

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Record Group/Collection:** George H.W. Bush Presidential Records  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Speech File Draft Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13599  
**Folder ID Number:** 13599-003

---

**Folder Title:**  
Exeter Town Hall 1/15/92 [OA 6095]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>

---

*Note: The President spoke at 8:52 a.m. at the Pease Air National Guard Base. In his remarks, he referred to J. Bonnie Newman, member of the Governor's Council, and Ruth L. Griffin, former Assistant to the President for Management and Administration. The text of these excerpted remarks follows the release as issued by the Office of the Press Secretary.*

### Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at a Town Hall Meeting in Exeter, New Hampshire January 15, 1992

*The President.* I am very, very pleased to be back. Mike, how are you? This guy meets me at Pease every time I come in there. [Laughter] Exeter rose-grower.

Let me just say how really pleased I am to be here and to thank you for turning out. I want to make a couple of comments, and then it's mainly questions. Isn't it, Judd? First, I want to thank the Governor for being at my side. You know my and Barbara's affection for Governor Judd Gregg and for Hugh and Kay, old longtime friends who stay in touch and who have kept me informed of this State—both of them, both Greggs—of the problems that we face in this State. And I'm not talking political; I'm talking about hardship for people that are hurting.

And one of the things I'm pleased to be able to do here is to at least let the people of this State know that even though I am President and do have two or three other responsibilities, that when people are hurting, we care. We get the message there. We read the mail; we can understand. And I just wanted to get that out loud and clear because we're in a political year, and you hear a lot of people that have discovered New Hampshire for the first time running around trying to say something different. Of course, we care.

Secondly, I am very grateful not only to the Governor but to Senator Bob Smith, Senator Rudman, who couldn't be with us—Bob Smith here today—who are doing a superb job, and then your Congressman, another dear friend, a man I respect, Bill Zeff.

These are leaders in the Congress. And they talk about pledges and all of this. Let me tell you something. I took a pledge when I was sworn in, the oath of office, and what I need a pledge about is to get more Congressmen and Senators like Senator Smith and Gordon Humphrey, who was in the Senate and is supporting me, and your Congressman here, Bill Zeff, and Warren Rudman. And then we would be able to control this Federal spending better, and then we would be able to see that we get these tax improvements that I've been asking for.

So that's the pledge I want, is the pledge from the people to give us more. And you're going to have to use your influence out of the State because you've done pretty darn well in the State in the United States Congress.

So, that was one point I wanted to make. The other one is that people say, "Well, you're in trouble in New Hampshire." Well, that may be. But I'm here to listen. I'm here to take the questions. I'm here to say, "Hey, there's a lot to do in partnership, the Federal Government, the State government where you've got superb leadership, and the people themselves."

And of course, we care. And somebody gave me the analogy of a country-western song about a train, hoping they'd see the light at the end of the tunnel is not a train coming through. And I trumped it with saying, well, remember the Nitty Gritty Dirt Band one, if you've got any country music people here, "If you're going to see a rainbow, you've got to stand a little rain."

Well, New Hampshire has stood more than its share of rain, job-hurting and the families wondering how they're going to make their ends meet. But there is going to be a rainbow out there. There's some fundamentals that are pretty darn good. And yet, we've got to do better.

And the last point I want to make is I hope that you will listen to the State of the Union Message. I have proposed, 3 straight years, growth agenda programs. Not some fancy quick fix that's going to have broad appeal in an election time, but things that would stimulate this economy. And now, we're putting this all together again with new additions to it to take these proposals to the American

people. And then what I hope we can do is rally the American people and get the economy moving by sound investment-oriented treatment of the Tax Code.

And that is what's needed, and still hold the line on spending. One of the few benefits of that budget agreement was that we have caps on the excesses of Federal spending, those things that can be controlled. And I want to keep them there. I do not want to bust the one restraint that is on the spenders in the United States Congress.

So having said that, I hope you'll ask the questions. We'll have a good health program that I think will have appeal to the voters here because it's family; it keeps things close to the people themselves rather than having a lot of mandated benefits out of Washington.

And this is the last point. I'm just back from a rather spectacular trip to Asia. I say spectacular—you try getting the flu at a dinner. [Laughter] I have a feeling the people in New England, and certainly having been a neighbor of this State for so long, understand that even Presidents get the flu. I said over there, even Democrats get it from time to time. [Laughter] But you've got to admit I did it in a dramatic way.

Having said that, exports account for a tremendous amount of the growth in this country. A lot of the jobs, I think it's estimated—I was talking to Bob and Bill coming over here—35,000 to 40,000 jobs in New Hampshire related to exports. So please don't buy this protection legislation that the Democrats and some others are putting out, this idea that we can shrink back inside. I want to put America first in the sense of the values, in the sense of getting this economy to be first but not in the sense of some kind of protection legislation that is going to shrink markets and throw the working people of New Hampshire further out of work. Let's expand these markets.

Now, fire away. Shoot. Any questions, even the tough ones. I know we've got a few fans in here for someone else. Bring them up.

