

The Issues

Overview and Ideology

Gore Bush

The Economy

Gore Bush

Social Issues

Gore Bush

Foreign Policy and Defense

Gore Bush

Environment and Natural Resources

Gore Bush



Overview and Ideology

New York Times

July 17, 2000; Page 14

Programs Offer Chance to Compare Bush and Gore (Excerpts)

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE



WASHINGTON, July 16 -- Vice President Al Gore and Gov. George W. Bush have yet to meet face-to-face in a debate, but they gave voters a chance today for the first time to make a side-by-side comparison as the two sat for hourlong interviews on network television.

The vice president faced aggressive questioning from Tim Russert of NBC's "Meet the Press" on his record and past statements, while the Texas governor was asked questions of a more political nature by Sam Donaldson and Cokie Roberts on ABC's "This Week."

(...)

The questioning highlighted some stark differences between the candidates, for example on Social Security, the death penalty and abortion. The side-by-side comparison also showed that Mr. Gore's 25 years in public office left him with a deep familiarity with issues, but also with a lengthy record that could be examined for consistency.

(...)



Mr. Gore underwent scrutiny of his Social Security plan. Mr. Russert said repeatedly that Mr. Gore's proposal was based on a rosy assumption that anticipated budget surpluses for the next 40 years. Mr. Gore said his plan would keep the Social Security trust fund sacrosanct and, by eliminating the national debt by 2012, would help extend the life of the entitlement program.

Mr. Russert noted that the Clinton-Gore budget for 2000 had proposed increasing the money for Social Security by investing some of the budget surplus set aside for Social Security "in corporate equities or other private financial instruments." Mr. Russert described the difference between the two candidates' approaches this way, "You want the government to invest in the market; George Bush wants individuals to invest."

Mr. Gore said he did not support that proposal, even though it was in the administration's budget, and he called it a trial balloon. The vice president said Mr. Bush's plan for privatizing part of Social Security would be a "catastrophe."

"What he wants to do is to divert 16 percent of the money that's going into the trust fund and put it into the stock market now," Mr. Gore said.

Mr. Bush has not specified an amount that he would allow individuals to invest in the market from their Social Security payroll tax.

Mr. Bush refused to answer whether, under his plan, the government would protect individuals against any losses.

"A safe return -- the safest of all investment vehicles -- yields about twice what the Social Security Trust is getting today," Mr. Bush said.

"Well, Governor," Mr. Donaldson said, "if this were 1929, we'd probably make the same statement and then those awful years came



forward and people would have lost money." Mr. Donaldson then reiterated his question about "whether you think the government should make good any losses for retirees."

"There's going to be a lot of discussions about the particulars of the plan," Mr. Bush said.

Asked whether he agreed with the details of one of the proposals on Capitol Hill to overhaul Medicare, Mr. Bush said, "I believe the next president must put Republicans and Democrats in a room and say, 'Let's reform Medicare.' "

When asked if the Republican Congress should accept a deal with President Clinton to cut the marriage penalty in exchange for funding Medicare to cover prescription drugs, Mr. Bush said: "That's up to this current Congress and this current president. What the people need to know about me is that this is where I'm going to lead the Congress when I become the president."

Mr. Russert highlighted some of the changes that Mr. Gore has made on various issues over the years.

Mr. Gore, who favors abortion rights, was asked if he believed that life began at conception. "No," he said. Asked when life did begin, Mr. Gore said, "There is a developmental process during which the burden kind of shifts over time," citing the first trimester of a pregnancy as being different from the third, but not pinpointing a time when he thought life began.

Mr. Russert pointed out that, in 1987, Mr. Gore had opposed federal funding for abortions for poor women and had called abortion "arguably the taking of a human life."

Mr. Gore acknowledged that he had changed his position, saying he did so about 15 years ago. "I talked to a lot of women who taught me



about the kinds of circumstances that can come up and the kinds of dilemmas that women can face," he said. "I've come to the very deep conviction that a woman's right to choose must be protected regardless of the woman's income."

Of a vote that he had cast that would define the term "person" to include the unborn, Mr. Gore said, "That was a very odd procedural vote."

He hinted that he would not require parental permission for a minor to have an abortion. He said such requirements had tended to be used as a back-door way to try to eliminate abortion.

On the death penalty, Mr. Gore said he did not support a national moratorium on executions for the 21 federal prisoners who are on death row. But he said he did support the moratorium on the death penalty in Illinois "based on the extraordinary number of errors" found in those cases.

Mr. Gore had been quoted as saying that with the death penalty, "there are always going to be some small numbers of errors." Today Mr. Gore said he wanted zero errors but sometimes because of human imperfection, even jury verdicts "sometimes produce a mistake." But he said he was unaware of any involving the trials of the 21 federal death-row inmates.

He also hinted that any state with questionable executions would do well to consider a moratorium. He did not mention Texas, however, a state that has the highest number of executions. Because of Mr. Gore's position on the death penalty, he has refrained from criticizing Mr. Bush's record on executions. Since Mr. Bush took office in 1995, Texas has executed 137 people, more than twice as many as the next highest state, Virginia.



Mr. Bush has said that he was certain that every execution in Texas had been warranted, that the inmates had been guilty and had had full access to the appeals process. Today, Cokie Roberts directed him to the case of Odell Barnes, who was executed in March even though several questions had been raised about his case. He was convicted of raping and murdering Helen Bass, a 42-year-old nurse who was his mother's best friend. Mr. Barnes went to his death insisting that he had had a sexual relationship with Ms. Bass but that he had not killed her.

"Well, I don't remember the specifics of Odell Barnes," Mr. Bush said. "You know, and I'm not castigating it. I wish you would have given me a chance to bring the full dossier so that I could have discussed it in detail with you."

Mr. Bush concluded: "If you ask me whether or not I think we've ever executed an innocent person, my answer to you is no, I don't believe so. And I've reviewed every single case. And I spend a lot of time on them, as do a lot of courts and lawyers and a board of pardons and paroles."

Mr. Gore was asked about a recent Supreme Court decision that said the Boy Scouts could exclude gay members. Mr. Gore said he had not read the opinion and offered none of his own.

Mr. Russert posed a series of questions on the investigations into Mr. Gore's financial activities in the 1996 campaign. Mr. Gore said Mr. Russert was "beating a dead horse." Asked if his visit to a Buddhist temple in 1996 was a fund-raising event, Mr. Gore said, "I believe it was not," adding, "There was no request for funds, no money changed hands."



New York Times

August 14, 2000; Page 1

Democrats Ready the Stage For Their Post-Clinton Era (Excerpts)

By JAMES DAO

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 13 -- The Democratic National Convention will adopt a platform on Tuesday that, like its Republican counterpart, makes a broad effort to reach voters in the middle, calling for schools to be more accountable for student performance, stricter control of the nation's borders, expanded global trade, a stronger military and the death penalty.

But in the details, the platforms sharply diverge on most issues, providing clear indications of how Gore and Bush administrations would differ.

*The Democrats offer modest, focused tax cuts to help middle-class families, while the Republicans call for an across-the-board income tax cut to stimulate the economy.

*The Democrats call for increased financing for public schools, while the Republicans support taxpayer-financed vouchers to help parents pay for private schools.

*The Democrats would keep the Social Security system as it is, bolstering it with general tax revenues. The Republicans call for allowing taxpayers to invest part of their payroll taxes in the financial markets.

*The Democrats propose extending Medicaid, the health care program for those with low incomes, to more children, while the Republicans advocate tax breaks to help people buy private health insurance.

*The Democrats call for developing the technology for a limited



system to protect the nation from ballistic missile attacks, while the Republicans support moving full speed ahead with an ambitious, space-based system.

*The Democrats endorse civil rights protections for gays and support laws intended to expand the rights of unions to organize workers. The Republicans oppose gay rights and support laws intended to reduce the ability of unions to organize.

For all those clear disagreements, the platforms are alike in that they closely reflect the styles, broad visions and campaign agendas of the two candidates. Writing a platform usually tests a candidate's ability to manage the factions in his party, and both Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore successfully enforced a high degree of unity on their platform committees.

(...)

DEMOCRATS

ABORTION "The Democratic Party stands behind the right of every woman to choose, consistent with Roe v. Wade, and regardless of ability to pay. We believe it is a fundamental constitutional liberty that individual Americans -- not government -- can best take responsibility for making the most difficult and intensely personal decisions regarding reproduction."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM Says the McCain-Feingold campaign-finance bill would be "the very first piece of legislation that a President Al Gore will submit to Congress." Also proposes "tough new lobbying reform, publicly guaranteed TV time for debates and advocacy by candidates, and a crackdown on special interest issue ads" and "a public-private, nonpartisan Democracy Endowment which will raise money from Americans and finance Congressional elections -- with no



other contributions allowed to candidates who accept the funding."

FOREIGN POLICY AND MILITARY DEPLOYMENT "We cannot be the world's policeman, and we must be discriminating in our approach. But where the stakes are high, when we can assure ourselves that nothing short of military engagement can secure our national interest, when we know that we have the military forces available for the task, when we have made our best efforts to join with allies, and when the cost is proportionate to the objective, we must be ready to act."

MISSILE DEFENSE "Al Gore and the Democratic Party support the development of the technology for a limited national missile defense system that will be able to defend the U.S. against a missile attack from a state that has acquired weapons of mass destruction The Democratic Party places a high value on ensuring that any such system is compatible with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

SCHOOL CHOICE "What America needs are public schools that compete with one another and are held accountable for results, not private school vouchers that drain resources from public schools and hand over the public's hard-earned tax dollars to private schools with no accountability."

GUN CONTROL "We need mandatory child safety locks, to protect our children. We should require a photo license ID, a full background check, and a gun safety test to buy a new handgun in America."

STATUS OF GAYS "We support continued efforts to end workplace discrimination against gay men and lesbians. We support the full inclusion of gay and lesbian families in the life of the nation. This would include an equitable alignment of benefits."

REPUBLICANS

ABORTION "We support a human life amendment to the



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

Constitution and we endorse legislation to make clear that the 14th Amendment's protections apply to unborn children. Our purpose is to have legislative and judicial protection of that right against those who perform abortions. We oppose using public revenues for abortion and will not fund organizations which advocate it."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM "Enact 'Paycheck Protection,' ensuring that no union member is forced to contribute to anybody's campaign -- and stopping an annual rip-off of \$300 million from union families by Washington-based politicians.

"Preserve the right of every individual and all groups -- whether for us or against us -- to express their opinions and advocate their issues. We will not allow any arm of government to restrict this constitutionally guaranteed right."

FOREIGN POLICY AND MILITARY DEPLOYMENT "The military is not a civilian police force or a political referee

"A Republican president will identify and pursue vital American national interests. He will set priorities and he will stick to them. Under his leadership, the United States will build and secure the peace. Republicans know what it takes to accomplish this: robust military forces, strong alliances, expanding trade, and resolute diplomacy."

MISSILE DEFENSE "America must deploy effective missile defenses at the earliest possible date. These defenses must be designed to protect all 50 states, America's deployed forces overseas, and our friends and allies. We will seek a negotiated change in the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty that will allow the United States to use all technologies and experiments required to deploy robust missile defenses."

SCHOOL CHOICE "We endorse the principles of Governor Bush's education reforms, which will expand parental choice and encourage



competition by providing parents with information on their child's school, increasing the number of charter schools, and expanding education savings accounts for use from kindergarten through college."

GUN CONTROL "Although we support background checks we oppose federal licensing of law-abiding gun owners and national gun registration as a violation of the Second Amendment and an invasion of privacy of honest citizens."

STATUS OF GAYS "We support the traditional definition of 'marriage' as the legal union of one man and one woman, and we believe that federal judges and bureaucrats should not force states to recognize other living arrangements as marriages."(pg. A18)



USA Today

August 15, 2000; Page 4A

Party's Platform Is a Reflection Of Gore's Principles (Excerpts)

By RICHARD BENEDETTO

(...)

Democratic and Republican positions on key issues compared

Democrats

Abortion

Support the right of every woman to choose, consistent with the Supreme Court's Roe vs. Wade decision, regardless of ability to pay. Support contraceptive research, family planning and family life education. "Our goal is to make abortion less necessary and more rare."

Education

Support fully qualified, well-trained teachers in every classroom; every teacher should pass a rigorous test to get there. Say that every failing school in the USA should be turned around or shut down and reopened as a public school under new leadership. Support letting parents choose to send their children to the public school of their choice. Would ensure that no high school student graduates without mastering the basics of reading and math.

Retirement Security

Leave the current Social Security system as it is, while creating "Retirement Savings Plus," privately managed savings accounts that are voluntary, tax-free and personally controlled. The government would pitch in by providing a match to help couples build a retirement fund of up to \$ 400,000.

Taxes



Support targeted tax cuts, more modest than GOP proposals, that would help middle-class families save for college, invest in job skills, pay for health insurance, afford child care and care for seniors or disabled relatives

Republicans

Abortion

Support constitutional amendment to ban abortion but want no punitive action against women who have an abortion. Oppose public funds for abortion. Say judges should be selected "who respect traditional family values and the sanctity of innocent human life." Condemn the procedure critics call "partial-birth" abortion.

Education

State that education is primarily a state and local responsibility. Call for expanding local control by combining federal programs into five flexible grants in return for higher standards and measured student progress. Support giving vouchers to low-income families with children in failing schools so they could go to public or private schools of their choice. Unlike in 1996, the platform does not call for abolishing the Education Department but says its role should be "progressively limited."

Retirement Security

Support reforms of Social Security without tax hikes. A consensus should be reached so workers could create personal retirement accounts with part of their payroll taxes. However, the plan would be voluntary, and current retirees or those nearing retirement would receive full benefits and not be affected.

Taxes

Support George W. Bush's plan to give all taxpayers a cut, double the child tax credit to \$ 1,000, end the inheritance tax, reduce the



"marriage penalty" and cap the rate paid by those in the top bracket.
Support a permanent ban on Internet taxes and repeal of federal excise tax on phone calls. Say a two-thirds vote of Congress should be required to enact future tax hikes.



Times-Picayune

August 27, 2000; Page 1

Bush and Gore Like Night and Day. Despite Steering to Center, They Swerve on Key Issues

By BILL WALSH

WASHINGTON -- Green Party candidate Ralph Nader is fond of saying that the two national parties have inched so close to the philosophical center that they are virtually indistinguishable. He even has names for the two candidates: Tweedledee and Tweedledum.

There is no doubt that both the Democrats and Republicans are moderating their messages this year to appeal to uncommitted independent voters, but their platforms also reveal significant differences in policy and priorities. Their approaches to governing, meanwhile, differ starkly.

On some issues, Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush are polar opposites. Gore wants handgun buyers to be licensed. Bush doesn't believe law-abiding gun owners should have to register with the government. Gore supports legal recognition of gay and lesbian marriages. Bush doesn't. Gore opposes oil exploration in the nation's largest federal wildlife refuge; Bush favors it to lessen the nation's dependence on foreign oil.

--Then, the similarities --

Still, the broad messages of their campaigns strike a similar chord. At a time when the Treasury is nursing a projected \$4.5 trillion, 10-year budget surplus, both candidates have cast themselves as custodians of the nation's prosperity with promises to pay down the national debt, keep their hands off Social Security reserves and cut taxes. They have



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

also both called for tougher standards in public education, curtailment of the influence of unregulated "soft money" in political campaigns and a boost in retiree savings.

