

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
Contested Materials Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to McKee RE: Haldeman's plan to meet with various White House officials regarding campaign finance. 1 pg.
9	20	3/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Price RE: the results of the New Hampshire primary. 1 pg.
9	20	3/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Memo	From Higby to Charles Rotchford RE: money for a film lens and calendar watch. 1 pg.
9	20	3/23/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Memo	From Buchman to Haldeman RE: money due from Haldeman. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/30/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Odle's handling of letters. 1 pg.
9	20	3/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: the Pennsylvania primary. 1 pg.
9	20	3/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	"Action Memorandum" from Haldeman RE: sending White House surrogates into Pennsylvania shortly before the primary. 1 pg.
9	20	3/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Ziegler's concerns with the campaign. 2 pgs.
9	20	3/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: the role of key states in the election. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/22/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: an analysis of the Southern view of RN. 1 pg.
9	20	3/21/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: following up on Strachan's conversation with Benham. 1 pg.
9	20	3/21/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Harris and Gallup polls. 1 pg.
9	20	3/21/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: a "Name Change." 1 pg.
9	20	3/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Bob Teeter. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: a trial heat poll involving Wallace. 1 pg.
9	20	3/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: questions generated by Haldeman for inclusion in a poll. 4 pgs.
9	20	3/16/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Wisconsin. 1 pg.
9	20	3/15/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Haldeman's appraisal of a Republican National Committee Communications position. 1 pg.
9	20	3/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: advance surrogates in New Hampshire. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: a one-page summary of the primaries for Haldeman. 1 pg.
9	20	3/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: a recent student poll. 1 pg.
9	20	3/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: requests by RN for various reports and pieces of information. 1 pg.
9	20	3/8/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: campaigning in Florida and New Hampshire finances. 1 pg.
9	20	3/8/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: generating a talking paper for Haldeman to use. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: reports from Benham's office on specific demographics. 1 pg.
9	20	3/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Letter	From Higby to Richard S. Stevens RE: an enclosed check. 1 pg.
9	20	3/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: campaign contributors. 1 pg.
9	20	3/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: Haldeman's desire to get Gallup and Harris poll results. 1 pg.
9	20	3/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Higby to Strachan RE: a discussion about the RNC budget. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
9	20	3/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Higby to Timmons RE: finding room for John T. Chadwell, Jr. in the campaign. 1 pg.
9	20		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From unknown author to unknown recipient RE: John T. Chadwell's desire to aid RN in his bid for re-election. 1 pg.

414
March 14, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT MC KEE
FROM: L. HIGBY

Haldeman wants to have a meeting with Stans, Mitchell, Safire and possibly Colson on the subject of campaign financing and releasing of contributors' names. Will you work with Haldeman in getting a date together for this. Check with him today and see if he wants to do it this week or wait.

LH:kb

HIGH PRIORITY

March 7, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR :

RAY PRICE

FROM :

L. HIGBY

Ray, would you please work out a suitable statement in conjunction with Ron Ziegler to be issued by Jerry Warren at the morning briefing, regarding the New Hampshire results? It should be along the lines listed below:

- The President was pleased by the support shown by the vote and wishes to express his appreciation to the voters of New Hampshire for their vote of confidence. He also wants to express his appreciation for those who, in his absence, made appearances in his behalf.

LH:pm

March 28, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. CHARLES ROTCHFORD
FROM: L. HIGBY

Attached is the \$9 for the film lens and the calendar watch replacement.
The rest of the money will follow shortly.

Attachment

LH:kmt

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
March 23, 1972

H . . .

Mr. Rotchford forwarded the attached. The total amount due from you is ~~\$11.06~~ -- Larry took one of the calendars for his wrist watch.

If you will make out a check at your convenience, I will forward it to Mr. Rotchford.

kb

Attachment

8.98

March 30, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

What happens to all the letters that we submit to Bob Odle? Obviously, 99 percent of them simply receive a reply saying we have placed your name on our active file and if something comes up we will get in touch with you. This is probably a pretty unsatisfactory way to handle this thing. Does Odle have any system for sending these letters directly from the National Committee to the State organizations, or better yet, the precinct or local organizations in the area where the people write from letting the local people know that they want to help and that some contact should be made. This is probably a good way to pick up a number of volunteers, yet I doubt if it is being done.

Please let me know.

LH:kmt

March 29, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Pennsylvania Primary

Bob indicated that you need to cover, with Magruder, the point that we need to be sure that we get our surrogates into Pennsylvania well ahead of the Pennsylvania primary to answer the Democratic candidates. He feels we failed completely on doing this in Wisconsin, and the Democrats have gotten away with making all the news where we get no answers out on our side. In Pennsylvania, which is the next primary that really counts, we should not let this happen.

cc: Chuck Colson - will you please have your people follow-up here as appropriate. Thank you.