### **The Economy**

**Q.** Mr. President, first let me say the conditions in the country today...

ernment in deficit, most every State in the Union in deficit, and most every municipality in the country in deficit, never mind the households, what do we have to do? And I'm glad you brought a few, to get the Congressmen and the Senators in this country to realize when we have millions of people without jobs, homeless, without health care, and these fellows have the gall to vote themselves a raise, what can we do other than vote out every incumbent? I hate to see that, but I mean, what do we have to do to get the message across to these people in Washington?

**The President.** Well, I think this kind of meeting helps. Fortunately, you have congressional delegations, the ones I mentioned from this State, that understand that. They fight against the excesses of Congress.

One of the things that I proposed or seconded the motion on were these proposals that are there, and they're bipartisan, I might add, for Congress to reform itself in terms of proliferation of committees and needing reforms, Congress to adhere to the same laws that the American people have to adhere to. One of the comments that I've made after the Clarence Thomas hearings was that that needed to be done. They ought not to exempt themselves from the laws you and I have to honor. And this congressional delegation understands that; these people here do. So, you've got to spill over and use your influence across the border, two ways I might add, Maine and Massachusetts, good places to start. So, try that one.

But no, you've got a good point. Look, I'm not up here to assign blame. I'll take my share of the blame. I don't take it for not caring or not understanding. I do. Barbara does. I hope we have projected the family concerns that we feel. We've tried to do that in this job. But I'm not here to blame.

But I am here to remind the voters up here that in two previous State of the Unions I have proposed growth initiatives that would have stimulated the economy. Now I'm going to do it again, and this time I'm going to look the American people in the eye, as I did in the past, and say, "All right, people are hurting more now. I've just come back

f people are out of...  
...e, pass this packa...  
...back into politics...  
...of this political year...  
...that's going to get...  
...and of this country...  
...approach I'm going t...

Now, we had one over there.

### **AIDS**

**Q.** We had a wor who led us in health...  
Chick Koop.

**The President.** Y.

**Q.** Can he help us...  
problems in the futu...

**The President.** Y...  
man. I think he war...  
other day. And onc...  
Koop, who came int...  
"Well, this guy's a l...  
national agenda." F...  
my. One of the thi...  
d this is a sensitive...  
gain because yeste...  
"Magic" Johnson—i...  
treating AIDS is a he...

We are concerne...  
it. When Barbara hc...  
arms, she's trying to...  
that both of us feel...  
and meet with those...  
with it—we have to...  
lem: Prevention, res...  
caring, making peop...  
is a national health p...

And Magic, who's...  
lowing in the footste...  
Chick Koop has pu...  
ning, is saying, "Loc...  
He said, "I've made...  
did. He made some...  
to help, get this thi...  
compassionate treat...  
...e what we can do...  
...e bully pulpit of...  
Chick Koop and of...  
General, to educat...  
treat with the health...  
tion and research. I...

of people are out of work. And if you really want to pass this package. And then we can put it back into politics and debate it for the rest of this political year. But get something done that's going to get the people of this State and of this country back to work." That's the approach I'm going to take.

Now, we had one here, and then I'll come over there.

#### AIDS

**Q.** We had a wonderful Surgeon General who led us in health care in the man of Dr. Chick Koop.

**The President.** Yes.

**Q.** Can he help us with some of our health problems in the future?

**The President.** Yes, he can. He's a good man. I think he wants to, too. I saw him the other day. And one of the things that Dr. Koop, who came into office and people said, "Well, this guy's a little conservative for the national agenda." He wasn't; very sensitive guy. One of the things that he has done—and this is a sensitive subject; it's on my mind again because yesterday I met with Earvin "Magic" Johnson—is to project the idea that treating AIDS is a health problem.

We are concerned about it. We care about it. When Barbara holds an AIDS baby in her arms, she's trying to express the compassion that both of us feel. When I go out to NIH and meet with those people that are afflicted with it—we have to do it on a health problem: Prevention, research and development, caring, making people understand this now is a national health problem.

And Magic, who's on that Commission, following in the footsteps of the education that Chick Koop has put forward to the beginning, is saying, "Look, lifestyle's important." He said, "I've made some mistakes." And he did. He made some big ones. But now I want to help, get this thing out for open debate, compassionate treatment as a disease, and see what we can do. And then use our office, the bully pulpit of the White House and Chick Koop and others, our new Surgeon General, to educate people. We've got to treat with the health aspect through prevention and research. I think he will have—we'd love to have him involved.

#### Health Care

**Q.** On the national health plan, what do you have planned as a help for the 35 million people who don't have health insurance?

**The President.** The question in the back is a very important question. What are you going to do about the 35 million who don't have health insurance? What we've done so far is emphasizing prevention, emphasizing inoculations and this kind of thing. Now at the State of the Union, I will have what I think is the proper, if you'll permit me to hold back some of the details, but a comprehensive health care program that does not increase the Federal mandates but does bring protection to the numbers of people that are uninsured. Therein lies the big problem.