But while they may share some of the same goals, their tactics lead them in wholly different directions, suggesting that the same philosophical differences that have traditionally separated Republicans and Democrats -- the role of the federal government in Americans' lives, the role of the United States in the world -- are alive and well in campaign 2000.

A bright line, for example, can be drawn between the two candidates in their approaches toward shoring up Medicare and Social Security. Both programs face financial peril over the next two decades as the generation of baby boomers retires.

Echoing the rhetoric of congressional Republicans and some moderate Democrats, including Sen. John Breaux of Louisiana, Bush believes that Medicare's bureaucracy-heavy structure makes it incapable of keeping pace with rapid changes in the health-care marketplace. While promising to maintain the federal health insurance "safety net," Bush would let beneficiaries buy their own insurance coverage using a government check. Instead of having federal bureaucrats micromanaging prices and benefits, Bush would recast the government as market regulator.

Gore says he would look for cost-savings and efficiencies within the current Medicare system. In fact, he proposes a dramatic expansion by allowing people ages 55 to 65 to buy into the program, a proposal he believes would take a substantial bite out of the uninsured population. Gore would seal off the Medicare budget in a "lock box" and would use \$75 billion of the federal surplus to extend the life of the program to at



least 2030.

On Social Security, Bush has spoken favorably of proposals to let Americans invest a portion of their Social Security taxes (he has used 2 percent in examples) on their own. Pointing to the paltry annual returns the government makes on its Treasury bill investments, Bush believes Americans should have the option of dabbling in the stock market.

Critics said Bush's proposal rests on overly optimistic projections of future federal surpluses, and Gore has derided the approach as "risky." He proposes to boost Americans' retirement income with a new government program targeting the low and middle classes. He would encourage people to set up tax-free retirement accounts, much like 401(k)s, and supplement their savings with government contributions. Though Gore has estimated the program would cost about \$200 billion over 10 years, independent analysts estimate the cost would be much higher.

--Education beliefs differ --

Gore would also substantially boost the federal commitment in education, dedicating \$115 billion over 10 years for school construction, hiring and training teachers, and creating a universal preschool program. While Bush has made education his marquee issue, his own spending plan is far more modest, totaling about \$17.5 billion over five years, a spokesman said.

Bush, however, highlights his commitment to local control over education spending.

"We will offer unprecedented freedom and flexibility in return for high standards and results," Bush said. "In my administration, federal dollars will no longer follow failure."

Though both candidates have talked about "choice" in education,



they mean very different things. If schools repeatedly performed poorly, Bush would let parents draw government education money to send their children to another school, including a private one. Gore would also allow parents to send their children elsewhere, as long as it was within the public school system.

"I will not go along with a plan that would drain taxpayer money away from our public schools and give it to private schools in the form of a voucher," Gore said.

--Taxes: The great divide --

Further differences between the two parties can be seen in the candidates' approaches to taxes.

Bush would carve out a quarter of the federal surplus for tax cuts, more than double what Gore has proposed over the next 10 years. Bush would also reconfigure the income tax structure, lowering all brackets so that no one pays more than 33 percent.

Gore, who would not touch the income tax structure, has assailed his opponent for targeting his tax cuts at the richest Americans and offering such costly relief, \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, that he said would plunge the federal budget back into deficit.

Bush concedes that some of his proposals, such as abolishing the estate tax, would unevenly benefit the wealthy, but he notes that wealthy Americans pay the lion's share of taxes. Bush also says that his income tax reforms would help taxpayers across the board, freeing 6 million Americans from paying anything.

Dusting off some tried-and-true Republican rhetoric, Bush has sought to portray Gore as a free-spending liberal whose wish list of new programs would devour the surplus -- and then some. The conservative National Taxpayers Union estimated last week that Gore's proposals



topped \$2.3 trillion, exceeding the available non-Social Security surplus by \$161 billion.

The candidates' differences can be seen not only in domestic policy, but also in foreign affairs.

Gore, like President Clinton, sees an active role for the U.S. military in peacekeeping operations around the globe. Bush is wary of such entanglements unless the strategic interests of the nation are at stake. Bush advocates, for example, a deadline for the withdrawal of troops from Kosovo, while Gore would leave them in place as part of a NATO peacekeeping force.

The two also differ markedly on the size and scope of a national missile defense program. Both recognize the threats posed by rogue nations, such as North Korea, and have proposed building large-scale missile defenses.

But Gore's approach takes into consideration Russia's concerns that a U.S. missile system could be used offensively as well. The vice president's plan would be moderated by the existing Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, which he called the "cornerstone of strategic stability in our relationship with Russia."

Bush, on the other hand, would withdraw from the ABM treaty if Russia objected that his far more aggressive missile system violated the agreement to mutually disarm. If elected, he said he would deploy a defensive shield "as soon as possible."

Critics contend that Bush's plan threatens to restart the arms race and sounds too much like an ultimatum.

Bush, meanwhile, has derided Gore's approach as too cautious, saying, "Now is not the time to defend outdated treaties, but to defend the American people."



For voters, at least, it's a choice.

THE CANDIDATES AND THE ISSUES

How Vice President Al Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush stand on major issues

ABORTION:

Gore: Strictly pro-choice. Would oppose any efforts to erode landmark Supreme Court decision, Roe vs. Wade. Opposes Republican-backed "partial-birth abortion" bill. Against parental notification.

Bush: Anti-abortion with exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother, even though Republican platform opposes abortion in all cases. Vowed to sign ban of "partial-birth abortions" that Clinton vetoed. Supports parental notification.

TAXES:

Gore: Targeted tax cuts of \$500 billion over 10 years. Expand Earned Income Tax Credit. Raise standard deduction for couples to eliminate "marriage penalty." Double the estate tax exemption to \$5 million per family. Make Child and Dependent Tax Credit refundable up to \$2,400. Allow stay-at-home parents to claim up to \$500 in child care expenses. Tax credit to pay for after-school programs. College tuition tax credit.

Bush: \$1.3 trillion in targeted tax cuts over 10 years and across-the-board income tax reductions. Eliminate "marriage penalty" by restoring 10 percent deduction for two-earner couples up to \$3,000. Phase out estate tax over eight years. Double child tax credit to \$1,000. Reconfigure all income tax brackets, reducing 15 percent to 10 percent, 28 percent and 31 percent to 25 percent, and 39.6 percent to 33 percent. Extend deduction for charitable giving to people who don't itemize. Raise corporate charitable deduction. Expand limit on education savings accounts from \$500 to \$5,000.



CIVIL RIGHTS:

Gore: Would sign executive order banning racial profiling. Supports legal recognition of gay and lesbian marriages. Thinks gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve in military, but would eliminate "Don't ask, Don't tell" policy. Believes affirmative action is still necessary.

Bush: Opposes gay and lesbian marriages or categorizing crimes against gays and lesbians as hate crimes. Opposes quotas and racial preferences. Would leave in place "Don't ask, Don't tell." Opposes racial profiling, but a spokesman said, "The federal role is not to run state police departments."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE:

Gore: Promised his first bill to Congress would be McCain-Fiengold ban on unregulated "soft money." Would require disclosure of donors for "issue ads" produced by special-interest groups. Favors beefing up lobbyist disclosure. Would strengthen Federal Elections Commission.

Bush: Would only ban only "soft money" from corporations and labor unions. Individuals could still give without limit. Supports "paycheck protection" legislation letting union members decide whether to direct money to political activity. Favors lifting the \$1,000 limit on standard "hard money" individual contributions. Favors instant disclosure.

DEFENSE/FOREIGN POLICY:

Gore: Supports limited missile defense system, but not one that threatens current Anti-Ballistic Missile treaties. Supports cooperative engagement through international organizations such at the United Nations. Strongly supports U.S. troops in peacekeeping capacity. Supports steady increases in spending on weapons programs.

Bush: Would push "very aggressive" land-, sea- and, possibly, space-based missile defense system. If Russia refuses amendments to ABM



treaty, pull out. Would unilaterally assert America's interests abroad. Send message to rogue states: Any terrorist attack will be met with "devastating" response. Move to reduce U.S. role in peacekeeping unless vital interests at stake. Boost Pentagon's research and development budget \$20 billion between 2002 and 2006.

EDUCATION:

Gore: Would greatly increase federal role with \$115 billion, 10-year program. Wants universal pre-school for 4-year-olds. Continue toward Clinton goal of hiring 100,000 new teachers. Let parents move children from failing schools, but only within public school system. Opposes-private school vouchers. Would push for testing all new teachers and linking tenure and pay raises to student performance.

Bush: Would spend about \$17.5 billion over 5 years and increase local flexibility in spending. Earmarks \$5 billion for reading programs, \$2.4 billion for teachers' training and \$3 billion for new charter schools. Shifts \$7.7 billion to disadvantaged (Title I) schools. Supports strong accountability standards with school-by-school report cards. If public schools fail three years in a row, parents would get government check to send child to public or private school.

ENVIRONMENT:

Gore: Would expand Clinton environmental policies. Extend moratorium on drilling off Florida and California to 2012 and urge a stop to current drilling. Opposes drilling in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. Would prohibit logging and road-building in national forests. Create a series of tax breaks to promote alternative energy use and development. Favors Kyoto treaty mandating reduction in greenhouse emissions in industrialized nations.

Bush: Shift control from federal government to states and nurture a



more industry-friendly approach to regulation. Considers Superfund misguided and mismanaged. Favors moratorium on new offshore drilling, but would let states decide about current drilling. Favors oil exploration in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge "when it's done in an environmentally sensitive way," a spokesman said. Favors 50 percent tax break on capital gains for people who sold land for conservation. Opposes Kyoto agreement.

GUN CONTROL:

Gore: Would require mandatory photo licensing for handgun purchases and require safety test. Limit gun sales to one per month. Require three-day waiting period. Increase penalties for gun crimes. Mandatory safety locks on handguns.

Bush: Opposes mandatory licensing of law-abiding gun owners. More money for enforcement. Automatic detention for juveniles who commit gun crimes. Favors voluntary safety locks, but would sign bill mandating them.

SOCIAL SECURITY/MEDICARE:

Gore: Allow those making less than \$100,000 to set up 401(k)-like tax-free accounts with government match to save for retirement. Create Medicare drug benefit covering 50 percent of costs up to \$5,000 annually, and 100 percent after patient pays \$4,000. Favors early Medicare buy-in as early as 55 years old. Opposes increase in retirement age.

Bush: Favors letting Americans invest unspecified portion of Social Security taxes on their own. Wouldn't touch benefits for retirees or "near retirees." Hasn't ruled out raising retirement age. Called for drug benefit, but hasn't spelled out specifics. Likes Medicare Commission plan to let beneficiaries buy coverage with government subsidy.



HEALTH CARE:

Gore: Supports strong patients bill of rights, including right to sue health plan. Grant \$3,000 tax credit for long-term caregivers. Address uninsured problem with refundable tax credit covering up to 25 percent of premium.

Bush: Signed patients rights law in Texas and would support federal measure with limited right to sue. Make purchase of long-term care insurance fully deductible. Grant tax credits (\$1,000 for individual and \$2,000 for family) toward purchase of health insurance.



CNN Inside Politics

Sep 19, 2000, 5 pm EST

CNN's Brooks Jackson Compares Bush's and Gore's TV Ads and Press Releases (Video)



Transcript:

SHAW: Well, beyond prescription drugs, the Bush and Gore camp seem to have plenty to quibble about these days. Our Brooks Jackson has been checking out some areas of dispute on the trail and on the airwaves.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JACKSON (voice-over): Not so long ago, they promised to take the high road.

BUSH: We are going to herald what we stand for in a positive and constructive way.

GORE: I'm not going to say a single negative personal thing about my opponents. You will not hear from me in this entire campaign.

JACKSON: Well, that's what they said then. But look at what their campaigns are doing now. Republicans run misleading descriptions of Gore's Medicare proposal.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD)



NARRATOR: But his prescription drug plan forces seniors into one HMO selected by the federal government.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: That's wrong, of course. Gore's government-run plan is voluntary. And seniors who sign up could still buy their medication from pharmacies.

Democrats countered with this about Bush's prescription plan:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, DNC AD)

NARRATOR: And Bush forces senior he does include to go to HMOs and insurance companies for coverage.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: That's wrong, too. Bush's approach is also voluntary. Nobody would be forced to buy coverage. HMOs and insurance companies would compete. Now Republicans are escalating with a new ad.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD)

NARRATOR: Al Gore will charge seniors a new \$600-a-year government access fee.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Oh, come on. Misleading again. That government access fee is actually an insurance premium, and only \$288 a year to start, as estimated by the congressional budget office, only reaching \$608 in the year 2010, as benefits are increased. And for the same coverage, premiums would probably be higher under the Bush approach, because he proposes much less federal subsidy.

(on camera): But if you think those misleading ads are sinking to a low level, take a look at the campaigns' press releases. This is how the Gore campaign reacted to Bush's release of a so-called "Blueprint for the



Middle Class."

(voice-over): This e-mailed release called the Bush document "a misleading 15-page picture book" -- quote -- Bush's blueprint: "15 pages, 2,644 words, six pictures." Gore's book: "191 pages, 69,042 words, no pictures."

(on camera): Oh, please. But in case some voter out there cares about word counts, the Bush campaign had this release...

(voice-over): ... saying -- quote -- "Gore comes up short in the budget document battle," and saying Bush's previous policy book had twice as many pages as Gore's: 457 pages, 126,000 words. Oh, boy. A Republican party release accuses Gore of "star-studded hypocrisy" for raising money from Hollywood while criticizing its marketing of sex and violence. This one says he fabricated a story about prescription drug costs.

(on camera): And here's one from the Gore campaign, saying it's releasing a "comprehensive, complete analysis of Bush child care and preschool proposals" -- quote -- "working around the clock, Gore camp examines the minute details of Bush plans."

But scroll down to the -- quote -- "detailed, comprehensive and complete chart" of Bush's proposals and you find nothing, just a footnote saying: "Bush doesn't have any child care or preschool proposals." Ha ha.

It goes on like that day after day. And the scary part is, some of the people behind this stuff will probably end up working on the White House staff.

Brooks Jackson, CNN, Washington.



Overview and Ideology - Gore

New York Times

July 8, 2000; Page 10

Draft of Democratic Platform Is Echo of Gore's Campaign

By JAMES DAO

ST. LOUIS, July 7 -- The Democrats released a draft of their party platform today that strongly articulates the centrist "new Democratic" views of Vice President Al Gore, but also offers concessions to liberals on several major issues, including trade, the death penalty and gay rights.

In many ways, the 41-page document tries to straddle the same ideological divide that faces Mr. Gore in his quest for the presidency. Even as he tries to reach out to moderate and independent voters this fall, Mr. Gore will need to energize core Democratic voters, who tend to be more liberal.

On many major issues, the platform stakes out the centrist views first championed by President Clinton in 1992. It calls for fiscal discipline and paying off the national debt by 2012. It proposes modest tax cuts. It advocates more accountability for schools and teachers. It views global trade as crucial to economic prosperity. It endorses tougher penalties, including the death penalty, for violent criminals.

But on many of those issues, the draft platform -- which will be completed at a meeting in Cleveland later this month -- also includes provisions intended to mitigate the concerns of liberals.

For example, on trade, potentially the most divisive issue for the party, the 2000 platform includes significantly stronger language than the 1996 platform about protecting workers and the environment against



the potential downsides of globalization.

"Al Gore will insist on and use the authority to enforce worker rights, human rights and environmental protections" in trade accords, it says. "We should use trade to lift up standards around the world, not drag down standards here at home."

