Presidents and this President, have been and has been, with varying degrees of success, embodying goodwill towards Canada, that I hope that our government has reciprocated, and a willingness to understand our divergencies in foreign or domestic policies going back to President Nixon's speech here in the House of Commons. I think it was in 1971. He said we understand that the United States was developed with foreign capital and that it eventually tried to domesticate its control of the economic environment and it is not surprising that Canada wants to go that route too. I think there has been a high level of understanding between the administrations.

Perhaps the danger now is that because of our economic travails or economic difficulties in the Western world, including the U.S. and Canada, the interest groups have become a bit more strident and vocal and are perhaps attempting to push the governments on conflictual paths.

I would apply that to Canada. I would apply it, I suppose, to U.S.-European relations right now as testified by genuine efforts made at the Summit to express frankly the areas of disagreement but to attempt to minimize their impact rather than exacerbate them. Difficulties are there but they don't damage the fabric of the relations except perhaps in hard economic times.

..... Q. Let me suggest one aspect of it that has always interested me. The period since the war has become so complicated that there was an enormous need of guided political leadership, to speak and to reduce all this diversity to identities so that the people could understand through the complexity and so on. And at that point, it seems to me, the men of words in the political world disappeared.

A. The men of words?

Q. The men of words. Who can speak today as De Gaulle did, or Churchill did, or even Roosevelt did? Where are they? Nehru could speak. Is that a fair...

A. Yes, that is absolutely dead on.

When you are talking about the complexity which leads people to see their regional or sectorial self-interest as opposed to the common weal, the general good, because it is so complex. You cannot seize it all. You cannot seize how Mr. Smith in some little village if he does what is right for him and his cohorts, will be destroying the fabric of the United States of America because it is so great and so beyond him. I think you have perceived it very well and indeed you have expressed, in so many words, certainly the danger which is menacing Canada now.

We are rife with regionalisms and with sectorialisms.

But any reading of history will remind us that this were ever true. Factionalism, whether it be in Europe or tribalism in Africa, or regionalisms in big countries like yours or mine, or the Brazils and so on, have always been and remain a fact of life. Now you seem to say that if we had the men of words this would not be as great a danger. I am not sure I agree with you.

But first of all, and maybe you won't agree with me. I would be inclined to say that in President Reagan you have a man of words. You have a man who seems to have encapsulated the mood of the American people at a certain point in history and who, even to his recent tax success in Congress, seems to have been able to bring people around to his point of view. Then look at the others. I mean, Schmidt has been there since - what? 1972, or 1974? - and he must have found some of the words. And in a sense, I suppose our party must have found some of the words and the feelings. The difference when we are talking today is that there is economic blight everywhere and (even) Churchill, with all his words in 1945 when the economic problems came to the floor, was swept away like (inaudible).

.... Q. Mr. Prime Minister, I wonder how you feel about the state of Canada-U.S. relations. It seems to me that over the last six months there has been a steady stream of criticism - I don't know how; it almost looks orchestrated, there is so much of it - and I wonder if that is a matter of concern to you?

A. Not a very grave concern. I am of the opinion that the U.S. government, the administration, is understanding of the nature of our difficulties and willing to solve them in a way which is fair to both sides. And I would say that has been true of Mr. Reagan's administration but it was (also) true of that of the various presidents that preceded him. But, parallel to that, we are going through difficult economic times and therefore the economic constituencies of the various members of Congress or of Parliament are putting pressure on their members to protect them against, whether it be the United States in our case, or against Canada in the case of the United States. We are seeing a fair amount of that. But just by strict count I see less difficult problems between our countries which have emerged during the past two years (or six months, whichever you want to take) than I did over the past two decades. I mean, look at the uranium cartel difficulty that arose in President Nixon's time; look at the problem of the delimitation of our maritime boundaries on the west or east coast. I mean, they have been with us at least two or three decades and they came to a head in President Carter's time. Look at the question of the Alaska gas pipeline that isn't a problem of any current invention. That is something that we've inherited in the last decade. Acid rain. I mean, we're a bit more conscious of it now, but certainly when President Nixon and I signed the Great Lakes water quality agreement, we were then concerned with environmental pollution of our waterways. So, none of these problems are new they are a bit more noticeable now because people are going through hard times and they're trying to make a little bit more of a row about their difficulties. But the Time/Readers Digest thing - well, that goes back then years and trans-border television...

Q. I know I'm surprised we even see them surfacing again...

A. Well, I know. These are old chestnuts. So let's not exaggerate the dismal state of relations between our two countries. I think they're perhaps less dismal than they've been many times in the past except we were rich and growing richer and we didn't take as much notice of them, then.

22/23

sense, proper sense of isolationism, I don't think so. If anything, I have been more criticized for not being supportive enough of NATO, for instance, rather than for being too supportive of it.