So, we will have a comprehensive—it's only 2 weeks away, so stay tuned, and I think it will be done with the values I think of as New Hampshire values in mind, without busting the budget. I ask you, when you hear all these people who have just discovered New Hampshire on the road map coming up here with these health plans, ask them what that is going to do to the people that pay the taxes, as well as those who need the health care.

So, I think we've got a good program, and I hope we can get the support from everybody in this room.

Yes, in the back in the middle.

**Q.** If I can just comment, I think we have time for about two more questions. We'd like to have everybody come up and have a chance to shake hands with the President.

**The President.** Anybody got a real controversial one or want to make a statement? I want some guy that really wants to be tough, some tough guy. Who is it? This guy in the middle? Yes. Who are you for, first, and then let's hear the question. [Laughter]

**Q.** I don't think you want to know.

**The President.** No, but really, they shouldn't be softballs. Call it as you see it, and you'll get it back.

**Q.** I'm a registered Democrat.

**The President.** All right, sir.

#### Education

**Q.** I haven't made up my mind yet.

Four years ago you proclaimed yourself "the education President."

**The President.** Yes.

**Q.** Well, I'm a student at the University of New Hampshire, and to the best of my knowledge New Hampshire is 51st out of 50 States. We're behind Puerto Rico as well, as far as State funding for education. And I just haven't seen very much evidence of your being the education President.

**The President.** The man asked a very important and very fair question. In the first place, Federal spending, and I can understand why you might not sense this, is up significantly in the Department of Education. As you know, Federal spending is 6 or 7 percent of the total education budget for the country. Educational spending, leave out Federal, is also up substantially.

Here's the good news: We do have a good program. I went to the 50 Governors. We put politics aside on this one, believe me. We've got the national education goals, six goals now. They were agreed by Democrats and Republicans alike. They are now encompassed in a program called America 2000, which is a national education strategy. It literally calls for revolutionizing the schools.

Yes, it requires some more Federal spending, but we're budgeting that. It requires much more participation of parents and of communities. I addressed a national chamber meeting yesterday on it. Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives coming together to say we've got to do it differently.

And please take a look at that program. It is sensible. I'm determined to keep it out of the political cross-currents. I don't care about my personal label; I am committed to education. This program, under the able leadership of Lamar Alexander, is one of the things that is beginning to get to the American consciousness. You and I might differ on this one; I still like the idea of parents being able to choose.

When I came out of the military to the G.I. bill a thousand years ago nobody said, "Hey, you've got to go to school A or school B, university A or B, or high school extension program A, B, or C." The person could choose. And choice in the State of Minnesota, formerly run by a Democratic Governor, has resulted in educational excellence.

And so, one of the concepts of this is choice. Another one is doing better in math and science. Another one is to continue the increases that we've already started on Head Start, ready to learn. Another one is, you're never too old to learn. Even I, and it's not just show business, have a little computer there, and I'm trying to learn it. And I'm doing something, and I hope it's an example that you're never too old to learn, although I'm having a few difficulties with the cursor. [Laughter]

The thing that troubles me is I don't think that we've gotten that across. It is a good, sensible program. It's really just starting, but it holds the answer, because we are not going to be as competitive in this world if we don't do better in math or science.

Another part of it is voluntary testing at the 4th, 8th, and high school level. And it's voluntary. But there's nothing wrong with testing. There's nothing wrong with standards so a school knows whether it's keeping up with other schools. We've gotten away from that sense of discipline. Then I want the schools to be drug-free so a kid can go and learn in a safe environment.

So, those are some of the ingredients of our program called America 2000.

#### War on Drugs

**Q.** Mr. President, it seems that as the economy gets worse and worse, that more and more people are turning to the sales of drugs and more and more people are using drugs as they see the economy toughen and their families suffering. What do you propose to do about this problem because it seems to keep getting worse?

**The President.** Let me repeat the question because I want to argue with the premise a little bit, not totally. The premise is, it seems to be getting worse on narcotics, drugs, amongst young people, and what do you propose to do about it?

We have a national drug strategy. We are making significant if not dramatic progress amongst young people, for example, in the use of cocaine, down by 10 percent. Where we're hurting as a society is the 35 and older, kind of the addicted crowd is not shaking it.

Education is a part of it. Treatment is a part of it.

ful interdiction  
ational drug  
there's another  
vate partnersh  
guy named Jim  
million—they  
lion a day. I do  
them, with adv  
tisements tryin  
parents that d  
of drugs.

We are making progress in making cocaine use. A way to go. So, lem, but I just there that these in terms of the about.

Last pitch is the people of the economic work, still really rest of the country about as family formation of the we do, like child the family has the family does.

Barbara is out. So, I do think that to the success. They not get this drug got a program. We together and that this. That isn't going to outprop across the State very, very strong, to try to help them stand.

You've got to go to hug them. You dust them off a game. And if you off into some of they need help or

[At this point Maureen Barrow with a book.]

ful interdiction effort, is a part of it. But the operational drug strategy is working. And then there's another ingredient to this. It's the private partnership under the leadership of a guy named Jim Burke. We're spending \$1 million—they are, not Government—\$1 million a day. I don't know whether you've seen them, with advertisements, pro bono advertisements trying to help educate children and parents that drugs are—you know, turn off of drugs.