In another tradeoff with labor, the document supports giving the president broad powers to negotiate trade agreements, a policy known as fast track that is strongly opposed by unions. But it also endorses legislation prohibiting the permanent replacement of workers on strike.

In another section, the platform asserts that more police officers and tougher penalties, including capital punishment, have helped reduce crime. But it will also include language advocating that people facing the death sentence have access to DNA testing and adequate counsel.

The crime-fighting section includes another plank sought by minorities: the condemnation of racial profiling by police officers.

In a section with the centrist-sounding title "Valuing our families," the platform will say that the party "supports the full inclusion of gay and lesbian families in the life of a nation." The provision is intended to suggest that the party supports civil unions for gay couples, though perhaps not religious ones.

Where the platform adopts Republican-sounding ideas, it usually criticizes the Republican version of those ideas. On tax cuts, for instance, the platform advocates reductions for "working parents." But it harshly attacks Gov. George W. Bush's proposed across-the-board tax cut with populist language.

"It would let the richest 1 percent of Americans afford a new sports car and middle class Americans afford a warm soda," the platform says.

The draft also echoes Mr. Gore's attacks on Mr. Bush's proposal to



let taxpayers invest part of their Social Security payroll taxes in the stock market.

"Taken together, George W. Bush's \$2 trillion tax cut, his campaign-season spending proposals, his support for privatizing Social Security add up to an assault on the surplus, causing Americans to have to choose between drastic cuts in education and health care or a return to the days of deficit spending," the draft reads.

Not surprisingly, the platform highlights Mr. Gore's core campaign proposals to preserve Social Security, expand health care, help the elderly buy prescription drugs, overhaul the campaign finance system and strengthen gun regulations.

And it devotes its largest section to Mr. Gore's education proposals.

On foreign policy, the platform calls for increasing military pay, enacting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and creating a limited national missile defense system capable of defending against attacks from North Korea or the Middle East.

In its language as well as its policies, the document echoes Mr. Gore's stump speeches. It is divided into three major sections -- prosperity, progress and peace -- which were the themes of a recent campaign swing by the vice president. It paraphrases the title of Mr. Gore's book on the environment, saying, "The Earth truly is in the balance."

And it closes with a pet Gore slogan: "Now, we say to America, 'You ain't seen nothing yet.' "



Overview and Ideology - Bush

USA Today

June 7, 2000; Page 8A

**Bush Tries Some Sidesteps To Get To Moderates.
The GOP Candidate Knows the Risks in Talking About the
Environment, Abortion and Guns.** (Excerpts)

By JUDY KEEN

Since he secured the Republican presidential nomination, Texas Gov. George W. Bush has laid out his views on more than 30 issues ranging from defense policy to senior citizen volunteerism.

There are three topics, though, that Bush would rather not dwell on as he reaches out to the moderate voters he needs to beat Vice President Gore in November: the environment, abortion and guns.

Bush can't avoid those issues completely. Last week at Lake Tahoe in Nevada, where he talked about conserving natural resources, he invited scrutiny of -- and Gore's attacks on -- his environmental record in Texas. Reporters do ask him about guns and abortion, and he generally says that he supports tougher enforcement of gun laws and that he's "pro-life," but he's never given a speech focused solely on either of them -- and has no plans to do so, says Karen Hughes, his communications director.

(...)

Bush's views on these three emotional topics might not only offend moderates but could also raise doubts among voters wary of the environmental movement, opponents of abortion and gun owners. That makes the way he handles them even more consequential:



Environment

To the politically potent and financially generous business community, "environmentalist" can be a dirty word. When it's used to describe a candidate, it can mean someone willing to abandon business concerns when there's conflict over a creek, species or forest. That might be why Bush didn't seize a chance to call himself an environmentalist last week.

During a 20-minute speech on protecting nature, he never said the word "environment." A day earlier, he was asked if he considers himself an environmentalist. He replied, "I consider myself someone who cares deeply about clean air and clean water."

His speech was meant to help close a gap. The vice president wrote a book on the importance of protecting natural resources and was endorsed last week by the League of Conservation Voters. By contrast, only once before in the campaign has Bush given a speech on an environmental issue. But his attention to conservation is enough to worry some businesspeople.

Democrats love to point out that Houston replaced Los Angeles last year as the U.S. city with the most dangerous smog. Texas ranks 46th among states for water-resources protection, and air pollution emissions have increased 11% during Bush's tenure, according to the Environmental Protection Agency.

On NBC's Meet the Press on Feb. 13, Bush blamed Houston's smog on the fact that the city has "a lot of automobiles" and said, "We've got to do a lot of work . . . to make sure we meet clean air standards, and we're working hard to do so."

Bush has helped improve the environment in Texas. Nearly all the state's water treatment plants comply with clean-water standards, and



he has set up private endowments to maintain state parks.

Nonetheless, it might be hard for him to convince voters passionate about the environment that he'd be a better steward than Gore.

His natural allies might be the business community and voters turned off by the environmental policies of the Clinton administration, which has turned millions of acres of land into national monuments. Much of that land is in the Rocky Mountain states that Bush must carry if he's to amass the 270 electoral votes he needs to win.

Abortion

Every time Bush says he doesn't want to change the Republican Party platform, which calls for a constitutional amendment banning all abortions, supporters of abortion rights cringe and the Gore campaign calls him an extremist.

And every time Bush says he won't necessarily choose a running mate who opposes abortion and says he wouldn't use opposition to abortion as a "litmus test" when nominating judges to the Supreme Court, abortion foes and the religious right criticize him.

Last month, conservative leader James Dobson of the group Focus on the Family accused Bush of sacrificing principle to win votes. "If you stand for everything, you stand for nothing," Dobson said.

It's difficult for politicians to find common ground between the two sides of the abortion issue, but Bush is trying. He is not, however, crusading. He has given speeches on personal responsibility and values, but he hasn't really drawn attention to abortion since the primary election season.

When he's asked about abortion, he doesn't promise to ban abortions. Instead, he says he would "set an ideal" for America. "The country I want to live in is a country that respects life of the unborn and



the living," he said last week on MSNBC's Hardball. "I don't think people believe it's going to be banned. I believe we can do everything we can to make it more rare."

Communications director Hughes says Bush "has tried to strike a common-sense approach on abortion rather than demagogue and divide." But some conservative leaders have threatened to encourage their supporters to stay home on Election Day if Bush chooses a running mate who supports abortion rights.

It's a tricky balance for Bush. If Bush's running mate opposes abortion, Gore will again call him an extremist, and many conservatives will stay with him. If his selection supports abortion rights, Bush could win some votes that would otherwise go to Gore. But some abortion opponents might consider voting for Pat Buchanan, the likely Reform Party presidential nominee, who is an adamant foe of abortion.

Guns

When a National Rifle Association leader said last month that a Bush victory would enable the organization to "work out of" the White House, he indignantly said he wouldn't be the NRA's puppet. "I'm going to make my decisions based on what I think is right for America," he said.

Bush supports a law requiring instant background checks for gun buyers and says he would sign legislation requiring gunmakers to put child-safety locks on handguns. He wants to raise the minimum age for handgun possession from 18 to 21 and signed a bill increasing penalties for selling guns to juveniles. Among some gun owners, that raises doubts about Bush.

Unlike Gore, however, Bush opposes gun registration, and he signed a Texas law allowing people to carry concealed weapons. Two days before last month's Million Mom March, organized by proponents of gun



control, Bush announced a trigger-lock giveaway in Texas. But these days he rarely mentions the Second Amendment, which gun-control opponents say guarantees the right to bear arms. During the primaries, he often mentioned his support.

In the aftermath of school shootings, many suburban voters -- especially women -- tell pollsters they are deeply concerned about gun violence. But across the South and in key Midwestern states, many rural voters support gun rights and agree with Bush that tougher law enforcement and stronger values are the solution.

In April, on the anniversary of the shooting at Colorado's Columbine High School, Bush went to a school and talked about values, not gun laws. Government, he said, should help people understand "that we need to teach our children right from wrong."

Clinton built a coalition by defining himself as a "new Democrat" not indebted to traditional liberal groups and ideas.

Bush often says he's "a different kind of Republican," and he seems to understand the risks inherent in his strategy. "I'll make it clear what my positions are," he says. "And if some people on (different) sides of the issue can't agree, so be it."



The Economy

Washington Post

May 3, 2000; Page A08

Candidates Duel Over Tax Cuts. Gore and Bush Trade Analytical Shots, Seeking an Imprimatur of Fiscal Responsibility (Excerpts)

By GLENN KESSLER

The presidential campaign veered into a dense economic thicket yesterday.

The Gore campaign, seeking to buttress its claim that George W. Bush's tax cut and spending plans are fiscally irresponsible, issued a detailed analysis that suggested the Texas governor would need to either slash government spending or increase the size of the national debt if his proposals were enacted.

The Bush campaign countered with updated budget projections that assert the rapidly expanding economy in recent months has added enough revenue to federal coffers to boost the projected size of the government surplus by 33 percent over the next 10 years--to more than \$ 4 trillion--enough to pay for the Republican's proposals.

The blizzard of charges and countercharges often involves mind-numbing interpretations of economic data and federal budget accounting, but it underscores a new imperative in this era of surplus politics: Both sides, while needing to demonstrate innovation with a burst of tax and spending proposals, must convince voters that they also won't blow a hole in the budget and saddle the nation with a crippling debt.

Vice President Gore is eager to link Bush to the soaring deficits



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

experienced under President Ronald Reagan and the governor's father. A Gore adviser, briefing reporters on the analysis Monday evening, repeatedly called the Bush campaign's projections "a new rosy scenario," the catch phrase used during the Reagan era to describe faulty economic analysis. Another adviser, speaking after the Bush campaign released its new analysis, dismissed it as "Alice in Wonderland economics."

For the Texas governor, the booming economy poses a hurdle because voters tend to reward the incumbent party during good economic times. But, as his staff's new budget projections suggest, it also presents an opportunity. The gusher of government revenue--if it continues--appear to easily accommodate a variety of tax cut and spending plans, though not, by the Gore camp's analysis, all of his proposals.

The situation is the exact opposite faced by the Clinton campaign in 1992, when staffers ignored worsening economic data that, after Clinton became president, made it impossible for him to keep his promise of a middle-class tax cut. With each quarter of good economic news, Bush could keep updating his forecast and even decide to expand the size of his tax cut or other proposals.

Gore has adopted President Clinton's pledge to eliminate the national debt by 2013 and has proposed \$ 350 billion in tax cuts over 10 years, while Bush's tax cuts would reduce revenue by \$ 1.3 trillion over the same period, according to a new analysis by the congressional Joint Committee on Taxation. "The Gore camp realizes that its feet are planted on more solid ground on this issue and it is going to stomp its feet as much as possible," said Robert Reischauer, president of the Urban Institute and a former director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(...)



The Gore campaign asserted that Bush's proposals would eat up so much of the projected surplus that he would need to cut nondefense-related programs by 20 percent for budget growth to keep pace with inflation. If Bush didn't cut these programs but merely kept spending increases even with inflation, then he would start running a deficit in 2005, Gore officials said.

A Gore adviser said that even this is unrealistic because Congress (like the administration) in recent years has boosted spending beyond inflation. But he conceded that Gore's own budget suggests Gore will not increase spending beyond the rate of inflation, which he said "assumes a level of fiscal discipline that has not been seen in recent years."

Independent budget analysts who reviewed the Gore documents said some of the budget assumptions and presentation of data tended to put Bush's plans in the worst possible light.

Gore's analysis was based on Congressional Budget Office economic projections made last year, which assumed the economy would grow 3.6 percent in fiscal 2000. Since then, the performance of the economy has outpaced those projections. The Bush campaign yesterday estimated the economy will grow 4.9 percent this year.

A bigger economy boosts revenue, and that in turn increases the surplus. It also enlarges the base on which future projections are made. Through the miracle of compounding, small changes now result in huge surpluses 10 years out.

But the Bush projection, like the CBO's, assumes that the economy, now in the longest expansion in history, will continue to grow without the possibility of a recession.



Washington Post

July 19, 2000; Page A04

Real Surplus May Be in Promises. Candidates' Spending, Tax Cut Plans Target a Windfall That's Already Being Spent (Excerpts)

By GLENN KESSLER

The next time Al Gore or George W. Bush proposes paying for a new program or big tax cut out of trillions of dollars in anticipated budget surpluses, consider the fine print: Much of the surplus money has already been spent or will be spent on current programs, leaving relatively little for other initiatives.

To be sure, the booming economy has helped eliminate budget deficits and sent government revenue soaring. Yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office projected that the budget surplus in the next decade--minus surpluses generated by Social Security that both parties say are off limits--will be about \$ 2.2 trillion. That's nearly \$ 400 billion higher than a White House estimate just last month.

Despite the roaring numbers, however, budget analysts say the actual surplus is much smaller than advertised. They cite a variety of reasons, including commitments already made by Congress and the White House, limitations in the budget forecasting process and assumptions that Congress will make budget cuts that it hasn't achieved in the past.

In recent years, revenue has so often exceeded forecasts that it helped make up any shortfall that might have emerged from Congress's failure to cut spending. This has encouraged lawmakers to offer ever-grander tax cut and spending proposals, such as bills to eliminate estate taxes or the so-called marriage penalty, approved by the Senate



yesterday. The higher CBO projections already have some lawmakers salivating for more.

But with new evidence that the economy is slowing, some experts fear lawmakers will ignore signs that much of the surplus is illusory until it is too late. Just one-half of one percentage point less economic growth than projected in 2010 would wipe out \$ 250 billion of the surplus that year, the CBO said in one of the many cautionary notes in its new estimate yesterday.

"It's virtually inevitable that at some point the trend is going to go in the other direction," said James Horney, a former CBO analyst who studies the federal budget at the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal policy institute. "If at that point we have committed to spend a large part of the projected surplus, we will have a shortfall."

(...)

Rudolph G. Penner, a former CBO director who is now at the Urban Institute, said keeping annual government spending growing at the same pace as the overall economy will cost about \$ 850 billion more than the CBO estimate.

In their own budget projections, however, both Bush and Gore maintain they won't need to spend that extra money. Bush, who has proposed about \$ 120 billion in new spending over the next five years, suggests he can cut an additional \$ 90 billion through government reform initiatives. (The Gore campaign contends that Bush's proposals actually will cost \$ 425 billion over 10 years.) Gore has proposed about \$ 400 billion in additional spending, which the campaign says is designed to fit with the projections of the surplus. (The Bush campaign pegs the cost of Gore's spending promises at more like \$ 900 billion.) But a Gore economic adviser privately acknowledged the CBO and White



House spending estimates are unrealistically low.

Ari Fleischer, a Bush spokesman, said President Clinton has forced Congress to spend more, and so the surest way to ensure that spending stays within the CBO estimates is to elect a Republican to the White House.

But there are other ways in which experts believe the CBO estimates are unduly optimistic. The surplus estimates, for instance, assume that about \$ 60 billion in temporary tax credits that Congress routinely extends will expire and that lawmakers will not deal with a looming political problem in the tax code known as the alternative minimum tax. That's a tax aimed at the wealthy, but because it is not inflation-adjusted it is expected to snare millions of middle-income families by the end of the decade--and will cost about \$ 95 billion to fix, according to William G. Gale of the Brookings Institution.