LH:kmt

ACTION MEMORANDUM

We need to be sure to get our surrogates into Pennsylvania well ahead of the Pennsylvania primary to answer the Democratic candidates. We failed on this completely in Wisconsin and the Democrats have gotten away with making all the news while we get no answers out on our side. In Pennsylvania, which is the next one that will really count, we should not let this happen.

HRH:kb
March 29, 1972

March 29, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

Ron Ziegler raised with me two problems in your area that you ought to give some consideration to and then let's talk about it.

One concern is Ziegler's access to polling information. He naturally would like to know everything, but realizes this is not a feasible possibility. He does feel, however, and frankly I happen to agree with him, that it would be helpful for him to have access to some general polling information, such as how we are doing, and particularly issue information and the strategy surrounding the information, i. e., if he knew that drugs ~~were~~ a very important issue in the minds of the public and that our recognition in the area of drugs is very low, he could upon occasion, in briefings and private conversation, emphasize the President's commitment towards the drug program. This is only one example, and I'm sure there are some much better ones.

Anyway, he probably should have some sort of general access or poll briefing made available to him. Nothing, of course, on trial heats, etc.

His second problem is in the area of being plugged in on what's happening generally over at the Committee. He has Bruce Whelihan set up to act as his liaison in this regard, but most of the emphasis will be primarily in the area of press. He wonders if it wouldn't be possible for you and Bruce to talk once or twice a week to get some sort of general briefing. This might be a good idea, a better idea even, however, might be for you and Ziegler to meet occasionally and go through things. It would certainly increase your access and stature and probably you can be more sure of what the type of information was that was being relayed to Ziegler.

Anyway, give this some thought, jott down some notes, and let's talk about it tomorrow.

LH:kb

March 28, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Scheduling Proposals in Key States

Bob suggested, in the meeting with Parker and Chapin yesterday, the idea of a key state book, that we all keep copies of, that indicates the situation in the states, what our primary targets are in each state, etc. It would really be more of a one page sheet such as Chapin turned in on his scheduling proposal rather than a poll type sheet but it would contain, of course, more political information. I am not sure, exactly, if this is a good idea or if you have any thoughts on it, but it might be something that would be worth discussing.

It was interesting to note in the meeting with Dwight and Dave yesterday that the subject of strategy with regard to several key states came out and Bob indicated that he needed to talk to Mitchell about this. If he is going to do it, obviously, he has to have all the background facts and know what the strategy is in each state, something we still have failed to provide him. Teeter is providing basic strategy information to Chapin. It would seem to me that we should be able to get some of it into Haldeman. Is there something we can do here?

LH:kmt

March 22, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Analysis of Southern Groups

Will you please ask the people at ORC to do a Southern break-out, in other words, take the approve-disapprove question and analyze only those people who fall in the Southern region on a demographic basis. We would like to see which sub-group in the South we lost on. If you don't understand this, please see me. We should try and get it done as soon as possible.

LH:kmt

March 21, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

To follow-up on your conversations with Benham, will you please ask him to consider the following:

1. What is the reason for our 5 point drop in popularity. Does he view this simply as a return to what our base support is after gaining five points briefly after a China trip or is there some other phenomenon. If he follows the above logic, saying there is only a temporary blip effect that ~~is caused by~~ the China trip, or some other positive event, this would argue for us to do nothing for the next several months and wait ~~about ten to twelve days~~ before the end of the Campaign and then put on a massive blitz that would result in us getting some more positive press. Likewise, this would argue that when we do something on the negative side, that will only have a temporary blip downward and then will bounce back up to the standard level of support. Does he not feel there is anyway we can raise our base level of support?

Also, I would like him to trace the theory of hard core Nixon hatred through the entire series of questions on the ITT matter. Is there a hard core that is on the negative side, no matter what, with regard to Nixon, the question number 13 provides a unique opportunity to do this, but for some reason, he chose not to do it.

Are these people who are always on the negative side in the negative also when it comes to approval, are they always for the Democratic candidates in trial heats, etc.? See what an analysis of this type shows.

March 21, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Harris/Gallop Polling

What is happening on the situation with Harris and Gallop?
When will they be in the field? What questions are they
polling, etc. ?

LH:kmt

202
March 21, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Name Change

Where do we stand on the subject of the name change? Is there something that can or should be done here.

LH:kmt

202
March 17, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

Bob asked that in addition to getting more information from DMI if we can get it, also get our January figures for Los Angeles and Orange County. What he wants to do, obviously, is make a comparison to see if the shift has been in Orange County and Los Angeles County. As you know, Teeter was worried about Orange County figures. The shift, as I'm sure you are well aware, is almost too much to believe, so let's check it out.