We are making progress. We've made big progress in marijuana, made big progress in cocaine use. And yet, we've still got a long way to go. So, we'll keep fighting the problem, but I just want to give a little hope out there that these figures are fairly encouraging in terms of the age group that you asked about.

Last pitch is this on it: I still think that the people of New Hampshire, in spite of the economic problems and being out of work, still really epitomize for a lot of the rest of the country what Barbara and I talk about as family values. I worry about the decimation of the American family. Everything we do, like child care, we try to make it that the family has a choice, or education, that the family does.

Barbara is out there, "Read to the kids." So, I do think that family involvement is vital to the success. The Federal Government cannot get this drug thing done by itself. We've got a program. We've got to keep the families together and the families involved in solving this. That isn't a vote-getter, and that isn't going to outpromise some Democrat halfway across the State. But it is something I feel very, very strongly about and will continue to try to help the American people understand.

You've got to read to your kids. You've got to hug them. You've got to lift them up and dust them off and put them back into the game. And if you don't do that, they drift off into some of this mire. In the inner city they need help on it, too.

[At this point, County Commissioner Maureen Barrows presented the President with a book.]

**The President.** Listen, I apologize, but we're really almost just getting started. This

is not show business. I mean, when a guy asked a very good question on education it gave me a chance to say what I think, but also it shows what concerns people. So I hope you don't feel this—even the guy at the end of the table here feels it's just some kind of a useless exercise.

But the message: I care. We're trying. We need help. We have had and will continue to have, I think, sound and sensible programs.

And let's not forget this: It was one year ago that I had to make a very fateful decision that affected the lives of a lot of Americans. And we saw instantly the return of American pride. It doesn't matter about how you feel about when we should have gone to war, the country came together. I want to use that same kind of leadership to bring the country together now on the social problems that affect us and on getting this economy going and getting New Hampshire back to work. And I need your help.

Thank you very, very much.

*Note: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. at the Exeter Town Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Dagostino, a retired rose-grower in Exeter, and Hugh and Kay Gregg, parents of Governor Judd Gregg.*

**Remarks to Davidson Interior Trim Employees in Dover, New Hampshire**

*January 15, 1992*

First, let me just say thanks for the warmth of this reception. And your chairman is just back from a trip with me abroad, and the thing got a little caught up in some of the politics of the moment which is hard to avoid. But the concept was: Look, this isn't any time to pull back; this is a time to try to expand American markets. I am not in favor of protection in the sense of pulling away from our export markets.

So, we went over there and tried to hammer away in getting our export market extended. And one of the things that saved us in the extraordinarily difficult times that, well, this State faces and the neighboring

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. \_\_\_\_\_

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

92 JAN 14 P4:11

DATE: 1/14/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ---

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
WEDNESDAY, 1/15/92

SUBJECT: \_\_\_\_\_

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

The attached has been forwarded to the President.

RESPONSE:

**SENSITIVE**

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 14, 1992

32 JAN 14 P2:26

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: DAVID DEMAREST  
TONY SNOW *TS*

FROM: CURT SMITH *[Signature]*

SUBJECT: EXETER TOWN HALL

On Wednesday, January 15th, at 10:30 a.m., you will deliver remarks, (approximately 9 minutes/cards) to a group of 350 New Hampshireites (including a large representation of Republicans) in Exeter's Town Hall. Governor Gregg introduces you; also acknowledged is County Commissioner Maureen Barrows, Senator Smith, and Congressman Zeliff.

Your speech acknowledges the political realities of campaign season, and suggests skepticism towards campaign promises of economic cure-alls. You also unveil a set of standards by which economic proposals, including those to be released in the State of the Union, may be judged.

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 14, 1992  
Draft Two EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you, Governor, for that kind introduction. Senator Bob Smith. Congressman Bill Zeff. County Commissioner Maureen Barrows. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these political ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \ \

I've had to look at a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been talking to people all over the country and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows that we need policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced capital gains taxes. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in defeating my growth initiatives than getting the economy back on its feet. Well, their victory is your disaster.

Now, you're going to hear lots of proposals for growth in the next six weeks -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make economic sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers

produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Does it prepare our students for the challenges of the next century? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretzky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it address your basic concerns: Does it protect what you want protected, and promote what you want promoted? For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve

the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their incomes, their pensions, their futures.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

Apply these tests each plan you hear this year -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these notions still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not me -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than

brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. I will fight against those who preach a politics of division, who want to turn the world into a land of us versus them, rather than as a place of unlimited opportunity. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer streets, and for a brighter future. \\

So listen to what my competition says -- then hear me out. I'm counting on the people of New Hampshire -- and I'm confident that when you sort out the beef from the bull, you'll know who's got the best plan to get this economy moving again.