The CBO and White House also count as part of the available surplus excess money now being generated by the Medicare trust fund. But the House and the Senate recently voted to make that money as sacrosanct as the Social Security surplus--dedicated to debt reduction--and the Clinton administration agrees with the concept. That takes another \$ 400 billion off the table.

A similar case can be made for about \$ 400 billion in surpluses accumulating in government and military employee pensions, Gale said.

That would leave anywhere from \$ 300 billion to \$ 700 billion for new programs or tax cuts, according to various projections. But then there's Social Security and Medicare reform: Gore would devote about \$ 500 billion for new Social Security benefits and retirement accounts, and another \$ 350 billion or so to shore up Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit.



Bush has also proposed overhauling Medicare along the lines of a bipartisan plan in Congress that is estimated to cost \$ 300 billion over the next 10 years, and has supported a House-drafted \$ 160 billion prescription drug plan. Bush would divert some Social Security payroll taxes to new individual accounts, but he has been vague about details and cost estimates. Lawrence Lindsey, Bush's chief economic adviser, recently suggested the plan would likely cost about \$ 900 billion over the next decade.

Presto, the surplus is more or less gone--even before tax cuts are considered. The "promise of a balanced budget contains the seeds of its own destruction, because when you have good news you spend it," Penner said. "By the time we get out a few years, I'll be very surprised if there is a budget surplus left."



CNN Inside Politics

Aug 22, 2000, 5 pm EST

CNN's Brooks Jackson Discusses Bush's and Gore's Tax Plans (Video)



Transcript:

SHAW: As we noted earlier in our lead story, Governor George W. Bush suggested today that voters may be confused about some aspects of his tax cut plan. So we thought this would be a good time to review Bush's proposal and Al Gore's, as well.

CNN's Brooks Jackson has been scrutinizing both candidates' plans in hopes of separating the facts from the political hype.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JACKSON (voice-over): Here's who George W. Bush says would benefit from his big tax cut.

SYBIL JOHNSON, WAITRESS: I have two kids, two dogs, a new house we're working on, and a job.

JACKSON: Sybil Johnson is just the sort of waitress mom Bush says needs a tax cut. Listen...

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE:
Under current tax law, for example, a single waitress supporting two



children on an income of \$22,000 faces a higher marginal tax rate than a lawyer making \$220,000. Under my plan, she will pay no income tax at all.

JACKSON: Sounds good, but look more closely. The truth is that Bush's hypothetical \$22,000-a-year waitress, who makes a bit more than our waitress, isn't paying any income tax now. In fact, she gets a \$1,688 refund thanks to the earned income tax credit, a subsidy benefiting low-wage workers.

We asked accountant Charlie Bish to calculate exactly how much Bush's waitress and Bush's \$220,000-a-year lawyer would benefit under Bush's plan. His \$22,000-a-year waitress gains \$114. Her after-tax income increases by 1/2 of 1 percent.

Our waitress is not impressed.

JOHNSON: I could put a penny in a cup for the whole year and I can see that.

JACKSON: But that \$220,000 lawyer? He gains more than \$7,000, increasing his after-tax income more than 4 1/2 percent. Just simple math.

CHARLIE BISH, ACCOUNTANT: Whenever you cut the tax rates, basically the people at the higher end of the spectrum will tend to enjoy a better savings simply because of the numbers.

JACKSON: The heart of Bush's plan is an across-the-board rate cut, dropping the top rate from 39.6 percent to 33 percent, and lowering the bottom rate from 15 percent down to 10 percent. It'd also abolish the estate tax, increase deductions for two-earner families, allow non-itemizers to write off charitable deductions.

BOB MCINTYRE, CITIZENS FOR TAX JUSTICE: The truth of it is it's a pretty traditional Republican tax cut plan that gives 60 percent of its



benefits to the top tenth and 42 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent.

JACKSON (on camera): So the richer you are, the more you would gain under Bush's tax plan. And not only that, it would consume most -- and some say all -- of the budget surplus outside Social Security.

(voice-over): The Bush plan would cost \$1.3 trillion this decade, according to the bipartisan Joint Tax Committee of Congress. Right off, that's most of the \$2.2 trillion non-Social Security surplus projected by the Congressional Budget Office and an even bigger bite out of the \$1.9 trillion forecast by the administration's Office of Management and Budget. But even that's not the whole story.

WILLIAM GALE, BROOKINGS INSTITUTION: That \$1.9 trillion figure is funny money. According to my calculations, a better estimate would be about 0.3 trillion.

JACKSON: Bush's tax cut by itself would shrink the surplus an estimated \$275 billion, because the national debt would not be paid down as fast and the government would have to pay more interest. The surplus would shrink even more if Congress boosts military spending as promised or expands Medicare to cover prescription drugs or -- well, you get the idea.

And our waitress mom? She'd rather have day care than a tax cut.

JOHNSON: That helps a lot of single parents a whole lot more than giving them a tax -- an earned tax credit at the end of the year.

JACKSON: A big tax cut? If Al Gore is elected, you can pretty much forget about it.

GORE: We can afford a series of targeted tax cuts.

JACKSON: Stop right there. "Targeted tax cuts"? What does that mean?



GORE: Tax cuts to buy health care, to pay for child care, to save for college and lifelong learning.

JACKSON: In fact, Gore opposes any outright rate cut that would favor most those who pay the most: upper-income taxpayers.

GORE: I would a whole lot rather have targeted tax cuts to help working families than a massive tax cut that primarily benefits the wealthy.

JACKSON: Gore's broadest tax cut would increase the standard tax deduction for married couples: no help for upper-income marrieds who itemize. Gore's other targeted cuts include tax breaks for health insurance, child care, college expenses, long-term health care, even a permanent tax credit for business research. Hardly tax cuts at all, some say.

MCINTYRE: Well, what Gore has proposed is a whole bunch of government spending programs that would be run by the Internal Revenue Service.

He's got a plan to encourage people to buy more energy-efficient appliances. Who's in charge of that? The Energy Department? No. The Internal Revenue Service. And down the list. It adds up to about 500 billion in spending programs that would be run by IRS.

JACKSON: The tax code already is growing more complicated. Taxpayers spend untold billions trying to comply. And Gore's list of proposed new tax breaks makes advocates of a simpler tax code cringe.

GALE: For any of these proposals, like child credits or retirement saving credits or health credits, there are simple ways to do it and there are complicated ways. History tells us that politicians will eventually choose the complicated ways, the reason being that they can satisfy more constituents by doing that.



JACKSON: Republican George W. Bush says the growing federal surplus is money the government doesn't need and should give back.

BUSH: The surplus is not the government's money. The surplus is the people's money.

JACKSON (on camera): But Gore would use the surplus to pay down the national debt by the year 2013, more quickly than Bush proposes. That would put downward pressure on interest rates. And Gore says lower interest rates benefit family budgets just as well as federal tax cuts.

Brooks Jackson, CNN, Washington.



Washington Post

September 13, 2000; Page A01

For Bush's 'Typical' Family, Lots of Tax Restrictions (Excerpts)

By MIKE ALLEN

Texas Gov. George W. Bush likes to say that anyone who pays federal income tax would benefit from his proposed tax cut and has been trying to dramatize the point by appearing with a supposedly typical family at each campaign stop and crowing about the savings they would receive under his plan.

But becoming one of the "tax families," as Bush's campaign staff affectionately calls these financial points of light, turns out to be no casual matter. In an e-mail sent to New Mexico Republicans last week, state party officials said Bush was "seeking two families in New Mexico to highlight his plan for tax relief and prescription drugs."

Then came the list of qualifications for becoming the latest tax family. According to the e-mail, a suitable family must make between \$ 35,000 and \$ 70,000 a year, itemize its taxes and have no children in day care, no children in college, no one attending night school, no children younger than age 1 and "no substantial savings outside of 401(k)."

"If you fit, you may get to meet the Governor on his next trip to New Mexico," the message says. "Thank you for your help!"

What the e-mail doesn't make clear is that the screening points have the effect of eliminating families who would benefit most from Vice President Gore's plan.

The message is an unusual peek behind the curtain at the exquisite care that goes into selecting the props--human and otherwise--for



modern, made-for-television campaign events. It also reflects the furious effort by each of the campaigns in a neck-and-neck race to portray itself as the champion of "working families," a phrase that Gore popularized and that Bush has taken to using in recent days.

The Bush campaign said the list of requirements to become a tax family is so long in order to ensure that the chosen families have financial situations that would present a sharp contrast between the Bush and Gore tax cuts.

"This is just a quick way to cut down on a lot of the preparation time if they have all this information in front of them for us to compute it," Bush spokesman Dan Bartlett said.

(...)

The Gore campaign plans to fight back this week with a report that looks beyond tax cuts and does the math for five households that it contends would benefit more from the Democratic plans than from the GOP ones. By including such Gore proposals as a higher minimum wage, the report argues that, for example, a family with two small children making \$ 35,000 would be \$ 6,946 better off under Gore. It says a family making \$ 50,000, caring for an elderly parent and hoping to send a child to college would be \$ 12,960 better off under Gore.

The two candidates have structured very different plans. Bush, who would cut taxes by \$ 1.6 trillion over 10 years, slashes tax rates for all tax filers, while Gore has assembled a smaller \$ 500 billion package of tax cuts targeted mostly at couples who make less than \$ 70,000 and who have specific needs, such as day care expenses or college tuition.

Unlike Bush, Gore also provides substantial relief to the working poor with little or no tax liability, which probably accounts for Bush's seeking couples making more than \$ 35,000. Because wealthier families



get a relatively large tax cut under Bush--while receiving little or nothing from Gore--the Bush campaign also likely wanted to avoid the spectacle of featuring families making more than \$ 70,000.



The Economy - Gore

Los Angeles Times

June 16, 2000; Page 24

Gore Calls For More Robust Tax-Cut Proposal

By MATEA GOLD

CINCINNATI -- Vice President Al Gore on Thursday doubled his proposed tax cut, offering a \$ 500-billion reduction over 10 years to help the middle class pay for, among other things, education and health care.

Speaking at a family owned wholesale produce company on the outskirts of Cincinnati, the presumptive Democratic nominee for president said growth of the federal budget surplus frees the government to increase the size of the tax cuts targeted at working families. Last July he had called for tax cuts of \$ 250 billion.

"Right now, we are experiencing some of the greatest economic success we have ever had," said Gore, sitting on a sack of long grain rice in a cavernous warehouse, his cowboy boot-clad foot balanced on a box of potatoes.

"Now, instead of the biggest deficits ever, we have the biggest surpluses."

After announcing the new \$ 500-billion figure, Gore recounted elements of his tax cut announced earlier.

The vice president's proposal includes the elimination of the so-called marriage penalty and refundable tax credits for health care, child care and after-school programs. He also would give a \$ 3,000 tax credit to help with long-term care costs and allow families to save up to \$ 10,000 tax free for college tuition.



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

Gore also would create independent savings accounts to complement the traditional Social Security benefits. Gore said that he would detail this "Social Security plus" plan next week as he continues his "progress and prosperity" tour through key battleground states.

"This tax relief package for middle-income families can help to solve the most important challenges that families face today," said Gore, warning that Republican George W. Bush's much larger tax-cut plan could return the country to deficits.

Texas Gov. Bush, the presumptive GOP nominee, has called for cutting taxes by \$ 1.3 trillion over 10 years, with the poorest workers paying 10% and the richest 33%.

Gore spent about an hour Thursday in the warehouse playing talk show host with a group of 10 people assembled to demonstrate how they would benefit from his tax-cut plan.

The vice president chatted with a young couple about the marriage penalty and a single mom about child care costs, murmuring sympathies about their financial constraints and promising that his proposal would help them.



Baltimore Sun

September 7, 2000; Page 1A

Gore Details Lofty Goals: Erasing Federal Debt, Less Poverty, Higher Incomes Called For, Fiscal Prudence Pledged (Excerpts)

By JONATHAN WEISMAN

CLEVELAND - Al Gore unveiled a book-length campaign manifesto yesterday that sets forth ambitious goals for the nation and pledges fiscal prudence and aggressive government intervention to achieve them.

The goals are bold and the aims straightforward, Gore said: "to help the middle-class families who have always been America's purpose and pride."

Those goals include raising college attendance to 75 percent of high school seniors and college completion rates to 50 percent, reducing poverty to the lowest level ever, creating 10 million high-technology jobs, ensuring that seven in 10 families own their homes and eliminating the federal debt by 2012.

The means to reach many of those objectives are untested, but the vice president has carefully calibrated the goals and policy prescriptions in his 191-page book, "Prosperity for America's Families," to appeal to the anxieties of swing voters, especially women, which linger even in good economic times, while claiming the mantle of fiscal responsibility in the race for the White House.

In releasing the detailed economic plan here yesterday, Gore, the Democratic presidential nominee, was taking a page from President Clinton's 1992 campaign, when his "Putting People First" document laid out what the Arkansas governor intended to accomplish in the White House.



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

The Gore book is largely a compendium of previous Gore proposals, with two exceptions: his 10 economic goals and a proposal to set aside \$300 billion in projected budget surpluses as a "rainy day" fund in case of an unexpected economic downturn or other exigency.

Virtually all of that \$300 billion was "found" in the Gore budget by shifting his budget projections from those of the White House budget office to the more optimistic estimates of the Congressional Budget Office.

The money would not be put into a fund but would be used to pay down the \$3.4 trillion federal debt. That would help lower commercial interest rates by a percentage point, Gore aides said, which would reduce annual interest payments by \$850 on a typical \$100,000 home mortgage and cut \$250 billion from total mortgage costs over a decade.

In many ways, Gore's goals are far more challenging than candidate Clinton's. Raising a nation's fortunes as it emerges from recession might be difficult, but it is not unprecedented. Sustaining a boom that has reached record heights means venturing into uncharted territory.

One of Gore's 10 economic goals, to raise family incomes by one-third over the next decade, would require a feat his advisers say has never been accomplished: keeping median family incomes rising by 2.9 percent annually over a decade. From 1997 to 1998, the average family income grew by 3.3 percent, from \$45,262 to \$46,737, but even Gore aides say the boom of the late 1990s will be hard to sustain.

"It's an ambitious goal," a senior Gore policy adviser said.

Gore also pledged to raise college attendance rates from the current two-thirds of high school seniors to three-quarters, and to raise college completion rates from 36 percent to 50 percent.

(...)



Gore's assertion that he can be the candidate of fiscal prudence and of new social spending has frustrated his political opponents. Rep. John Kasich, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, bristled yesterday that Gore had tried "to lecture Republicans on fiscal responsibility" as he laid out what Kasich estimated to be \$800 billion in new federal spending.

"He thinks he can buy people's votes with their own money," Kasich said. "People are not silly. They don't believe there's a chicken in every pot."

Before Gore spoke, Republicans noted a Senate Budget Committee analysis of the vice president's campaign promises that concluded the spending and tax cut proposals had exceeded the projected non-Social Security budget surplus of \$2.2 trillion by as much as \$906 billion.

That would not put the government back into deficit, but it would mean that Gore would have to dip into the surplus of Social Security and Medicare taxes that both parties have put off limits.

"He spends the entire surplus on bigger government," Bush, the Republican presidential candidate, told a crowd of a few hundred gathered at the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre airport in Pennsylvania. "He won't admit it."

Bush made it clear yesterday that he would not cede the issue of fiscal responsibility easily. He highlighted an advertisement his campaign took out in USA Today that featured the signatures of six Nobel laureate economists who backed his tax plan.

"My plan has been endorsed by Nobel prize winners," Bush said. "His plan has been endorsed by Bill Clinton."