With regard to the Mitchell meeting on March 21, Bob felt there might be some interest in John Mitchell, Bob Teeter and Haldeman getting together for a meeting. Rather than responding to the fact that Mitchell and Teeter are getting together, why don't you just say would it not perhaps be worthwhile for the former Attorney General and Bob to sit down with Teeter and review the situation together and see what the feeling is. The point is that Bob does not want to horn in on Mitchell's meeting, but I would guess Mitchell would welcome Haldeman sitting in on a polling meeting now that we have gone round the polls once. Obviously Bob studied them more than John did.

Why don't you get a reading on what can be done here and, if so, plan on setting up the meeting on March 21. It would obviously be to our advantage to have the meeting in Haldeman's office, but I don't know if Mitchell can, or would prefer to arrange that, and obviously there is no need to make waves here. See what you can work out.

LH:kb

March 17, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

We should run a head-to-head with Wallace in the Trial Heats
for this poll.

LH:kb

March 17, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

I have attached several rough questions that Bob wants to have included in the poll. He wants to make sure it covers four areas, trial heats; China aftermath, using some follow-up questions on China; the ITT situation; and, the President on busing.

Attachment

LH:kb

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS:

Busing

-- We should ask who watched, the people who heard and read about the speech, their reaction and then the question about whether or not they agree or disagree with the President's decision to declare a moratorium on busing. We should then ask a question of whether or not you (people you are asking) feel Congress should approve the President's proposal of an Equal Opportunities Education Act that would provide two and a half billion dollars in federal funds during the next year to improve the education of children from poor families.

We should then ask a question that picks up the criticism.

Which one of these statements would you agree with:

- The best way to achieve busing is through a Constitutional Amendment.
- It is better to have busing for our children.
- The President's proposal is a back door, sneak attack on the Constitution.

Bob said it would also be interesting if we started a trend perhaps along the question of: As of now, who do you think will win the Presidential election in November?

As of now, who would you like to see win the Presidential election in November?

With regard to ITT:

We should ask how many people are aware of the Kleindienst hearings and international telephone and telegraph.

We should ask a question about, on ITT going something like: Based on what you know and have heard about ITT, which following statements would you say are true and which ones would you say are false:

-- The government dropped an anti-trust suit against ITT.

-- ITT made a contribution of \$100,000 or more to the Republican party.

-- The reason the Justice Department dropped the case against ITT was because of the contribution to the Republican party; that is, there was a distinct connection between the anti-trust case and the contribution.

-- There is no basis for the charge that wrong-doing existed by the contribution by ITT to the San Diego Visitors' Bureau, that this was normal business practice.

-- The whole Senate hearing was a Democratic/Political movement to discredit the Nixon Administration and block the Kleindienst nomination.

012

We should probe the Presidential connection with ITT with a question something like: Do you believe that President Nixon was directly involved in the ITT case or the arranging of the contribution to the San Diego Visitors' Bureau.

Do you feel the media have fairly reported the Senate hearing?

Do you believe Kleindienst should be confirmed as AG?

We should also try and find out, in addition to awareness, how important people feel the ITT case is; what is their level of concern: From what you know of the case now, will it effect your decision in how you vote in November, etc.

These are obviously very rough questions, but we should get them to O'Neil so he can play around with them and see if we can work something out that would be helpful.

Also, there is no need to worry about doing anything on Vietnam on this poll.

LH

March 17, 1972

March 16, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

I am sure you have already thought of this, but we probably should have some line developed for Wisconsin as we did for Florida and New Hampshire. The question will probably come up some time within the next couple of weeks and you might want to be ahead of it this time.

LH:kb

512
March 15, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

Bob agreed with your suggested action on the RNC Communications position. He emphasized however, that if there is any problem here whatsoever, to get it back to him immediately. He doesn't want this to drag on.

LH:kb

212
March 14, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

To follow-up on our conversation this morning -- Bob has received a report that Jack Kemp has reported that the advancing for surrogate candidates in New Hampshire was lousy. He would like someone to talk to Kemp and find out specifically what the problem was. Also, this person should talk to a couple of other of the surrogates to find out what the problems were. The person should also do some checking in Florida and see how we are handling the advance operation for surrogates there.

Bob would then like a memo from whoever does the checking on what the problems were, what Kemp reported the problems were, and what we are doing to correct the problems.

Will you please follow-up on this and have the report in to Haldeman by close of business on Thursday.

Thank you.