You know, the Republican party was founded about 100 yards away from here. It set its sights on becoming the party of freedom, of union, and of the future. The GOP's founders declared war on the very kind of Know Nothing Nativism that seems to be rising up in some parts of our country today. Well, I intend to remain true to the the principles, optimism and determination that made this party and this nation great.

With New Hampshire's help, we will rise to heights our forefathers would have found unimagable. And we will rise on the basis of our hard work, our belief in freedom, and our faith in ourselves. Thank you. God bless New Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 14, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: DAVID DEMAREST  
TONY SNOW *TS*

FROM: CURT SMITH *[Signature]*

SUBJECT: EXETER TOWN HALL

On Wednesday, January 15th, at 10:30 a.m., you will deliver remarks, (approximately 9 minutes/cards) to a group of 350 New Hampshireites (including a large representation of Republicans) in Exeter's Town Hall. Governor Gregg introduces you; also acknowledged is County Commissioner Maureen Barrows, Senator Smith, and Congressman Zeliff.

Your speech acknowledges the political realities of campaign season, and suggests skepticism towards campaign promises of economic cure-alls. You also unveil a set of standards by which economic proposals, including those to be released in the State of the Union, may be judged.

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 14, 1992  
Draft Two EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you, Governor, for that kind introduction. Senator Bob Smith. Congressman Bill Zeliff. County Commissioner Maureen Barrows. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these political ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\\

I've had to look at a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been talking to people all over the country and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows that we need policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced capital gains taxes. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in defeating my growth initiatives than getting the economy back on its feet. Well, their victory is your disaster.

Now, you're going to hear lots of proposals for growth in the next six weeks -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make economic sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers

produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Does it prepare our students for the challenges of the next century? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretzky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it address your basic concerns: Does it protect what you want protected, and promote what you want promoted? For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve

the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their incomes, their pensions, their futures.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

Apply these tests each plan you hear this year -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these notions still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not me -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than

brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. I will fight against those who preach a politics of division, who want to turn the world into a land of us versus them, rather than as a place of unlimited opportunity. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer streets, and for a brighter future. \ \

So listen to what my competition says -- then hear me out. I'm counting on the people of New Hampshire -- and I'm confident that when you sort out the beef from the bull, you'll know who's got the best plan to get this economy moving again.

You know, the Republican party was founded about 100 yards away from here. It set its sights on becoming the party of freedom, of union, and of the future. The GOP's founders declared war on the very kind of Know Nothing Nativism that seems to be rising up in some parts of our country today. Well, I intend to remain true to the the principles, optimism and determination that made this party and this nation great.

With New Hampshire's help, we will rise to heights our forefathers would have found unimaginable. And we will rise on the basis of our hard work, our belief in freedom, and our faith in ourselves. Thank you. God bless New Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

92 JAN 14 P 1: 55

January 14, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW

FROM: ROGER B. PORTER *RBP*

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Exeter Town Hall  
Exeter, New Hampshire

We have reviewed the attached Presidential remarks and have noted a few suggested changes on the draft.

If you have any questions or we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

cc: Phillip D. Brady

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM



DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL

SUBJECT: EXTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

SENSITIVE

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look <sup>AT</sup> a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need <sup>I</sup> ~~is~~ policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap<sup>ital</sup> gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in ~~wrestling me to the floor~~ <sup>DEFERRING MY GROWTH INITIATIVES</sup> than in getting the economy back on its feet. ~~Sure they got me to give in on taxes.~~ But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

*THIS SUGGESTS WEAKNESS.*

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it ~~make sense~~ <sup>STIMULATE THE INVESTMENT NECESSARY TO CREATE JOBS?</sup> In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

*INCREASE AMERICA'S CAPACITY TO COMPETE IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY?*  
Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

*STOP THE SLIDE IN REAL ESTATE VALUES AND INCREASE HOME SPACES?*  
Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

*CONTROL WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND BRING THE DEFICIT UNDER CONTROL?*  
Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

UNDER CONTROL?

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up, ~~measures up~~. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss

247

92 JAN 14 12:25 WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM



DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

SUBJECT:

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<del>SCOWCROFT</del>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

January 14, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW

The NSC staff concurs with the draft presidential remarks.

*Brent Scowcroft*  
Brent Scowcroft

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

cc: Phillip D. Brady

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshirites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up ~~measures up~~. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

CLOSE HOLD

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM



DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL

SUBJECT: EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

*See additional comments from Bob Brady*

**SENSITIVE**

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

10:15 m

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

32 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshirites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

[NOTE: This from the guy who took "the pledge" + then raised taxes?]

Brady  
4844

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: <sup>will</sup> ~~Does~~ it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

*Handwritten signature*

*the spur investments in productivity needed to create jobs?*

*Grady 4/8/44*

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? *in the global economy?* Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs. *address the decline in real estate values*

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- ~~starting with home values~~. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. ~~And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values,~~ *bank* Americans ~~watched~~ their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future. *by controlling Federal spending*

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- ~~does it minimize it, or does it politicize it?~~ Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

*Shady  
44844*

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up measures up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference

between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce;

consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry

stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss



WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

92 JAN 14 P1:14

DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL

SUBJECT: EXTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

*See comment*

**SENSITIVE**

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "..skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

USTK  
checking

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up measures up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

**MASTER**

J.B.  
Gardner - beef.  
DD - add retirement/pension sentence.