Gore advisers dismissed the Senate Budget Committee analysis as "unbelievably distorted." They noted that the Budget Committee



estimated the cost of Gore's proposal to make some college tuition costs tax-deductible at \$120 billion, but that when Clinton introduced the same plan, Congress' Joint Committee on Taxation put the cost at \$30 billion.

The cost of the most expansive Gore proposal, to match middle-class private savings with government grants, was estimated at \$750 billion by the GOP- controlled Senate budget panel and at \$200 billion by the Gore campaign.

(...)



Boston Globe

September 10, 2000; Page A30

**On Bush Tax Plan and Social Security, Gore's Rhetoric Seen Loose
With Facts**

By GLEN JOHNSON

CARBONDALE, Pa. - A Pennsylvania company that changed from making silk 100 years ago to fire-resistant materials now offered Al Gore a backdrop to make a pitch for adding 10 million high-wage, high-tech jobs to the American economy.

It also served as the latest venue for Gore to repeat two statements, one about his rival, George W. Bush, and another about himself, that stretch the truth.

Speaking of his opposition to a tax cut proposed by the Texas governor, Gore said Thursday, "Let me make it clear: I will not go along with any plan that takes the entire surplus and squanders it on a big tax cut for the very wealthy at the expense of the middle class."

In fact, Bush has not proposed that. His \$1.3 trillion tax cut would consume slightly more than a quarter of the projected \$4.56 trillion surplus over 10 years. Since it is an across-the-board cut, it would apply to all taxpayers, although the rich would benefit more than the poor.

The vice president told workers at Gentex, a manufacturer outside Scranton, "It is also time to secure retirement by making sure that Social Security and Medicare are put in an off-budget lockbox with a sign on it that says, 'Politicians, hands off.' "

In fact, Bush also says he wants to put Social Security money in such a "lockbox," but Gore's vivid imagery suggests that the money would be placed in some sort of vault. Earlier in the week, the vice



president told one audience the lockbox would be "ironclad."

The reality is that the term does not refer to a bank or an account, but the commitment to use all unneeded Social Security taxes in the coming years to pay off part of the nation's \$3.4 trillion debt. That way, when Social Security faces insolvency in 2037, the country will have more capacity to deal with it.

When Bush refers to a lockbox, he often notes that its benefit would be to reduce the national debt.

Gore aides defend their candidate's rhetoric, the use of which since the Democratic National Convention has paralleled Gore's rise in the polls. Gore also talks about "fighting for middle-class families" and says Bush is "for the powerful," and he is "for the people."

The Bush campaign says Gore's statements illustrate the vice president's tendency to twist the facts for his own purposes. It is the same charge that former US senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey leveled against Gore last winter in the Democratic primary campaign.

In January and February, Bradley complained repeatedly about Gore telling audiences the former senator wanted to eliminate Medicaid and replace it with a \$150-a-month voucher. In truth, that dollar amount was not a cap, as Gore implied, but an average. And it was not per family, but per individual. When challenged on the statement, the vice president modified his language, but only slightly.

He subsequently said the vouchers were "capped at \$150 a month or averaged at \$150 a month, however you want to say it," even though the statements were contradictory.

"I think it just shows that Al Gore will say anything to get elected, no matter how false or phony," said a Bush spokesman, Ari Fleischer. With a bit of sarcasm in his voice, he alluded to Gore's change of heart over



abortion: "Remember, Al Gore has always been prochoice."

A Gore spokesman, Chris Lehane, denied that Gore was stretching the truth. He said it is Bush who is guilty of political hyperbole. While Bush talks daily about rebuilding the military, Lehane said, he budgets only \$45 billion for it. Gore, by contrast, proposes \$100 billion in new military spending.

"On all these issues, you have the Texas two-step, where he says one thing and does another," Lehane said.

Exaggeration is a fact of life on the campaign trail. Candidates always present their proposals in the best possible light and their opponent's in the most unfavorable terms.

Gore, however, has a long history of making statements that stretch the truth, such as his claims that he "took the initiative in inventing the Internet," or that he and wife Tipper served as the model couple for Erich Segal's novel "Love Story."

As his standing in the polls has dropped, Bush has hammered away at the credibility theme, most recently in reference to Gore's willingness to debate. It is an issue that cuts both ways for the two campaigns.

After sealing up the Democratic nomination in March, the vice president challenged Bush to debate "anytime, anyplace." The Bush team hedged, but a week ago it announced it would participate in two hourlong debates on CNN and NBC, as well as a 90-minute debate sanctioned by the Commission on Presidential Debates.

The vice president refused to accept those terms, saying he wanted Bush to agree to three debates proposed by the commission before they did others. While the Bush team is now reconsidering its position, Gore's hedge became the subject of a commercial by the Republicans challenging his credibility.



Yet Bush is susceptible to criticism on the subject because two weeks ago he said, "I want as many people to watch our debates as possible." Since then, both ABC and CBS have said they would not air the first two debates because they are being produced by rival networks.

Gore's statements about tax cuts and the Social Security lockbox have caught the attention of some of those who have watched both candidates in action.

After initially conceding the Bush tax cut does not consume all of the surplus, as the vice president stated, Lehane, Gore's spokesman, returned to correct himself.

He said Bush's \$1.3 trillion cut would actually cost about \$1.6 trillion, because the nation would incur about \$300 billion in extra interest costs if that portion of the surplus is used not for debt repayment.

The Gore campaign also says the Bush tax cut costs \$300 billion more than Bush acknowledges - for a total of \$1.9 trillion - because of the intricacies of its effective date. Aides to the Texas governor dispute that, but Lehane, like the vice president, is insistent.

"He does spend all the surplus on a tax cut for the wealthy," Lehane said.



The Economy - Bush

Washington Post

June 17, 2000; Page A04

Whither Bush's Big Tax Cut Vow? Republican Candidate Shifts Campaign Focus to Smaller, Targeted Breaks (Excerpts)

By TERRY M. NEAL

In his Super Tuesday victory speech, George W. Bush struck a defiant tone: "The polls say cutting taxes is not popular. I'm not proposing tax relief because it is the popular thing to do. I'm proposing tax relief because it is the right thing to do."

Yet since that March 7 speech in Austin, Bush has said little about his 10-year, \$ 1.6 trillion plan to cut income tax rates for all Americans, a proposal he touted daily during the primary season. Instead, he has rolled out a series of targeted tax cuts aimed at helping people purchase health insurance and housing and save for retirement and other purposes.

The shift reflects the campaign's conclusion that a massive across-the-board tax cut is not the ticket to the White House. With polls continuing to show that tax cuts are not among the top concerns of voters and with Vice President Gore referring repeatedly to the Texas governor's "risky tax scheme," Bush has adopted a new tax strategy that resembles the one employed to great effect by President Clinton in recent years.

(...)

Bush, for his part, yesterday offered his most extensive comments on a broad-based tax cut in months, as he reacted to Gore's proposals this



week for more targeted tax cuts for education, health care and retirement savings. "Yet another change," Bush said in Canton, Ohio, giving his head a little shake. "He ought to release the results of the focus groups." And he added a warning: "Be wary of what's called 'targeted tax cuts'--tax cuts for political purposes."

Later, during a news conference, Bush acknowledged that some of his own proposed cuts are targeted at education, health care and charitable giving. The difference, he said, is that his tax proposal is based on principles, while Gore's is politically motivated. "Surely America doesn't want a focus-group-driven presidency. They want a president who makes decisions based on principles," he said.

Bush's principles include the belief that no one should pay more than 33 percent in federal income tax, that the bottom rate for low-wage earners should be dropped to 10 percent, and that the additional taxes paid as workers strive for the middle class--his favorite example is a single mother earning \$ 22,000--should be phased in more gradually.

"The plan I laid out in the primaries is the one I plan to run on," he said. "I'm not one to chase public opinion."

(...)



Houston Chronicle

July 16, 2000; Page 4

Bush's Fiscal Skills Fall Short, Gore Says (Excerpts)

By BENNETT ROTH

WASHINGTON - Al Gore on Saturday ratcheted up his attacks on George W. Bush for potential budget problems brewing in the Lone Star state, telling a group of moderate Democrats that Bush's record on fiscal responsibility has not matched his rhetoric.

To underscore his contention, Gore has seized on new projections of a budget squeeze in two programs that could drain \$ 610 million from the state's \$ 1 billion surplus.

"As America begins this new century with the biggest surpluses ever, Texas's budget surpluses are rolling away like tumbleweed," Gore said in an address to the Democratic Leadership Council in Baltimore.

Gore said Bush is to blame for the budget predicament because he pushed through a \$ 1.7 billion state tax cut that left little money for other needs.

The vice president also said Bush had lobbied for tax breaks for powerful state interests.

"Instead of taking up legislation dealing with children's health care, Gov. Bush made a tax break for the oil industry the very first bill he signed that year," Gore said. "Now I don't know how many oil executives lack health insurance, but Texas is second in the nation for children without health insurance."

The first bill Bush signed during the 1999 legislative session was an emergency tax break for oil wells. During the same session he lobbied the legislature to approve a children's health program that was more modest



than what Democratic lawmakers had proposed. Bush eventually relented and signed the Legislature's plan.

Bush spokesman Dan Barlett responded that the budget predicament in Texas is not unusual; the state often is required to add money to programs when lawmakers have misjudged spending needs. In this case Medicaid and criminal justice programs will require more funds than initially projected.

Bartlett blasted Gore for exaggerating the budget situation, which was first reported last week in the Houston Chronicle.

"As he continues to do bad in the polls he feels it necessary to attack Gov. Bush and continues to distort and mislead on his record," Bartlett said.

(...)



New York Times

August 6, 2000; Page 16

Bush Puts New Spin On G.O.P. Blueprint

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON

WASHINGTON, Aug. 4 -- The economic agenda presented to the Republican National Convention and the nation on Thursday night by Gov. George W. Bush stuck closely in many ways to Republican orthodoxy.

Its centerpieces were tax cuts and the creation of personal investment accounts within the Social Security system.

It emphasized that the solutions to some problems, like the growing numbers of people without health insurance, rested not with government bureaucracy but with the private marketplace. And it promised a budget that would provide more money for the military.

But there were twists.

Throughout the convention, the Bush team sought to counter the idea that Republicans stand for sweeping tax cuts that are reckless and a boon only to the country-club set. Tax cuts were showcased in Philadelphia as a prudent way to spur entrepreneurship, help people looking to reach the middle class, and provide an economic pick-me-up should the long business expansion begin to flag.

Gone was the Republican call to shrink government's size and influence by starving it of revenues. Mr. Bush went so far in his speech as to single out his support for federal programs like Head Start.

Perhaps most notably, Mr. Bush made clear how he intended to handle one of his trickiest political tasks: making a case against an incumbent vice president whose administration is presiding over an



economic boom.

Rather than ignoring it, or getting into a battle over who deserves the credit, Mr. Bush said the real issue should be what the nation chooses to do with its prosperity.

"We will use these good times for great goals," Mr. Bush said, pledging in particular to ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

To some degree, Mr. Bush was trying to do for Republicans on economic policy what President Clinton has done for Democrats.

By emphasizing elimination of the federal budget deficit and the national debt, Mr. Clinton sought to erase the perception that Democrats were the party of profligacy and high taxes. In the end, doing so gave him more freedom to press for substantially more spending on the issues at the core of the Democratic agenda, especially health and education.

Similarly, Mr. Bush seems intent on dispelling the idea that conservative policy is inconsistent with helping people who have not already made it economically, and his tax plan contains elements specifically intended to help the working poor.

But Mr. Bush is by no means apologizing for the fact that his proposals to cut all income tax rates would do what such proposals always do: provide most of their benefits to the people who make the most money.

So Mr. Bush is certain to draw heavy fire from Vice President Al Gore. Democrats said that the focus in Philadelphia this week on helping single mothers, struggling family farms and Hispanic entrepreneurs was nothing more than camouflage for the usual conservative effort, embodied by the Bush campaign, to reward the wealthy people and powerful interest groups that finance Republican campaigns.



Worse, they said, Republicans would squander the projected federal budget surpluses and leave nothing for priorities like adding prescription drug coverage to Medicare or modernizing schools.

Democrats look at the Bush tax plan and see 43 percent of the benefits going to the top 1 percent of households by income, those making more than \$319,000 a year, according to Citizens for Tax Justice, a liberal-leaning research group.

Lawrence B. Lindsey, Mr. Bush's chief economic adviser, said Republicans remained focused on the incentives that tax cuts provide to earn and save more, whether for a waitress earning \$18,000 a year or the entrepreneur who wants to be able to pass a painstakingly built business along to her heirs without being subject to a hefty federal estate tax.

After several years in which their agenda seemed to generate little public enthusiasm, Republicans have taken heart from polls showing that support for tax cuts is growing.

But to the extent that he emphasizes the substance of economic policy, Mr. Bush risks not only inviting an onslaught from Mr. Gore over class politics and fiscal rectitude, but also focusing voters on the fact that the Clinton-Gore years have been pretty good for most people.

With unemployment at 4 percent, inflation benign and incomes broadly rising, Democrats gathering for their Los Angeles convention this month will no doubt be eager to show that on those counts, Mr. Gore's election would mean more of the same.



Daily News (New York)

August 23, 2000; Page 23

Tax Cut Needs Explaining, Bush Says (Excerpts)

By HELEN KENNEDY and RICHARD SISK

Finding himself on the defensive for the first time since the primaries, Texas Gov. George W. Bush conceded yesterday that he hasn't made a good case for his giant tax cut proposal.

"I've got to do a better job of making it clear," Bush told reporters aboard his campaign plane during a swing through the Midwest, as polls showed him lagging for the first time in the wake of Al Gore's postconvention surge.

"I think when people understand that we've got a lot of money that's going to be applied to different programs, people will buy into the tax-relief package even more."

The Republican candidate contends that the budget surplus "is the people's money," and they should get it back. The Gore camp shoots down all of Bush's proposals by insisting that he can't pay for his promises on top of a \$1.3 trillion tax cut plan.

But Bush said he had no intention of backing down. He said he expects the surplus to grow so much in the next 10 years - to \$2.5 trillion - that he can slash taxes and increase spending. "Surely we can send some of that money back to the people who pay the bills," he said.

(...)



New York Times

August 26, 2000; Page 1

Bush Tax Plan: The Debate Takes Shape (Excerpts)

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON

WASHINGTON, Aug. 24 -- In the shorthand of presidential politics, Gov. George W. Bush's tax cut proposal is either an overdue effort to return to citizens what is rightfully theirs, or, as Vice President Al Gore puts it, a risky scheme to reward the wealthy.

(...)

Much of the focus is on the scale of Mr. Bush's plan, which would reduce all income tax rates, double the child credit, provide a break for married couples, repeal the federal estate tax and expand the deductibility of charitable contributions.

Mr. Bush's tax cut would reduce federal revenues by \$1.3 trillion in the nine years starting in 2002, and it would use up \$1.6 trillion of the surplus over that period. That figure includes the increased interest costs the government would have to pay if any of the surplus was spent or used for tax cuts.

But that would make Mr. Bush's plan considerably smaller than the tax cut championed by President Ronald Reagan in 1981. If it had not been partially offset by subsequent tax increases before it became fully effective, the Reagan plan as passed would ultimately have amounted to an annual tax cut equal to 4 percent of the gross domestic product, according to a calculation by Robert S. McIntyre, the director of Citizens for Tax Justice, a liberal research group.