Q. During the campaign, Reagan threw out an idea about a common market in Mexico and the United States and Canada and nothing ever came of it. Did you ever put your mind to that question? Should we be thinking in a totally different way?

A. I don't think that should be the first stages of our thinking. I think that we should be doing more to create a communality of youths of North American countries first and perhaps eventually in the hemisphere.

We haven't addressed ourselves enough to that and it is because of my thinking on that that I have suggested and even promoted with Presidents Portillo and Reagan trilateral meetings of which only one was held at Grand Rapids, in September of last year, if my memory is correct.

I think we have much to gain and little to lose by increasing the degree of knowledge of people at all governmental levels of each other. There is a fair amount of inter-parliamentary democratic representative exchanges and visits and so on. Businessmen travelling a lot, certainly

23/23

governments cooperate a lot between United States and Canada on a piecemeal basis. But, there is perhaps a need for more exchanges and heightening of understanding at levels closer to the summit.



Q. When Harold MacMillan came to Washington a little while ago, we were philosophising like this and he said every country has its nightmare - Germany's is inflation, ours is unemployment-what, he said, is yours? I said Pearl Harbour. And in a way it is true that we have two illusions: one is that the Soviets are the Nazis and the other is that, with the modern weapons, the Republic could be destroyed. And these two illusions - I call them illusions anyway - tend to dominate our politics, plus our sports-minded idea that we must be number one. And that gets in the way of a sensible debate.

A. It is very true.

Q. I am sorry you've lost your trip to the ASEAN countries because that's one of the really hopeful areas in the world.

A. It is, it is.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 23, 1982

Dear Mr. Whiston:

Thank you for your letter to Mr. Deaver regarding Edward M. Urschel's application for admission to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. Mr. Deaver appreciates your concern and input and has forwarded your request to our Military Office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Shirley Moore". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

SHIRLEY MOORE
Staff Assistant to
Michael K. Deaver

Mr. C. Richard Whiston
Mullen, McCaughey & Henzell
Attorneys at Law
112 East Victoria Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

MULLEN, McCAUGHEY & HENZELL

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

THOMAS M. MULLEN
ARTHUR A. HENZELL*
VERNON L. MARTIN*
PHILIP S. WILCOX
WILLIAM L. GORDON
C. RICHARD WHISTON*
GEORGE L. WITTENBURG
J. ROBERT ANDREWS
JAMES W. BROWN
JEFFREY C. NELSON
JOSEPH F. GREEN
GARY W. ROBINSON
LESLIE M. ROBINSON
IAN M. GUTHRIE
MARK E. MYERS

*A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
112 EAST VICTORIA STREET
POST OFFICE DRAWER Z
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93102
(805) 966-1501
TELECOPIER: (805) 966-1505

M. C. McCAUGHEY
RETIRED

September 14, 1982

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO

Ack

Mr. Michael L. Deaver
Assistant to the President of the United States
Office of the President of the United States
1724 M Street N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20270

Re: Edward M. Urschel
1233 East Mountain Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Dear Mike:

A young friend of mine here in Santa Barbara, Edward M. Urschel, is applying for admission to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. His father is a prominent surgeon in this community and everybody that is aware of this application is very enthusiastic about Ted going into the United States Navy as a career.

I have written under separate cover, Congressman Lagomarsino and Holmes Tuttle. Any assistance or inquiries you can make on his behalf would be very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,



C. Richard Whiston

CRW/jpc

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 24, 1982

Dear Mr. Sajbel:

Mr. Deaver has asked me to thank you very much for the Manitou Naturally Sparkling Mineral Water. We opened it in the Santa Barbara Biltmore staff office and enjoyed it the last week of our stay. Each and every person on the staff have asked me to add their thanks to that of Mr. Deaver.

Thanks again for your generosity and thoughtfulness.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY MOORE
Staff Assistant to
Michael K. Deaver

Mr. Richard Sajbel
1488 San Mateo Avenue
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Nipper's

FINE WINING

Mary Power
24 bottles
restraged

September 3rd, 1982

Mr. Michael Deaver
Assistant for the President
Western White House
c/o The Biltmore Hotel

Dear Mr. Deaver

Please find attached two cases of MANITOU NATURALLY SPARKLING MINERAL WATER as instructed by Rick Sajbel of Manitou Corporation.

With our compliments, we remain,

Sincerely,



Nipper's
Arthur von Wiesenberger
President



MICHAEL K. DEEVER

Frank

many thanks for your participation at today's luncheon. Here's your diet. I guarantee it. I lost 33 lbs in about two months.

Cheers! Mike

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Mr. Frank Shakespeare
President
RKO General, Inc.
1440 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10018

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 24, 1982

Dear Mr. Nieto:

I was so pleased to receive the beautiful poster of your painting. My family is also thrilled with it, and we plan to have it framed and find a place of honor for it in our home.