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

County Commissioner Maureen Banows

DAG

Thank you, <sup>Governor,</sup> for that kind introduction. I know there's been

some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise ~~voters~~ bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy.

(DD)

That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these <sup>political</sup> ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

skinner)

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been <sup>looking at the data</sup> ~~looking at the data~~ and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows <sup>that what are</sup> we need ~~is~~ policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced <sup>taxes</sup> cap gains.

I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. <sup>a concession I will not make again.</sup> But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

LDD

(Skinner)

(Counsel)

(Skinner)

small:  
delete  
last 2  
sentences  
or  
explain  
↓  
in going  
to skip  
this because  
Skinner's  
already  
signed  
off of  
one caveat  
above,

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

(DD) Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? <sup>Does it prepare our students for the challenges of the next century?</sup> Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their <sup>wages</sup> health, <sup>Counsel</sup> their investments, <sup>(their own retirement.)</sup> their children's future.

DD says "old pension" what does that mean & is it necessary?  
Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

(DD) When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my <sup>plan</sup> proposals measure ~~up~~ <sup>up</sup>. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these <sup>notions</sup> proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

(DD) I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not <sup>ME</sup> ~~my style~~ -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

Carney

I know New Hampshire shares these goals,  
I ask New Hampshire to join  
this fight.

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

So listen to what my competition says -- then hear me out.  
I'm counting on the people of New Hampshire -- and I'm confident  
that when you sort out fact from fiction, you'll see that we've  
got the best plan to get this economy growing again. //

RE POTUS Visit

TOM SNOW, GORHAM HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

FVF, 100 yards from Exeter Town Hall

**THE SQUAMSCOTT HOTEL.** Gorham Hall was originally the site of the Squamscott Hotel, built in 1838 by the enterprising sisters, Martha Gilman and Mrs. Hannah Ladd. Shortly thereafter, "Major" Blake and his son-in-law, Oliver Prall, purchased the Squamscott and conducted a successful business here for many years.

\* **THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.** Then, according to Dr. James D. Squires, on October 12, 1853, an auspicious historical event visited the Squamscott Hotel in the guise of the Hon. Amos Tuck. In February of that year Congressman Tuck came home to Exeter after the close of his third, two-year term in Congress. The Hon. Amos Tuck was among those who opposed the extension of slavery and in order to work towards this end he hoped to unify all N.H. elements having any reason to oppose the Democrats into a new opposition party.

"On October 12, 1853, Tuck met with thirteen other men in the Squamscott Hotel.....All seeking to form an organization that would work harmoniously together. Tuck suggested that they abandon all old names and call themselves Republicans."

"There deliberations were, of course, secret, and no newspaper accounts appeared at the time to tell what happened in Exeter. But before the year was ended, Dr. Batchelder told the whole story to the eminent New York editor, Horace Greeley, who was visiting his native town of Amherst."

"Through Greeley's efforts the facts of the October meeting in New Hampshire and of the new name that had been proposed for the party appeared in print. Thus, months before either the Ripon meeting or the assembly at Jackson, New Hampshire men pioneered in the formation of a new political group to oppose the Democrats...."

This event is recorded on a bronze tablet located on the right side of the main entrance to Gorham Hall and reads: On This Site The Republican Party Was First Named By Hon. Amos Tuck Oct. 12, 1853. Dartmouth College holds the original plaque for its commemoration significance. A new tablet has replaced the original.

**ABRAHAM LINCOLN.** During Todd Lincoln's tenure at Phillips Exeter Academy, President Abraham Lincoln visited Exeter on a number of occasions. It is widely accepted that he stayed at the Squamscott Hotel.

**PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY.** In 1872 Phillips Exeter Academy bought the Hotel and renamed it Gorham Hall in honor of one of their trustees, Dr. David W. Gorham. The building was subsequently sold and renovated a number of times. In 1955 concern was voiced by many that the proposed new buyers of Gorham Hall were only interested in the land and not the building. Fortunately, **NICHOLS POULTRY FARM** was able to purchase the property, saving Gorham Hall and utilize it for office space, until in 1960, the Academy repurchased Gorham Hall for their administrative offices.

**GORHAM HALL TODAY** is one of the largest office buildings in downtown Exeter. Phillips Exeter Academy sold Gorham Hall in 1983. Since this time its primary tenant has been Exeter Holdings, Ltd., a private capital firm specializing in the acquisition of small to medium sized businesses. More recently they have shared this beautiful old building with the Exeter School District for their administrative offices and Bottomline Technologies, a thriving and innovative high-tech computer company.

# CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss

## WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

SUBJECT: \_\_\_\_\_

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

# SENSITIVE

*All comments*

# CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise ~~things~~ bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been ~~looking at the data~~  <sup>talking with people all over this country</sup>  and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

*add  
SRS must  
investments  
education ✓*

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, ".skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

(?)  
add  
pension

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my <sup>plan</sup> proposals measure up ~~measures up~~. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these <sup>notions</sup> proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not <sup>me</sup> my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss



WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

92 JAN 14 A 9:30

DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL

SUBJECT: EXTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

SENSITIVE

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

02 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these <sup>political</sup> ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows <sup>that what are</sup> we need ~~is~~ policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. ~~But~~ while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

That is a concession. I will make a deal.

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretzky used to say, "...skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

32 JAN 14 AM 11:33

January 14, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY SNOW

FROM: John S. Gardner *JSG*  
SUBJECT: Exeter Town Hall Remarks

Phil and I just had one comment on this:

1. P. 2, first paragraph: Couldn't these other descriptions be interpreted as applying equally well to the President?
2. P. 2, third para.: To use "beef" will remind the press corps of Gary Hart in 1984!

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshirites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

Want this be interpreted as applying equally well to the President?

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

↓  
Sounds like Gary Hart  
1984!!  
A

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "..skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

Try to seem with GOP  
w/o voters - it  
a little light

Ask for support  
at the end

CARNEY

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Ask for support AT END

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.)) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshire knows there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

~~Back~~

CARNEY: CROWD is 1/3  
Bush backers 2/3 undecided  
Republicans. Might want  
to watch lunch ~~at~~ a Git...

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, ".skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. 298772ss

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

02 JAN 13 P7:19

DATE: 1/13/92 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: TUESDAY, 1/14/92 NOON

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL

SUBJECT: EXTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE - WED. 1/15/92

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HORNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SKINNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PETERSMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BROMLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KAUFMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNOW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HOLIDAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please forward your comments directly to Tony Snow, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than NOON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, with a copy to this office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

SENSITIVE

CLOSE HOLD

PHILLIP D. BRADY  
Assistant to the President  
and Staff Secretary  
Ext. 2702

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

92 JAN 13 P5:35  
PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS:

EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "..skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

(Smith/Grossman)  
January 10, 1992  
Draft One EXETER

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EXETER TOWN HALL  
EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1991

Thank you for that kind introduction. I know there's been some concern about my illness at the Japanese State Dinner, and some questions about the cause of my sickness. \ I know Barbara joked about how my tennis game was to blame -- but I want to set the record straight. \\ I told Barbara that I didn't want to eat any broccoli for lunch. \\ Any broccoli farmers here?

Well, you all know that I don't like broccoli. And I know that you all don't like baloney. Almost everyone in New Hampshire has met a future president at one time or another, and they can see right through the smoke screens of pipe dream promises. I know we're swinging into a campaign cycle. And already I see contenders scrambling all over each other to promise voters bigger, better, and bolder than the next guy. That's perfectly acceptable -- that's democracy. But it is not acceptable to exploit economic hardship for political profit ((some of these ambulance chasers give new meaning to the phrase, "no pain, no gain.")) And it is not acceptable to sacrifice good, prudent policy in the battle for a better bumpersticker.

Of course, this state never had much of a market for snake oil salesmen. Daniel Webster once said, "There is nothing so powerful as truth..." New Hampshireites know there's a difference between soundbites and sound policy; and they don't cater much to sweet talking over bitter truths. \\

I've had to look a few bitter truths myself. There are many parts in this country where the economy is lagging and Americans are hurting. I've been looking at the data and making some tough decisions. Everyone knows we need is policies that spark growth. Some seem to have stumbled upon this truth only recently, ((some others have stumbled upon it, picked themselves up, and pretended it never happened)).

Ever since coming to the White House, first as Vice President, then as President, I've fought long and hard for lower taxes, less spending, fewer regulations and reduced cap gains. I'm afraid that the Democratic Congress has been more interested in wrestling me to the floor than in getting the economy back on its feet. Sure they got me to give in on taxes. But while they were celebrating victory over the President, the country was losing the battle for growth.

In less than two weeks, I'll be proposing my package for growth. Others will be proposing different solutions. There are a lot of voices out there -- some prudent and pragmatic, some irresponsible and irrelevant. Too often, election time generates so much baloney, that Americans are left asking, "Where's the beef?" So I've devised a few simple tests I'd suggest in figuring out whether growth proposals are beef or bull:

First: Does it make sense? In a healthy economy, investors invest in business; entrepreneurs take risks; workers produce; consumers buy. It doesn't take an economics degree to figure this out. A prescription for economic health does not deter investment. It does not punish risk. It does not regulate

business out of business. And it does not tax away a hard earned income.

Second: Does it make us more competitive? Does it prepare us for the markets of tomorrow? Think about it -- yesterday the smokestack; today, the microchip; tomorrow -- who knows? Wayne Gretsky used to say, "..skate where the puck is going to be, not where it has been." As global trade continues to grow by leaps and bounds, we need to make sure American exports stay ahead of the curve. Our merchandise exports support 7.2 million American jobs -- a 42% rise in five years. It's simple -- a more competitive America means more American exports. More American exports mean more American jobs.