If fully enacted, the Bush plan would eventually reduce taxes by about 1.5 percent of the gross domestic product, Mr. McIntyre said.



More important than its absolute size is whether the tax cut is affordable, given the size of the projected budget surplus.

Over the first nine years of the Bush tax cut, starting in 2002, the total surplus is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to be \$4.3 trillion, assuming that government spending rises at the rate of inflation.

Of that, \$2.1 trillion would be the non-Social Security surplus, which is the portion up for grabs for tax cuts and spending. (The two political parties have agreed that the portion of the surplus generated by Social Security should go only to reducing the national debt or shoring up the retirement system.)

So on the face of it, Mr. Bush's tax cut in that nine-year period -- \$1.3 trillion plus \$300 billion in interest costs -- would still leave \$500 billion for other purposes.

But there are already many calls on that \$500 billion. There is considerable bipartisan support for taking off the table, for tax cuts or spending, the portion of the surplus being generated by Medicare, which is more than \$300 billion over the nine-year period.

Both parties are heading toward adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. There is backing in both parties for tax cuts not included in Mr. Bush's proposal.

And Mr. Bush has made expensive commitments of his own, from expanding access to health care to building a national missile defense.

Moreover, there is no assurance that the surplus will materialize as projected. Even if it does, history suggests that more of it might go to spending programs than is assumed in the surplus projections, given the well-established propensity of both parties to spend more than they say they will.

But Mr. Bush's team said there was plenty of money available for the



tax cut and for other needs. Mr. Bush has said he can save \$200 billion over the next decade by improving the way government operates, and he has vowed to crack down on government spending. His plan makes no provision for taking the Medicare surplus off the table. Even after adding \$256 billion in spending increases over 10 years for the military, education, agriculture and other programs, his advisers say there would still be a substantial buffer left.

(...)

As Mr. Gore has increasingly emphasized a populist message, he has tried to focus attention on who would benefit most from Mr. Bush's proposal.

An analysis by Citizens for Tax Justice found that 59.4 percent of the total tax cut would go to households with incomes in the top 10 percent, \$92,500 or more, with that group getting an average tax cut of \$6,410.

The bottom 60 percent of households, those with incomes less than \$39,300, would get 12.6 percent of the total tax cut, an average of \$227, according to the analysis.

Mr. Bush's team looks at the question from a different angle, suggesting that lower-income people would benefit proportionately more than upper-income people, at least relative to the size of their existing tax bills.

The Bush campaign produced figures showing that a family of four with two incomes totaling \$47,500 -- the national median -- would see its federal income taxes decline by 56 percent under the Bush plan, to \$1,493 from \$3,393 under current law. By contrast, a family of four with one worker making \$250,000 would see its tax bill fall by 13 percent, to \$59,187 from \$68,031.



Social Issues

Los Angeles Times

May 15, 2000; Page 5

Whether Bush or Gore, President Will Be a Player in School Reform

(Excerpts)

By RONALD BROWNSTEIN

The political climate in Washington has grown so polarized that it's not clear whether the Senate this year will even agree on legislation reauthorizing the basic federal programs supporting public education.

When centrist Senate Democrats, led by Indiana's Evan Bayh and Connecticut's Joseph I. Lieberman, last week offered a sensible compromise between Democratic demands for more school funding and Republican calls for more local autonomy, they attracted all of 13 votes. That was a tip-off that most legislators in both parties would rather have a dispute they can take to the voters than a deal that could attract President Clinton's signature. That may be the sole bipartisan point of agreement about education in Congress these days.

This is hardly the ideal backdrop for exploring new ways that Washington can kick-start the school reform movement. Yet that's exactly what presidential contenders Al Gore and George W. Bush have been doing. In their own ways, each envisions Washington assuming a much more intimate role in shaping the direction of school reform. Democrat Gore would expand that role considerably more than Republican Bush, but both would use the White House to push very specific remedial plans on local school districts.

As president, either would likely face cries of infringing on local



autonomy--the same complaint that's stymied many of Clinton's education initiatives. "Both Gore's and Bush's proposals are right on the line between being good policy and being overly prescriptive," says Michael D. Casserly, executive director of the Council of Great City Schools, an association of the largest school districts. Yet the trend toward greater guidance from the top may be inevitable as education rises as a national priority--and federal officials grow frustrated with the mixed results of local reform efforts.

This trend is most visible in Gore's education agenda. By dribbling out his plans over the past year, the vice president has somewhat obscured the full scale of his ambitions. But, building on Clinton's ideas, he is proposing to significantly enlarge Washington's role in virtually every aspect of school operation--offering both more money and more direction.

Gore would pour new federal money into everything from preschool (he's proposing \$ 5 billion a year in federal grants to provide virtually universal access to early instruction) to high school (he wants to give states money to experiment with smaller high schools and new strategies to discourage dropouts). He also would provide more funds for building schools (like Clinton, he wants Washington to pay the interest on bonds localities float to construct new schools), as well as closing them (he's proposed giving states more money to intervene in failing schools, including shutting them down and reopening them with new management).

In Gore's vision, Washington would construct an assembly line to help fill classrooms with the new teachers needed to meet the demands of growing enrollment. He wants to spend \$ 8 billion over the next decade to recruit 1 million teachers, mostly by expanding a Clinton program that



provides college scholarships to young people who agree to teach in low-income districts. Then he wants to provide districts billions of dollars to hire new teachers under a program to reduce class sizes. Finally, he's proposed an \$ 8-billion, 10-year grant program to boost teacher pay in districts that agree to toughen standards for teacher performance.

With all this money, though, comes strings--lots of them. As a condition of federal funding, Gore would require every school district to end social promotion--the practice of passing students to the next grade, regardless of whether they've mastered their current material. He would bar districts from using teachers who have not received state certification and require them to test new teachers in their subject area. For districts that participate in the grant program to raise pay, the demands grow more specific yet: They would be required to give principals the authority to hire teachers without regard to seniority and to create streamlined means for dismissing poorly performing teachers.

That's not the end of it. Gore would also mandate that states identify schools that are failing to improve student performance and undertake specific measures to turn them around. That would start with guaranteeing students in them the right to transfer to a better public school, and end with requirements to dismiss the principal. About the only thing missing are mandates to fire the kitchen staff when the lunches serve mystery meat--though if Gore keeps eating in cafeterias during his school-day visits, that might not be far off.

Like many Clinton proposals, this agenda paradoxically employs liberal means toward center-right ends. Most of the requirements Gore would impose on local districts aim to advance goals conservatives support, such as toughening teacher testing; yet Republicans recoil from the notion of Washington mandating them. That's the theme Bush



pounds in denouncing the Gore blueprints.

Yet Bush would measurably extend Washington's reach himself. Like Gore, he would push states to stiffen their teacher accountability systems. In return for giving states more authority over existing federal education dollars, Bush would require them to test students in math and reading every year from third through eighth grade. And he would trample local prerogatives by providing low-income parents federally funded vouchers for private school. Thus, whether or not individual communities want to encourage parents to bail out of the public schools, Bush would override their decision and give more families the means to do so.

"That undermines local control more than any Democrat would ever dream of," says Bruce Reed, the White House's top domestic policy advisor.

(...)



New York Times

May 19, 2000; Page 23

Benefits and Drawbacks to Bush and Gore Proposals for Overhauling

Social Security (Excerpts)

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON

WASHINGTON, May 18 -- Social Security is slowly going broke, says Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, and the best way to avoid painful benefit cuts or tax increases is to establish private investment accounts through which workers could seek higher returns on their contributions to the retirement system.

Social Security is slowly going broke, says Vice President Al Gore, and the best way to avoid painful benefit cuts or tax increases is to channel money from the federal budget surplus into the retirement system.

The differences between the presidential candidates are clear enough. But behind their approaches are complicated policy and political considerations regarding the problem and the possible solutions.

How the System Works

Benefits to current retirees are paid out of payroll taxes levied on nearly all workers and their employers. Because the work force at the moment is large relative to the number of people who have retired, those taxes generate more revenue than is needed to pay benefits, a surplus of about \$150 billion this year and \$2.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

The excess revenue goes into a trust fund out of which future benefits can be paid. But the trust fund is not quite what its name implies. Rather than accumulating cash, it contains bonds issued by the federal government to the retirement system, a promise to pay back to



Social Security the surplus funds when they are needed.

In the meantime, the Social Security surplus goes to other purposes. For years, the government simply spent it.

(...)

In supporting private investment accounts, Mr. Bush's approach centers on increasing the return on the money coming into the system.

Mr. Bush has not provided a detailed plan. But most privatization proposals call for diverting two percentage points of the 12.4 percent payroll tax into accounts that would be owned and controlled by individuals. A worker earning \$50,000 a year would have \$1,000 a year going to a private account.

In return for the chance to invest the money themselves, workers would accept a lower guaranteed benefit from Social Security at retirement. The basic idea is that the guaranteed benefit could be reduced by more than the amount diverted into the personal accounts -- but that the returns generated for each worker by Wall Street would more than make up for the difference.

The Bush campaign notes that stocks earned an average annual return, after inflation, of 7.2 percent from 1926 to 1997. By contrast, workers born after 1963 can expect on average a return from their Social Security contributions of 1.9 percent, according to Social Security statistics cited by the Bush campaign.

Private accounts would provide a start on Social Security solvency over 75 years, the standard normally used in assessing the system's health, Mr. Bush has said. He has acknowledged that other steps, like benefit cuts, would be needed to finish closing the gap, but has not said what steps he would support.

Case Against the Accounts



However strong the performance of stocks in the past, there is no assurance that they will do well in the future. And even if they do match their historical performance, there will inevitably be ups and downs along the way.

People who retire and cash out their holdings in a bull market would do far better than people who have to sell while the market is depressed. And some people would no doubt make smarter investment decisions than others. Should large numbers of people lose money in the market, there would be tremendous political pressure to bail them out.

Some portion of any investment gain might be eaten up by the administrative costs of maintaining the accounts. And to the degree that payroll taxes are going into private accounts rather than to pay benefits to current retirees, the government would have to put additional money into the system, presumably by using the Social Security surplus. That in turn would reduce the amount of money available for debt reduction.

A diversion of two percentage points of payroll tax revenue would equal just under \$1 trillion over the next decade. By not using that money for debt reduction, the government would add \$300 billion to its interest bill in that period. So about \$1.3 trillion of the \$2.3 trillion Social Security surplus over the next 10 years would be needed to finance a private accounts plan.

The Gore Approach

Mr. Gore starts with the premise that the current system should be left more or less intact. His plan is built on the idea that there should be a way to use the current budget surplus to help Social Security down the road. While the basic idea may be simple, the way the government handles its finances makes executing it quite complicated.

Since the Social Security system cannot keep big cash reserves of its



own under the government system, the vice president wants to use all of the Social Security surplus and some of the general revenue surplus to eliminate, in 13 years, the \$3.5 trillion in national debt held by the public.

Eliminating the debt would leave the government better able to borrow, if necessary, later on. By putting downward pressure on interest rates, debt reduction would also stimulate economic growth, creating jobs and producing more payroll tax revenue to help keep Social Security healthy.

Starting in 2011, Mr. Gore would funnel to Social Security an amount of money equal to the annual interest savings from debt reduction -- \$100 billion a year at first, growing to more than \$200 billion a year by 2015. Mr. Gore says the infusion would extend Social Security's solvency to 2054 from 2037 without having to cut benefits or otherwise alter the system.

Case Against the Gore Plan

While eliminating the debt would have substantial benefits, transferring the interest savings to Social Security would be little more than a paper shuffling exercise and would still leave taxpayers on the hook to pay for the shortfall in funds.

Since Social Security cannot hold cash, the transfers would be in the form of government bonds that would be redeemed at some point out of general tax revenue. In that sense, Mr. Gore's plan would in essence transform Social Security into a welfare program, Senator Moynihan said. Mr. Gore's plan would do nothing to address the underlying imbalance between how much the system takes in and how much it has promised to pay in benefits.



Washington Post

June 21, 2000; Page A06

**Different Plans, Same Challenge. Gore, Bush Must Convince Diverse
Groups of Value of Social Security Proposals**

By DAN BALZ

The campaign debate over Social Security has devolved quickly into a simple set of negative attack lines. George W. Bush's campaign says Al Gore's plan fails to fix Social Security's long-term financing problem. Gore's campaign says the Bush plan would wreck the system.

These charges will intensify as the November election nears, backed up by a torrent of statistics and testimony from experts attached to both campaigns, as the two candidates attempt to draw distinctions between their proposals. But at heart, both Gore and Bush face the same challenge, which is to reassure different groups of voters that they will maximize their retirement benefits.

The problem is, these different groups of voters have contradictory impulses when it comes to the government's retirement program: Older Americans prefer the status quo, while younger Americans want new savings options and higher returns. Bush and Gore claim to do both, but in the past few weeks, each has undergone a shift in emphasis in describing his plan.

With political ads financed by the Republican National Committee, Bush has sought to reassure older voters that his plan won't affect their Social Security benefits. In contrast to the initial rollout of the Bush plan, which put more emphasis on bold leadership, the RNC ads begin by stressing that for those Americans at or near retirement, the Bush plan maintains the status quo.



"Older people are already suspicious of this idea," said Guy Molyneux, a Democratic pollster. "They're the ones least attracted to privatization. If older Americans think this is going to affect them in some way, it could be pretty dangerous. For Bush, it's a critical challenge."

Gore has moved in the opposite direction. He began by trashing Bush's plan for allowing workers to divert some of their payroll taxes into stock market investments as a form of "stock market roulette." Yesterday the vice president offered his own version of a government-aided personal savings account that might entice younger workers who want more opportunities to build a personal nest egg.

"My plan is Social Security plus, not Social Security minus," he said in Lexington, Ky. "It's the best of both worlds, not the worst of both worlds."

Republicans accused Gore of trying to piggyback on the appeal of Bush's plan to younger workers. "This was a guy who initially wanted the government to manage investment portfolios, then decided any investment in the private sector was unbelievably risky, and now has changed again," Bush said Monday in California. "This is a man chasing polls and focus groups."

But Gore campaign officials argued that the vice president's savings proposal is significantly different from Bush's, primarily because the money used to help fund the accounts does not come from payroll taxes but rather from the growing pool of general revenue available by improved federal budget surplus forecasts.

"We're not trying to blur the lines," said campaign spokesman Mark Fabiani. "We're trying to make things clear and separate. Gore guarantees Social Security as a bedrock for all Americans. Bush doesn't."

Gore supporters note that his savings plan offers far greater



government assistance to low-income families than to those making more money, and in unveiling the idea yesterday, the vice president struck a populist tone, suggesting that the political battle over Social Security will carry many of the echoes of past debates on the issue between the two parties.

"Never again should a hard-working family see the door slowly closing on their dream," Gore said. "On behalf of those people--not just the ones who think comfortably about their savings over Scotch in the club looking out at the golf links, but also the ones who carefully try to make it all add up to the dream over a pressured half-hour lunch break on the factory floor--we will take the White House in November."

The Bush campaign quickly zeroed in on the fact that the Gore proposal stands outside the Social Security system. Larry Lindsey, Bush's chief economic adviser, said that although Gore has offered two new entitlements aimed at retirement savings, one for widows and working women and now yesterday's savings plan, he has done nothing to shore up the system's finances.

"Fixing Social Security is really the key issue," Lindsey told reporters yesterday. "Governor Bush has proposed a way of doing that. To date, Mr. Gore has not."

