

Originally Processed With FOIA(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:** Snow, Tony, Files  
**Subseries:** Subject File, 1988-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13892  
**Folder ID Number:** 13892-011

---

**Folder Title:**  
Budget, [7/16/90]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>

---

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet (George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01a. Memo	Re: Presidential/ Congressional budget negotiations. (1 pp.)	07/16/90	<del>P-5</del>	

**Collection:**

**Record Group:** Bush Presidential Records  
**Office:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)  
**Subseries:** Subject File  
**WHORM Cat.:**  
**File Location:** [Budget 7/16/90]

**Open on Expiration of PRA  
(Document Follows)  
By CAF (NLGB) on 4/5/05**

<b>Date Closed:</b> 12/22/2004	<b>OA/ID Number:</b> 13892-011
<b>FOIA/SYS Case #:</b> S	<b>Appeal Case #:</b>
<b>Re-review Case #:</b> 2005-0485-S	<b>Appeal Disposition:</b>
<b>P-2/P-5 Review Case #:</b>	<b>Disposition Date:</b>
<b>AR Case #:</b>	<b>MR Case #:</b>
<b>AR Disposition:</b>	<b>MR Disposition:</b>
<b>AR Disposition Date:</b>	<b>MR Disposition Date:</b>

### RESTRICTION CODES

<p><b>Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]</b></p> <p>P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]  P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]  P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]  P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]  P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]  P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]</p> <p>C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.</p> <p>PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.</p>	<p><b>Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]</b></p> <p>(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]  (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]  (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]  (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]  (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]  (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]  (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]  (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information</p>
--	--

Dan Me.

# Close Hold

- o It is important to address the budget negotiations and budget deficit problem and the President's role head-on.
- o Basic strategy should be to put and keep the ball deep in the Democrat's/Congress' court. Keep the pressure on them to come up with their part of the deal -- "I did my part, now it's their turn." -- of the President's statement, remind them that the Democratic leadership agreed to it in the meeting and supported it later that day publicly.
- o The object is to get the press and the public to put the heat on the Democrats, to get serious about the negotiations and what they are willing to do on domestic spending, entitlements, and process reform -- the tough stuff for them.
- o Characterize the issue as critical to the health of our national economy, the welfare of the country and one that will have a direct effect on many individual citizens now and in the future. Don't use language that lets the press characterize this simply as a wrestling match between Republicans and Democrats.
- o Use the word "Congress" if you want to be a little less political and the word "Democrats" if you want to be more political.
- o The five points I used in Chicago are attached which is generally what I think the President should do.

7/16/90

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet (George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01b. Memo	Re: Five Points of Presidential/ Congressional budget negotiations. (3 pp.)	07/12/90	<del>P-5</del>	

**Collection:**

**Record Group:** Bush Presidential Records  
**Office:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)  
**Subseries:** Subject File  
**WHORM Cat.:**  
**File Location:** [Budget 7/16/90]

**Open on Expiration of PRA  
(Document Follows)  
By CAF (NLGB) on 4/6/05**

<b>Date Closed:</b> 12/22/2004	<b>OA/ID Number:</b> 13892-011
<b>FOIA/SYS Case #:</b> S	<b>Appeal Case #:</b>
<b>Re-review Case #:</b> 2005-0485-S	<b>Appeal Disposition:</b>
<b>P-2/P-5 Review Case #:</b>	<b>Disposition Date:</b>
<b>AR Case #:</b>	<b>MR Case #:</b>
<b>AR Disposition:</b>	<b>MR Disposition:</b>
<b>AR Disposition Date:</b>	<b>MR Disposition Date:</b>

### RESTRICTION CODES

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

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

Let me stop right here for a moment and address what I know is on a lot of your minds as you came to Chicago. That is the President's statement two weeks ago regarding the budget deficit and a potential increase in tax revenue. I think there are several points that need to be made and kept in mind as we think about the implications of the President's statement.

First, the President knows that good government is good politics and that there is no issue where that is more true than the importance of a strong growing economy. We have had 92 months of economic growth under Republican administrations. There would be no greater threat to the country, and to us politically, than to have that growth end.

The President believes that the budget deficit is the one thing that could threaten that economic growth and that is the issue that needs to be solved and solved this year.

Second, the President is the person who supplied the leadership to start these negotiations, has now taken the leadership to get them off the dime

and into a serious mode, and he will be the person who supplies the leadership to ultimately get a solution to this problem.