Third: Does it help you keep your house in order -- starting with home values. For many American families, a home is more than their castle, it's their capital. And while government mismanagement chipped away at home values, Americans watched their main assets grow smaller and smaller. Other families, confronted with tragic accidents or chronic illnesses, watch as unbridled health care costs drain away the lifeblood of lifetime savings. Taxpayers have a right to ask whether economic proposals are going to help them preserve the value of the things they have worked so hard to secure -- their homes, their health, their investments, their children's future.

Fourth: Does it get Washington's house in order? What does it do to the federal budget -- does it minimize it, or does it politicize it? Does it cap spending and does it give the American people their money's worth? Anyone who's ever managed

household finances can tell you that the deeper you crawl into debt, the harder it is to climb out. Maybe some people up on Capitol Hill can get away with bouncing checks -- American competitiveness cannot.

When I deliver my State of the Union this month, take these tests, and see if my proposals measure up. Apply these tests to any other package floating out there -- and see whether they back it up or shoot it down. Too many of these proposals still operate on the old paradigm of tax it, spend it, and promise it. Well, I don't think many people are going to buy it. ((Mother Nature's the only one around here who can give New Hampshire a snow job)).

I didn't come up here with miracles or magic tricks. I'm not going to promise to outlaw icy roads or black fly season. I won't play to any fear of foreigners, to hidden hatreds, or to class conflict. That's not my style -- never has been, never will be.

But I will continue to fight Capitol Hill for fewer taxes and lower spending. I will continue to fight abroad, like I did in Asia, for more free trade and more fair trade -- leveling the playing field for the power of "Made in America." I will fight against protectionism -- policies that would have our industry stagnate in the stale air of government shelters rather than brave the bracing winds of international competition. I will fight against isolationism -- protecting American interests and preserving American principles. And I will continue to fight at home -- for better schools, for a cleaner environment, for safer

streets, and for a brighter future. Thank you. God bless New  
Hampshire, and God bless the United States of America.

#

#

#

EXETER TOWN HALL \ EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1992

0 THANK YOU, GOVERNOR, FOR THAT KIND INTRODUCTION.  
SENATOR BOB SMITH. CONGRESSMAN BILL ZELIFF.  
COUNTY COMMISSIONER MAUREEN BARROWS.

0 BARBARA AND I ARE THRILLED TO BE HERE. WE KNOW NEW  
HAMPSHIRE AS FRIENDS, AND NEIGHBORS. WE'VE LIVED  
NEXT DOOR VIRTUALLY ALL OUR LIVES. I'VE CAMPAIGNED  
HERE AS VICE-PRESIDENT, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, AND  
PRESIDENT. UNLIKE SOME, I HAVEN'T JUST DISCOVERED  
THIS STATE.

- 2 -

0 TODAY, I'VE BEEN TO NEWINGTON -- NOW EXETER --  
LATER DOVER, ROCHESTER, AND PORTSMOUTH. I KNOW  
TIMES ARE TOUGH. THAT'S WHY I'M HERE TO TALK TO  
PEOPLE -- TO LISTEN, AND LEARN. YOU'VE HEARD THE  
TALK OF MY OPPONENTS. IT'S CAMPAIGN SEASON -- A  
TIME WHEN SOME CONFUSE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
SOUNDBITES AND SOUND POLICY. NEW HAMPSHIRE KNOWS  
THE DIFFERENCE. YOU REALIZE WE NEED SOLUTIONS, NOT  
SLOGANS.

- 0 THE SOLUTION IS POLICIES THAT SPARK AMERICAN GROWTH AND SPUR AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS. WE DON'T NEED TO BUILD A FENCE AROUND AMERICA -- WE NEED TO CONVINCED OTHER COUNTRIES TO TEAR THEIR FENCES DOWN. THAT'S WHY I WENT TO ASIA -- BECAUSE EXPORTS ARE CRUCIAL. NEW HAMPSHIRE SENDS \$1.2 BILLION IN EXPORTS TO MORE THAN 100 COUNTRIES -- INCLUDING \$176 MILLION TO THE FOUR COUNTRIES I VISITED IN ASIA. EXPORTS SUPPORT NEARLY 35,000 NEW HAMPSHIRE JOBS.

- 0 I WILL LEAVE NO STONE UNTURNED TO OPEN TRADE AND OPPORTUNITY. I AM CONFIDENT WE WILL SUCCEED. MY CONFIDENCE RESTS ON THE VALUES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE: FOR PROOF, LOOK AROUND YOU. NEW HAMPSHIRITES HAVE ROCK-SOLID REALISM AND CLEAR-EYED IDEALISM. YOU BELIEVE IN LIBERTY AND SELF-RELIANCE / DEMOCRACY AND ENTERPRISE / HARD WORK / FAITH IN FAMILY AND COMMUNITY / ABOVE ALL, FAITH IN GOD. SO DO I.

# # #