Picking up on Gore's criticism of Bush's plan as risky, GOP pollster Bill McInturff said, "How risky is it to add billions and billions in new accounts without ever fixing Social Security?"

Gore's campaign claims that Bush has put the system at risk. And it has focused on what Bush won't say, namely that the partial diversion of payroll taxes into private accounts will require some reduction in the guaranteed benefit under the current Social Security system.

"Very few voters have an understanding of what the Bush plan will



mean for them," Alan Blinder, former vice chairman of the Federal Reserve and a Gore economic adviser, told reporters yesterday. "The Bush plan will sound worse, not better, as people get to know it better."

So far, voters know little about what either Bush or Gore has proposed, according to officials in both campaigns who are closely monitoring public opinion on the issue. But that's likely to change after this summer's national conventions. Even by some Democratic estimates, Bush has been more successful in this early stage in rolling out his Social Security plan, but he and Gore may have trouble satisfying young and old in the months ahead.



New York Times

July 7, 2000; Page 14

Gore Highlights Differences With Bush on Medicare

By ALISON MITCHELL

CHICAGO, July 6 -- Asking repeatedly "Whose side are you on?," Vice President Al Gore today drew a sharp contrast between his Medicare proposals and those of Gov. George W. Bush. He branded Mr. Bush, his likely Republican opponent, the candidate of powerful industries.

Mr. Gore lectured with charts and graphs at a suburban senior citizens' center, seeking to put a debate over Medicare, the popular Great Society health insurance program for the elderly, at the forefront of the campaign agenda.

He said he would devote \$339 billion to shoring up the program during the next decade and adding a new prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries. Mr. Bush, he said, had allotted "not one dime in his proposal for extending, strengthening, adding to Medicare. Not a penny."

Time and again, Mr. Gore directed pointed and detailed questions at Mr. Bush, who rarely talks about Medicare. The governor has put forward broad principles -- but little detail -- for creating more competition between private and public health plans to overhaul Medicare for the retirement of the baby boom generation.

Turning to Medicare questions for which Mr. Bush has not provided specific answers, Mr. Gore asked whether Mr. Bush supported raising the eligibility age, or raising premiums, or sending more recipients to health maintenance organizations.

"If Medicare is important to you, these questions are something you



should know the answer to," Mr. Gore told the audience of local elderly residents.

The vice president also used a version of an old union organizing slogan about choosing sides as he tried to frame the presidential election.

"In this election for president," he said, "the fundamental choice has to do with whose side are you on. I want to fight for the people; the other side fights for the powerful."

"And that's why the big pharmaceutical companies are supporting Governor Bush," Mr. Gore said. "That's why the big oil companies are supporting Governor Bush. That's why the big polluters are supporting Governor Bush. That's why the H.M.O.'s and insurance companies are supporting Governor Bush."

Today's debate about Medicare was a sign of a new stage in the Gore campaign. This spring he repeatedly denounced Mr. Bush's policy proposals as "risky." Then he stepped back and detailed some new policy proposals of his own. Now he is trying to start drawing the contrasts between his own ideas and those of Mr. Bush.

Medicare is traditionally an issue that plays to the advantage of Democrats. So far this year it has not had the prominence in the presidential race that Social Security has had, even though experts say it faces the possibility of insolvency earlier than the retirement program does.

The Bush campaign for its part accused Mr. Gore of practicing the politics of class warfare.

"Governor Bush's campaign is focused on bringing people together, while Al Gore is trying to pit one group of Americans against another," a Bush spokesman, Ari Fleischer, said today. "We always knew the latest version of Al Gore the positive wouldn't last long."



The Bush campaign also called Mr. Gore and President Clinton obstacles to keeping Medicare solvent because last year all four of Mr. Clinton's appointees to a bipartisan, 17-member group opposed its chairman's ideas for overhauling the health care program.

"Al Gore's charts and graphs can't hide the fact that the Clinton-Gore administration opposed bipartisan Medicare reform and they submitted a budget to cut Medicare spending by \$70 billion," said another Bush spokesman, Dan Bartlett, pointing to some savings Mr. Clinton had proposed for the program in his 2001 budget. Mr. Bush would not support those reductions, Mr. Bartlett said.

But along with those savings, Mr. Clinton has also called for adding an expensive new prescription drug program. Mr. Gore's slightly different version of the proposal would cost \$255 billion over a decade.

Last year, the bipartisan commission, headed by Senator John B. Breaux, Democrat of Louisiana, fell one vote short of the 11 needed to approve a final report intended to forge a consensus on how to overhaul Medicare. Ten commission members, eight Republicans and two Democrats, voted for major changes that would convert Medicare into an arena for competition among public and private health plans.

Mr. Bush has criticized the Clinton administration for opposing the Breaux plan. And Mr. Bush's broad concepts generally mirror those of the majority on the commission.

Mr. Breaux had proposed that the government, instead of paying separately for each medical service, offer a fixed amount of money to each beneficiary. The beneficiary could use the money to buy private health insurance, through a managed care plan, or to enroll in the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program.

He also proposed to offer Medicare coverage of prescription drugs as



a new benefit, with the government paying for drugs for people with incomes up to 35 percent above the poverty level. Health maintenance organizations and other private health plans would have had to offer drug coverage to Medicare beneficiaries, but they could charge extra.

Mr. Breaux would have also gradually raised the eligibility age to 67, from 65, would have charged higher premiums to high-income people, and would have required beneficiaries to pay 10 percent of the cost of home health care visits.

Mr. Gore has taken a different approach, shying away from the efforts to turn more of the program over to private insurers. He would use \$40 billion of the expected budget surplus and \$75 billion of savings in interest payments from paying down the national debt to extend the life of Medicare until 2030. He would also enact nearly \$30 billion in savings.

Mr. Gore told his audience today that he had opposed the Medicare commission's report because he felt it would raise the eligibility age, lead to higher premiums and push more people into H.M.O.'s.

Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bush's spokesman, said the governor supported the concepts of the Breaux commission. But he said Mr. Bush had not said where he stood on the eligibility age, and he said the governor did not believe that the Breaux plan would lead to premium increases.

Mr. Bush has not set out his own Medicare plan but instead named six principles for change. He has said there should be no rise in payroll taxes. And he wants Medicare to offer every recipient a "choice of plans including the option of purchasing a plan that covers prescription drugs." He has said Medicare must cover expenses for low-income elderly.

His aides say Mr. Bush has earmarked \$5 trillion over five years for



shoring up Social Security and Medicare, including a provision for some kind of prescription drug benefit.



Courier-Journal (Louisville, KY.)

July 31, 2000; Page 06a

Health-Care Plans Highlight Difference Between Bush and Gore

(Excerpts)

By SARA SHIPLEY

Health insurance is shaping up to be a significant issue in this fall's presidential election, and the candidates have staked out widely different views.

"Health care is one of the most clear areas where you can differentiate the candidates," said Grace-Marie Arnett, president of the Galen Institute, a free-market think tank specializing in health-care policy.

Here's a rundown of the major candidates' plans:

GEORGE W. BUSH: The Texas governor's proposed \$ 4.3 billion "Health Care Safety Net" is aimed at "providing access to health care for those most in need."

The plan combines public spending with private initiatives. Bush wants to add 1,200 community health centers to serve migrant workers and other poor people. Currently, the United States has 3,000 of these centers, which serve 11 million patients, 4.4 million of whom are uninsured.

The governor wants to alter the National Health Care Service Corps, which pays doctors to work in medically neglected areas, to better focus assistance in regions where the need is greatest.

Bush also would provide \$ 500 million over five years for a "Healthy Communities Innovation Fund" that would reward creative local efforts to treat and prevent diseases.



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

In a separate proposal, Bush suggests that the government pay up to 90 percent of the cost of private insurance for those who do not receive public coverage or employer coverage. The maximum annual benefit would be \$ 1,000 for individuals earning \$ 15,000 or less and \$ 2,000 for families earning up to \$ 30,000.

Bush also wants to make the Children's Health Insurance Program more flexible through block grants, encourage the creation of group plans for small businesses, and lift restrictions on medical savings accounts.

AL GORE: The Gore plan would spend \$ 146 billion over 10 years to provide health insurance to many more Americans. "It would be, if enacted, the largest health-care program since Medicare," said Sarah Bianchi, deputy director of issues for Gore's campaign.

The vice president wants to expand the Children's Health Insurance Program advocated by the Clinton administration and enacted in 1997. The proposal would raise the income ceiling, increase federal matching funds and make parents eligible for the same coverage their children get.

He also wants to let people between 55 and 65 buy Medicare coverage, assure that people with disabilities can keep their health insurance when returning to work, and strengthen community health centers.

Gore has proposed several tax credits. Small businesses would get a 25 percent tax credit on premiums for employees offered health-care coverage through insurance coalitions. Individuals who have to buy their own health insurance would also get a 25 percent tax credit.

(...)



CNN Inside Politics

Aug 23, 2000, 5 pm EST

**CNN's Kate Snow Discusses Bush's and
Gore's Education Plans (Audio)**



Bush/Gore
Education Policy
Kate Snow



Transcript:

SHAW: While George W. Bush takes a day off from the campaign trail, his running mate, Dick Cheney, is traveling through California. He's raising money and promoting the Texas governor's plan for education. The Bush proposal differs a great deal from that of his opponent, Al Gore.

Our Kate Snow takes a closer look at both plans and the issue of education reform.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KATE SNOW, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Some call it the Texas miracle -- schools held accountable for students progress, test scores on the rise. Governor Bush wants to spread the miracle.

BUSH: In my administration, we will have minimal regulation and high standards. We'll have local control of schools, with one national goal: excellence for every single child.

SNOW: In a Bush administration, states would have to develop



standardized tests; than any school receiving federal money through Title 1, a program for low-income students, would have to show results of test scores.

BUSH: Those schools that won't teach and won't change will have three years to produce results, three years to meet standards, three years to make sure the very faces of our future are not mired in mediocrity.

SNOW: If a school fails, parents would get \$1,500 and a choice: send the children to a private school, give it to a public school, or use tutoring. That proposal has drawn fire from Bush's Democratic opponent.

GORE: We need to invest more and demand more, not aim too low, and invest too little and drain resources away from public schools with private school vouchers.

SNOW: Bush's proposals would cost significantly less than Gore's, adding \$13 billion to the education budgets over five years. That's one-fourth of what Al Gore claims he would spend.

Including in Bush's plan: money to teach and test early reading skills, to build more public charter schools, tax breaks and training for teachers.

GORE: You see, the goal here is not to spend the most or cut the most, but the goal is to improve the most.

SNOW: It's the same philosophy he's promoted in Texas. Since Bush took office in 1995, education spending is up 55 percent, including money for early reading and advanced-placement classes, and again, the focus on accountability. Texas children in certain grades will have to pass a standardized test to move on and high school students have to pass a test to graduate. Scores on state achievement tests have risen under Bush. In 1994, 53 percent of Texas students passed. By 2000, the rate jumped to 80 percent passing; 31 percent of African-Americans



passed in 1994, that more than doubled in 2000.

But many of the accountability reforms were initiated under previous administrations, and some dispute the very notion of a Texas miracle. They say those test scores are inflated because younger children are spending so much time on test drills and older kids are dropping out before the test is even taken.

JIM HOFFMAN, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS EDUCATION PROFESSOR: Teachers are teaching to the content that is covered in the test only. So we have a statewide curriculum that's quite comprehensive across many different areas, but most of those areas are not taught.

SNOW: Some say if Bush was were president, the emphasis on centralized standards would put Washington in control of the classroom, and the Bush campaign insists teachers would still be in charge, but the Bush White House would demand results.

Al Gore says the U.S. needs another revolution...

GORE: We ranked 18th out of 18 nations surveyed in 12th grade math.

SNOW: ... to put the nation's students on par with the rest of the world.

GORE: It's the very first proposal that I've made as a candidate for president, and that is to bring not small changes, not gradual improvements, not minor advances, but truly revolutionary advances in our public schools.

SNOW: The revolution won't be cheap. Gore would pump \$115 billion over 10 years into an education reform trust fund. That's much more than his opponent George W. Bush would spend.

BUSH: There's no way that I can possibly outspend Al Gore on any program, any place, anytime in government. His motto is, vote for me, I'll



spend more money.

SNOW: Gore says the investment will payoff, with more money to wire classrooms to the Internet, preschool for every child and smaller class sizes.

GORE: We've got to recruit more than two million teachers over the next two years.

SNOW: Gore proposes tuition breaks for college students willing to teach at needy school and pay raises for teachers already on the job.

But the vice president is also staking out positions that don't go over so well with teacher unions. In a Gore administration, teachers would be tested and states without certified professionals would lose funding.

Gore would encourage states to test their students, but unlike his opponent, he'd measure progress based on a national test. States and school districts would be required to identify failing schools. If those schools didn't turn around within two years, they'd be shut down and reopened with a new principal. That leads to the major difference between Gore and Bush. Gore would allow parents to move their kids from failing schools to better public schools, but he strongly opposes Bush's idea of giving parents money for private school tuition.

GORE: You can't reform public schools by draining money away from public schools into private school vouchers. That is a mistake.

SNOW: Critics question why Gore hasn't pushed harder for reform over the past seven and a half years.

NINA REES, HERITAGE FOUNDATION: This administration has talked a good talk about closing down schools that are not performing well. To this day, not a single one of these schools -- and there are over 6000 of them right now around the country -- not a single one of them has shut down.



SNOW: But Gore defends the Clinton administration record. He takes credit for wiring classrooms to the Internet, providing tax credits for college students, helping schools hire new teachers and expanding funding for Head Start.

(on camera): They are some of the same changes Gore is proposing for the future. Republicans say that's a sign Gore doesn't have any new ideas. But the Gore campaign counters, when it comes to education, the vice president is building on success.

Kate Snow, CNN, Washington.



CNN Inside Politics

August 28/29, 2000, 5 pm EST

CNN's Pierre Thomas Analyzes Bush's and Gore's Crime Plans (Audio)



Transcript:

SHAW: The Gore campaign is touting new crimes statistics and trying to use them against George W. Bush. The Justice Department reports violent crime dropped another 10 percent here in the United States last year to its lowest level since the government began keeping such records in 1973.

The Gore camp cites President Clinton's "cops initiative" to put 100,000 new community police officers on the streets as a key factor in the reduction in crime. And Gore's Web site takes aim at Governor Bush for saying he would eliminate that program.

In response, the Bush campaign says the cops initiative is just another big government initiative and the governor favors local control.

Now, let's take a closer look at Governor Bush's plan to combat crime in America. Here's CNN's Pierre Thomas.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

THOMAS (voice-over): To understand George W. Bush's record on crime and gun control, you need only to come to Harris County, Texas, a



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

conservative tough-on-crime community where 33,000 residents have permits to carry concealed weapons.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Criminals are using guns to accomplish their aims, and I need to do something to better protect myself and make myself more their equal.

THOMAS: Pro-death penalty.

CHUCK ROSENTHAL, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY, HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS: There are some crimes that are so heinous that if you commit those crimes you have to pay for it with your own life.

THOMAS: Since Governor Bush took office in 1995, Texas has put more than 130 inmates to death, more than any other state in the Union.

BUSH: The death penalty is not an easy subject for a lot of folks. I'm going to uphold the laws of the land, and if it costs me politically, it costs me politically.

THOMAS (on camera): Bush's position on the death penalty should come as no surprise. In fact, in one recent survey, 73 percent of Texans were in support of capital punishment.

BUSH: Is everybody OK?