If you are going to have Walker handle this project, you might want to let him know today so his office can at least be setting up an appointment with Kemp. This is a very delicate matter, obviously, that could easily upset Magruder, etc., so it has to be handled on a low-key basis and you should make this clear to Walker. Also, you should let Chapin know what we are doing here so he doesn't have the feeling we are getting in the middle of his operation without at least advising him.

LH:kb

March 13, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

Bob would like a handy one-page summary from you of a run-down of the primaries, mentioning those states where we are on the ballot, who is against us, what our expectations are, etc. He doesn't want a long involved report, but something he can refer to very quickly; hopefully, only one page long.

LH:kb

March 13, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

To follow-up on the student poll on page 18 of today's News Summary, make sure this is in by noon today. Bob will probably be asked about it this morning.

LH:kb

March 9, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

Per our conversation this afternoon, the following has been requested by the President:

1. A report by Friday at 5:00 p. m. on our celebrity situation.
2. A report on McCloskey and his situation in California.
3. With regard to McCloskey also find out whether or not his district has been redistricted so that he needs to run against another Republican incumbent or if he is in a safe district. Is there a candidate running against him? Does he have a chance, etc.

Bob would like this information, obviously, as soon as possible.

4. Also, find out who is on the Florida ballot who is on our side.

Thank you.

LH:kb

912
March 8, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Items to be Covered

Several items that you should cover:

1. We need to determine what our basic line is in Florida, what our outlook is, what our competition is, etc. Will you please get together with Magruder and whoever else should be involved here, for example Ziegler, and work out a proposal on this. Get it in by tomorrow at noon.
2. You should explore with Magruder the possibility of whether or not we can score any points by reporting the low dollars that we spend in New Hampshire and can we be sure that the reported expenditures are set up properly. Also, can we make the point that we use no television in New Hampshire as contrasted to the enormous use of television by candidates. You should discuss this item with Magruder and Colson and work out something, if appropriate.
3. Did we do the Florida state-wide student pole on college campuses or was that done by someone else? What's the background story on that?

LH:kmt

052
March 8, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Talking Paper for Mr. Haldeman

Please prepare talking paper for Haldeman that he could use in convincing the Attorney General that we need to get Flemming out of the line of responsibility. There is a real problem here, obviously, that needs to be changed.

LH:kmt

552
March 7, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

Wouldn't it be possible, like we have done in the past, to have Benham's office read to us the demographics on approval to see where the changes are, or if not, to include that when they send the other demographics down? The delay on this one is rather alarming.

LH:kb

252
March 7, 1972

Dear Dick:

Enclosed is my check for the use of the spa.
Thank you again for your courtesy in letting
us use the facility.

Looking forward to getting back to California
and hope to see you when we're there.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Higby
Administrative Assistant
to H. R. Haldeman

Mr. Richard S. Stevens
President
1221 West Coast Highway
Newport Beach, California 92660

Enclosure

LH:kb

452
March 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR : GORDON STRACHAN

FROM : L. HIGBY

Bob asked that you talk to Mitchell (Magruder) and Stans to make sure that they know that the President cannot talk to any potential contributors. It's obvious in looking at the Kleindienst case that it bears out the wisdom of this approach.

Also, make sure that you let Parker, Chapin, and the rest of the scheduling apparatus know that this will be the policy. In the case of Magruder and Stans, do this by a telephone call. In the case of our people here, it's O.K. to do it by memo, but don't mention the Kleindienst analogy.

LH:pm

March 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR : GORDON STRACHAN
FROM : L. HIGBY

Bob asked as to when you would be having the Gallup results and the Harris results from their field poll. Will you please let me know on this?

Thanks,

LH:pm

258
March 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR : GORDON STRACHAN
FROM : L. HIGBY

I'd like to discuss briefly with you at your earliest convenience,
the RNC budget. Please bring any material that you have on
the current budget that I might read abthe

LH:pm

March 28, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. WILLIAM E. TIMMONS
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Mr. John T. Chadwell, Jr.

Congressman Arends talked to Bob yesterday, as I indicated to you he would.

Mr. Arends was calling on the subject of Mr. John T. Chadwell, Jr. He is currently Assistant to the Director of the Office of Law Enforcement in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Arends indicates that Mr. Chadwell wants to help in the campaign, that he is good, able and smart and would be good in fund raising or anything else for that matter.

Bob asked that you check this request out to see whether or not Mr. Chadwell is someone we want to bring aboard and follow-through with Mr. Chadwell and the Congressman, if appropriate.

Please let us know what you do here.

Thank you.

cc: Clark MacGregor

LH:kmt

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

John T
Chadwell Jr: Treas
Asst. Dir. - Off. Law Enforce
Office of Sec. Treas
wants to help in campaign
good-olde-smart
fundraising or anything