I so enjoyed meeting all of you when you were in recently.

Again, my thanks for your generosity and thoughtfulness.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. DEEVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

Mr. John Nieto
Route #3
Box 86N
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 24, 1982

Dear Jon:

I was so pleased to get your letter, but sorry to learn that Sue had such a traumatic trip and the sudden death of your Mother. I remember talking about her at lunch. She sounded like a wonderful Mother and I know she had a son who was very proud of her.

I hope that Sue is all right now and that everyone is settled in and ready for the adventures.

I enjoyed our visit at lunch and hope it will be possible to visit with you before private life swallows us up.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. DEEVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

Mr. Jon Nordheimer
The New York Times
London Bureau
London International Press Centre
76 Shoe Lane
London EC4A 3JB
England

The New York Times

LONDON BUREAU
LONDON INTERNATIONAL PRESS CENTRE
76 SHOE LANE
LONDON EC4A 3JB
ENGLAND
01-353 8181

*File
note*

Sept. 14

Michael Deaver
The White House
Washington

Dear Mike,

Sue and I and the children have finally settled in here after a fairly traumatic crossing. She was hospitalized with pneumonia and my mother died suddenly in Savannah.

I talked briefly with Ed Streator and hope we can get together shortly. The pipeline sanctions have the Brits up in arms.

I can't tell you how much I enjoyed seeing you again over lunch in Washington. It was most considerate of you to arrange the visit with the President. It was a hell of a treat for Lee and Teddy.

If your travels bring you this way before or after you step back into private life please let us know. Sue joins me in our best wishes to you and Caroline.

Cheers,

Jon
Jon Nordheimer

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 25, 1982


Dear Paul:

Thank you for your letter regarding the National Future Farmers of America's 55th Convention.

I have asked my deputy, Mike McManus, to look into the possibility of the President attending. I will have him contact you once he has reviewed the situation.

Paul, your interest and information concerning this convention is appreciated.

Sincerely,



MICHAEL K. DEAVER
Assistant to the President
Deputy Chief of Staff

Honorable Paul Laxalt
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

M. McMan

September 23, 1982

MEMORANDUM TO: PAT BYE
FROM: ^{FR} FREDERICK J. RYAN
SUBJ: FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA CONVENTION,
NOVEMBER 11-13, 1982 - KANSAS CITY,
MISSOURI

We have received an invitation for the President to attend this annual convention of F.F.A. They expect approximately 23,000 attendees from 30 states.

The invitation is currently under review. If the input from other White House offices is favorable, we will bring it up to Mike at our Long-Range Scheduling Meeting.

If I were to venture a guess, I would say that because of the location of the event, the likelihood of acceptance is not too great.

Please let me know if you need additional information on this.

PAUL LAXALT
NEVADA



ack

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D. C.

September 21, 1982

Dear Mike:

I have been contacted by Scott Neasham, National Future Farmers of America President, regarding their invitation to President Reagan to address their 55th National Convention, and I was asked to contact the White House on their behalf.

Mike, I can certainly appreciate the demands on the President's time and am sure you are giving this request every consideration. I did want to note that every President since Roosevelt has spoken before this group, the largest youth convention in the world.

As always, your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,

PAUL LAXALT
U. S. Senator

PL/kf

Mr. Michael K. Deaver
Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

*Mike
See attached*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 27, 1982

Dear Mr. King:

I finally got through the correspondence you sent, as well as your file here in the White House.

You were highly recommended by some top White House personnel, and I'm sorry you didn't get the job you applied for. However, as far as ERISA is concerned, since you have decided to vote Democrat in the fall because your interests are better served, I suggest you contact your Congressman or Senator to get input from that source.

I'm truly sorry there doesn't seem to be an answer to replacing ERISA.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY MOORE
Staff Assistant to
Michael K. Deaver

Mr. Edward King
3808 Archer Place
Kensington, MD 20895

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 27, 1982

TO: TELEGRAPH OFFICE - Room 87 EOB

FROM: MICHAEL K. DEEVER

STEVE HOLLERN
1007 MALLICK TOWER
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102

I REGRET BEING UNABLE TO ATTEND AND SPEAK BEFORE YOUR GROUP TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28TH. DUE TO UNCONTROLLABLE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE PRESIDENT HAS BEEN SCHEDULED FOR A PRESS CONFERENCE THAT IS MANDATORY FOR ME TO ATTEND.

I HAD LOOKED FORWARD TO MEETING YOU AND SPEAKING BEFORE YOUR GROUP, AND SEEING MY FRIEND PAT JACOBSON AGAIN.

PLEASE EXTEND MY APOLOGIES FOR ANY INCONVENIENCE I MAY
"AVE CAUSED BY MY INABILITY TO ATTEND.

MICHAEL K. DEEVER