Third, the President was dealing with political reality. He said in his press conference two weeks ago that his convictions about taxes had not changed at all, but recognized it would be necessary to have some tax revenue increases in order to get a deficit agreement. Remember, he has said time and again that if Congress would give him a line item veto he would be happy to take responsibility for reducing the deficit and would do so without raising taxes. However, the political reality is that no package can be agreed on or get passed without agreement of the Democrats who control Congress.

Fourth, the President has put the ball deep in the Democrats territory. He has done the one thing that the Democrats have been saying he needed to do for over a year in order to get serious budget negotiations moving. Remember, the Democrat leaders last week agreed and supported the statement that not only included the

phrase, 'Tax Revenue Increases' which is what they wanted, but it included domestic spending cuts, entitlement reforms and budget process reform. Now the ball is in their court and as they come back to Washington, I think we will find the voters interested in what they are going to bring to the table in those areas.

Fifth, I know George Bush well and there is not going to be a deal that is not a good deal for the economy and the country. And that in the end will give this party a very strong record to run on.

Poll we had done:

President Bush said earlier this week that he and the leaders of Congress agreed that a solution to the budget deficit problem would have to include tax revenue increases, major cuts in domestic spending, reduction in the growth of entitlements, cuts in defense spending, and budget process reform. Do you approve or disapprove of the statement President Bush made?

Approve	58%
Disapprove	31

7/12/90

## REVIEW &amp; OUTLOOK

## To-ga! To-ga!

Pity Washington's poor budget summitteers. While they're stuck debating how much more to tax a six-pack of Budweiser, their fraternity brothers in Congress are throwing the biggest party of the summer.

Despite all the wailing about the "deficit," the spending taps on Capitol Hill are wide open. The campus police (they of the "no new tax" pledge) are nowhere in sight, so the revelers have abandoned all self-restraint. There hasn't been anything quite like this since John Belushi screamed "toga" at Faber College. The Bush Administration seems not to want to spoil the fun by pointing any fingers. Hapless taxpayers are left asking where all the money went.

Since George Bush put "tax revenue increases" on the table last month, the House of Representatives has passed eight appropriations bills worth \$403.1 billion. That's about \$41 billion or 11.4% more than last year, more than double the inflation rate. The Housing and Veterans bill came in at a whopping 17% over a year ago, apparently meant as a tribute to the HUD scandal. The farm bill is rolling in at a record \$54 billion, while a Ways and Means subcommittee has created a new \$4.5 billion foster-care entitlement. Dan Rostenkowski may curse the deficit, but don't say he doesn't know how to have a good time.

The farm bill captures the let's-get-busy nature of the revels. In the House, a rare liberal-conservative coalition tried to remove the worst subsidies, but "we got waxed," reports New York Democrat Tom Downey. Even an amendment to deny crop subsidies to farmers earning more than \$100,000 went down to defeat, though it would have saved \$700 million a year. In the Senate, a bipartisan attempt to trim the ridiculous sugar subsidy by a mere two cents a pound (to 16 cents) also was routed.

The only Members not enjoying the party are the nerds trying to resist the peer pressure. After Illinois Republican Harris Fawell voted to cut back one spending bill by a measly 2%, House appropriators denied a \$17 million grant to Argonne Laboratory in Mr. Fawell's district. Everyone else got the message.

Minnesota Democrat Tim Penny's proposal to cut each appropriation bill by 2% lost all but once, much like ear-

lier efforts to cut by 10% and then 5%. Cheeky Republican Bob Walker of Pennsylvania then moved to cut spending by .0000000002%, or \$19.90, but he lost too!

What are the Members protecting? The Heritage Foundation's Scott Hodge has compiled a list that reads like logrolling in our time: \$2.85 million for a fish farm in Stuttgart, Ark.; \$8 million for the U.S. Institute of Peace; \$100,000 for an Army Corps of Engineers investigation of Waikiki Beach (every fraternity brother's dream); \$8.5 million for a high-occupancy-vehicle traffic demonstration project in Virginia; and \$50,000 for the national bicycle program manager. And so on.

About the only thing on the chopping block is defense, with the exception of domestic military bases the Pentagon doesn't want. The Stealth bomber has to go, but Democrat Gene Taylor is holding onto his district's Mississippi Army ammunition plant, just in case someone (say a GOP candidate) invades the Gulf Coast. A "base closing bill" sponsored by Democratic Reps. Les Aspin and Pat Schroeder is rigged with enough bureaucratic tripwires to prevent most bases from ever closing.

We could go on, but suffice it to say that this is the crowd President Bush wants to reach a budget "agreement" with. The talks are stalled, so the latest line is that the fault lies "within the White House." Reportedly, John Sununu and Dick Darman are at odds, as if the President doesn't make up his own mind.

But even if he can agree with Tom Foley and George Mitchell, how will George Bush enforce anything with the rest of Congress? Whom can he count on? Senate Appropriations Chairman Robert Byrd? Not likely, since Mr. Byrd is privately boasting that as long as he's in the Senate George Bush will never get a line-item veto or enhanced rescission.

Short of these or other institutional reforms, the only fiscal discipline in town was "no new taxes." While Congress still spent into deficit, even it could only go so far. With that discipline now lifted, Congress is back to its bacchanal. Mr. Bush has played his best card, but Congress has yet to put a single spending cut or budget reform on the table. No wonder the Members are in a mood to party.

A Baltic Sea  
Of Leaders Asks  
America's Help

By AMITY SHLAES

How long is 100 days? Long enough for a country to make a revolution. Long enough too for the Soviet Union to lock that country inside its crumbling empire.

That at least is the view of a clutch of leaders from newly elected Baltic governments passing through Washington this summer. The statesmen from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia talk of the disintegration of Mr. Gorbachev's power. They talk about independence declarations they have made in the past 100 days and hope that their mission to America will speed them along the road to full independence. But they also fear that American help won't come in time to stop a Moscow that still controls their borders from squeezing them back into the Soviet order. Some of them even think that by fall—100 days from now—Soviet troops might turn Baltic independence into a historical footnote.

Ivars Godmanis and Janis Jurkans, Latvia's newly elected prime minister and foreign minister, represent the optimistic side of that wager. The pair of Balts checked into Washington's Mayflower Hotel 10 days ago bearing a message for Mr. Bush from Boris Yeltsin, the Russian republic's new president. Mr. Yeltsin suggested opening diplomatic relations between the Russian republic and the U.S. Soon, the Latvians hope, new individual nations—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Russia—will start replacing the Kremlin in the international order. "Everything is great. We see no problem," burred Mr. Jurkans into the telephone late one evening last week after a meeting with Secretary of State James Baker.

As things turned out, the Latvians did make progress. The U.S. has never recognized the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations in 1940, but it doesn't (yet) recognize the new Baltic governments either. When the Latvians arrived in Washington, the White House told them the president had no time to meet.

Messrs. Godmanis and Jurkans were not even invited to last Wednesday's Rose Garden ceremony commemorating Captive Nations Day—even though the annual event is designed specifically to honor struggles of nations like Latvia. On Thursday, though, Sen. Robert Byrd (D., W. Va.) introduced the two gentlemen to the Senate, and the president's office got wind of the Yeltsin message. Presidential time materialized. The Latvians spent 40 minutes Monday with Mr. Bush.

Whatever this kind of behavior says about the president, it satisfies the buoyant Latvians. "Creeping recognition," is how some in Washington have described it. "Fine, don't recognize us yet," Mr. Godmanis reportedly told Mr. Bush. "We're



Lennart Meri

By :  
It's that tin people are heaating their lives safe haven.

But even if the perils of vessels, there reach their go merchant or n be allowed to sia, Macao and them first asy or Thailand, t away and push they reach Hor trary distinctio lical deprivat out" as people life," as one B sequence, they to Vietnam, a than death.

This patheti along with the ltical nonsense ple from findi; Indochinese re camps in Soutl will give them : been interned

It is this sit sored conferer summer as su Vietnam—is co neva. The favo the convention boat people ba against their w tend that they A Large-Scal

The irony is much more dif settle because cluding the U.S quotas, the bo proved their w

From 1981 t conducted a la nomic and soci boat people, households acr were predomi nic Chinese fro were Lao. All U.S. during the

Unlike those ter the fall of wave of refug and occupation contact with the hardship in the they were muc Only one in 10 l rival to be able signs and, in ter they arrived wi: entered the U.S since the Grea

Nonetheless, had found empl poverty, while even experts in their remarkat deed, little in t