THOMAS (voice-over): Bush supporters point to the death penalty as indicative of a get-tough-on crime attitude.

Bush has supported one of the nation's largest prison build-ups. Under the construction program which began in previous administrations, the number of Texas prison beds will grow from 41,000 in 1989 to 150,000 when completed this year. And he signed legislation toughening penalties against juvenile offenders, including allowing youth as young as 14 to be tried as adults.

But in this campaign, any talk of crime fighting also often leads to the question of gun control, and it is here Bush walks a political



tightrope; balancing the proud pro-gun Texas tradition against the need to appear more moderate before a national electorate which generally favors more restrictions on firearms.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We've had a history where people have had and owned pistols, shotguns and rifles.

THOMAS: Bush supported a law limiting the ability of Texas cities to sue gun manufacturers, he opposes a three-day waiting period for firearms purchases and weekend gun shows. And in 1995, Bush signed a law legalizing the possession of concealed weapons despite opposition from a number of state law enforcement officials.

BUSH: He said, I believe law-abiding citizens should be able to protect themselves and their families.

THOMAS: Since the measure became law, 212,000 Texans have received concealed weapons licenses.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We have doctors, lawyers, we have federal judges, district judges.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Two shots, fire!

THOMAS: Many Texans say Bush helped level the playing field against criminals who are now on the defensive.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They are running scared out there, because they don't know who's carrying and who's not.

THOMAS: But Bush critics say he is in the hip pocket of the National Rifle Association.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, HANDGUN CONTROL AD)

NARRATOR: No wonder the NRA says...

WAYNE LAPIERRE, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION: If we win, we'll have a president where we work out of their office.

(END VIDEO CLIP)



THOMAS: Bush supporters scoff at any notion that he's soft on guns. They say he increased state funding for gun crime prosecutions, supports trigger lock distribution programs, and has sometimes taken positions at odds with the gun lobby. He favors raising the legal age for handgun possession from 18 to 21, and would maintain the federal ban on assault weapons, which the NRA wants repealed.

So what has all Bush's actions meant to the Texas crime rate, and how does Texas compare nationally? Statewide from 1994-1999, there was a 20 percent drop in crime in Texas, a drop that mirrors the national crime decline that began seven years ago during the Clinton- Gore administration.

Pierre Thomas, CNN, Harris County, Texas.

SHAW: Now, nationwide, the crime rate is down. And voters are not as concerned about the matter as they once were. But that has not stopped both presidential candidates from drawing up crime-fighting plans.

Yesterday, CNN Justice correspondent Pierre Thomas looked at George W. Bush's proposals. Today, he focuses on Al Gore's plan.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE) PIERRE THOMAS, CNN JUSTICE CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Vice President Al Gore surrounded by law enforcement: imagery to help define a major theme of his campaign's domestic policy.

GORE: If you give me the chance, I will be a law enforcement president.

THOMAS: The new-Democratic tough-on-crime philosophy has been a staple of the Clinton-Gore administration, something Gore continues to readily embrace.



GORE: We are putting 100,000 new community police officers on the streets. We funded new prison cells and expanded the death penalty. We stood up to the gun lobby to pass the Brady Bill and ban assault weapons.

THOMAS: Prior to 1992, Democrats were generally seen as soft on crime. And the issue was largely seeded to Republicans.

NORM ORNSTEIN, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE: It would be hard to deny that Bill Clinton has had an amazing amount of success at neutralizing the crime issue in a political fashion. It would be impossible to imagine Gore moving away from what has been an extraordinarily successful, political and policy approach to the issue of crime.

THOMAS: Gore the presidential candidate is offering his own spate of anti-crime initiative, aimed at allowing him to amplify a record which he argues has contributed to a seven-year drop in crime.

Among the proposals of the Gore plan: calling for 50,000 additional community police officer, a constitutional amendment protecting the right of crime victims. Gore also supports a nationally mandating, but state-urn system for photo-licensing of new handgun purchases.

The National Rifle Association says Gore is a threat to gunowners everywhere.

CHARLTON HESTON, NRA PRESIDENT: I want to the say those fighting word for anyone from the sound of my voice to hear and to heed, and especially for you, Mr. Gore -- from my cold dead hands.

(APPLAUSE)

THOMAS: But the NRA and Gore have not always been at odd. In fact, the NRA once gave Gore high marks. In 1978, Gore voted against requiring serial numbers on handguns made in the U.S. And in 1985, he voted against a waiting period for handgun purchases.



A 1984 NRA campaign fact sheet said, "Gore has been there each and every time sportsmen and gun owners have needed a friend."

Gore supporters say his position on gun control evolved because of the nation's growing gun violence. CHRIS LEHANE, GORE CAMPAIGN SPOKESMAN: Keep in mind, Al Gore was a congressman in rural Tennessee, represented a very rural district. He took a hard look at what was going on with gun violence in our society and recognized that we really needed common-sense gun reforms, and as a result, he became a cosponsor of the Brady Bill.

THOMAS (on camera): Gore supporters say he's now public enemy number one for the NRA. And on gun control and crime issues, that's very where he want to be.

Pierre Thomas, CNN, Washington.



CNN Inside Politics

August 29, 2000, 5 pm EST

**Ad Watch by CNN's Brooks Jackson of Ads By Bush and Gore on
Prescription Drug Plans (Video)**



Transcript:

SHAW: In nine key states, the political parties are battling over the issue of prescription drugs on television, but the competing claims in the DNC and RNC ads might leave some voters scratching their heads.

Our Brooks Jackson now takes a closer look at the ads to see who is telling the truth.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BROOKS JACKSON, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): The rising cost of prescription drugs has touched off a political ad war. But who's telling the truth? The Republican National Committee started it.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD) BUSH: Every senior will have access to prescription drug benefits.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: And the Democratic National Committee quickly responded.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, DNC AD)



NARRATOR: George Bush's approach leaves millions of seniors with no prescription drug coverage -- none.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: So which is it? Access for everyone or millions left uncovered? Well, listen closely.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD)

BUSH: Every senior will have access.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: "Access," he said. He did not say every senior would have coverage, a big difference.

Bush hasn't yet issued specifics, but he says he supports the approach proposed by senators John Breaux, Democrat, and Bill Frist, Republican. Under their bill, seniors would shop around, choosing either traditional government Medicare or government-approved private plans. The government would pay 100 percent of the premium cost for the poor and nearly poor, but only about 25 percent of the premium cost for couples earning above roughly \$15,000 a year, and the subsidy would be taxable. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the Breaux-Frist bill would leave 15 percent of the elderly and disabled still without coverage for prescription drugs, about 6 million persons.

The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that a somewhat similar plan would leave 12 percent uncovered. That's more than 4 1/2 million.

Either way, the DNC ad...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, DNC AD)

NARRATOR: ... millions of seniors with no prescription drug coverage.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: ... appears to be accurate.



The dueling ads are running in nine battleground states, paid for mostly with soft money. Republicans say they're spending 6-8 million; Democrats, more than \$5 million. Democrats say they're delighted. Medicare is their turf.

GORE: I do invite you to compare and contrast the plans that we put forth.

JACKSON: The administration's plan, which is Gore's proposal, would cover virtually everybody, but it would be very expensive: \$338 billion over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That's far more than the \$192 billion estimate for the Breaux-Frist bill.

But the Republican ad attacks Gore's proposal on other grounds.
(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD)

NARRATOR: He's pushing a big government plan that lets Washington bureaucrats interfere with what your doctors prescribe.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Well, Gore's plan would be run by the government and would allow cost-containment measures, including formularies: lists of preferred drugs. But the bipartisan plan Bush favors would allow private insurance companies -- corporate bureaucrats, if you will -- to use cost-containment measures and formularies, too. So the Republican attack...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC AD)

NARRATOR: ... plan that lets Washington bureaucrats interfere...
(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: ... is not the whole story.

Meanwhile, an attack by soundbite.

ARI FLEISCHER, BUSH CAMPAIGN ADVISER: Under the Gore plan, a typical senior who spends only \$700 a year on prescription drugs, the value of his benefit is only going to be 13 cents a day.



JACKSON: That 13-cent figure started showing up in Republican press releases over the weekend. Their calculation assumes Medicare recipients spend only \$673 a year on prescriptions, a figure they got from the Kaiser Family Foundation. But that number is from 1996.

PATRICIA NEUMAN, KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION: Our studies show that average spending in the year 2000 will be \$1,263, about.

JACKSON (on camera): And going up fast?

NEUMAN: And going up fast.

JACKSON (voice-over): So that 13-cent figure? It's just bogus.

(on camera): Whatever the ads say, whatever the talking points, the Gore plan is simply more generous and expensive than anything Republicans have proposed so far.

Brooks Jackson, CNN, Washington.



Chicago Sun-Times

September 06, 2000; Page 1

How to Save Medicare. What the Bush and Gore Health Plans Mean to You

By SCOTT FORNEK

Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush released his long-awaited plan to help seniors pay for prescription drugs Tuesday, coupling it with a bold pledge to revamp Medicare to provide more choices in health coverage.

"We will work to modernize Medicare," Bush said. "But we will not wait to help seniors get prescription drugs."

But Democratic rival Al Gore's campaign denounced Bush's proposal, saying the Texas governor provides no way to pay for it and still leaves millions of seniors without any way to pay for their medicine.

"It is really a Band-Aid approach written for and by the big drug companies and leaving behind the middle-class seniors who need help," said Pete Giangreco, Gore's senior Illinois adviser.

Bush's campaign fired back that despite Gore's emphasis on the issue over the last few months, the vice president and President Clinton "squandered eight years" by failing to provide the elderly real help.

"Now (Gore) supports a plan that is a one-size-fits-all government-run HMO," said Bush spokesman Bob Hopkins. "(Bush's) plan applies to every senior, and it offers seniors choices.

The chief differences between the two candidates' plans lie in the money each promises to spend, the role private insurance companies play and how the drug benefit fits into the overall Medicare system.

Bush, who unveiled his plan in Allentown, Pa., is calling for \$ 48



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

billion in funding to states over four years to help provide the prescription drug coverage to low-income seniors as an immediate short-term measure for the most needy.

Then another \$ 110 billion would be used to change the overall Medicare system. A presidential task force would hammer out the details, seeking to allow seniors to choose between Medicare or private health care plans for prescription drugs and health costs such as hearing, eye and dental care.

Gore's plan would provide \$ 253 billion over 10 years for drug coverage. All Medicare recipients would be eligible for the benefit, which would cover up to 50 percent of their prescription costs, but they would have to pay \$ 27 in monthly premiums. Gore proposes no major overhaul of the whole system.

The American Association of Retired Persons, a leading advocate of providing the drug benefit under Medicare, did not take a position on the two plans but welcomed Bush's entry into the debate.

"The problem is big, and it's growing," said John Rother, the group's director of legislation and public policy.

The seniors lobbying organization estimated that roughly one-third of the estimated 34 million senior citizens on Medicare have adequate prescription drug coverage under private retirement plans, one third have some private coverage and the other third -- or about 12 million -- have no coverage.

Rother estimated that the 12 million without coverage spend an average of \$ 1,100 a year on prescription drugs. Under Gore's plan, they would typically pay \$ 324 in premiums the first year and receive \$ 550 in benefits. Lower-income seniors would receive drugs free.

"It's easier to evaluate the Gore proposal because it is specific,"



Rother said. "It's very difficult to have a judgment on the Bush plan because so much of that would depend on details to be decided later.

Hopkins said no specific estimates can be provided under the Bush proposal because "there are a number of options under this plan that make a one-size-fits-all number impossible and unfair."

Bush campaign officials argue that Gore would make the federal government the largest purchaser of prescription drugs, leading to price controls. And they said Gore's plan would require half of all seniors to pay more in annual premiums than they would receive in benefits.

Gore's campaign argues that Bush is leaving coverage to the states and private insurers, who do not have to participate. Giangreco said only 22 states currently have such assistance programs, and Texas is not one of them.

"If you live in 28 of the 50 states, he has no plan," Giangreco said.

Gore also contends that nearly half of the roughly 12 million seniors who currently lack prescription drug coverage earn more than the maximum income level in Bush's plan, meaning they would remain without coverage.

On the overall plans, the AARP's Rother said: "It really comes down to your opinion of whether Medicare is basically OK today or whether Medicare needs fundamental changes to survive. And how you answer that question will determine whose plan you like better."



Boston Globe

September 10, 2000; Page F1

Counterintuition on College Aid. Bush, Gore Reverse Roles

By PATRICK HEALY

When it comes to higher education, George W. Bush is thinking big. Very big.

Consider the pledge - stunning for a Republican who advocates limited government - that he delivered last month in Hampton, N.H.: "College is every parent's dream for their children," the GOP presidential nominee said, "and we should make this opportunity available to all students."

We should? All students?

Americans, including many in the Republican Party, have long debated whether all high school seniors should go on to college. Or whether, in a meritocracy, taxpayers should subsidize big public universities for students who didn't shine in high school. Or whether parents should go into debt for freshmen who might lack the maturity to know when to stop partying and start studying.

For his part, the Texas governor wants to give all poor students a boost, regardless of their academic ability. He would increase the need-based Pell Grant to \$5,100 for freshmen, up from \$3,300.

What does Al Gore say? While the Democratic nominee backs upticks in Pell Grants (although not on the scale Bush has proposed), he is reserving his rhetorical muscle for the Clinton administration's favored policy to help college students: tax credits for tuition.

Which renders the 2000 political calculus for students and their parents thusly: The Republican is embracing a \$5 billion new federal



subsidy for the poor, and the Democrat is touting tax cuts, primarily for the middle class.

"It's like a Brecht play - no one's playing their assigned parts," said Terry Hartle, vice president for government and public affairs at the American Council on Education. "The Republicans want to help the lower income, and the Democrats want tax relief to help middle- and upper-income families."

Why have the rivals seemingly traded places on easing the college tuition burden, an issue that scores highly in the polls? And whose plan would work better?

This much is certain: The candidates foresee a squeaker on Election Day and want to make inroads with swing voters and each other's core constituencies. Pell Grants are a very popular brand name with low-income and minority families who tend to vote Democratic, but who may be open to Bush's appeals. Vice President Gore's tax-relief proposal - which would provide up to \$2,800 a year for tuition - is especially geared to benefit the middle class, where Bush's stronghold lies.

Bush would spend an additional \$1 billion on \$1,000 scholarships for Pell recipients who pass advanced placement science and math exams, as a reward for aiming high. Taken together, the Republican plan would shower more money on Pell Grants than on most other education commitments he has made this year.

Enlarging the Pell Grant program is a good issue for Bush: It appeals to so-called "compassionate conservatives" by helping the poor, and it also has luster for the school-choice wing, since the Pell, in some respects, is higher education's version of vouchers.

But the Pell plan has some drawbacks. If, under a President Bush, recipients of larger grants dropped out of college at steady rates, the



beefed-up program could easily be tarred as a waste of money.

A better reward might be a bigger Pell Grant for college juniors and seniors, instead of just freshmen, since the upperclassmen would have an academic track record and could probably use the same relief from debt or part-time jobs.

Morton Owen Schapiro, a student-aid analyst who recently became president of Williams College, said a larger Pell program would help "the people who are most in peril."

According to Schapiro's research, only 44 percent of poor students go to college, compared with 86 percent of the affluent. And it isn't that richer children are smarter: Among students with top test scores, 19 out of 20 who are wealthy go to college, compared with 3 out of 4 from low-income families.

Just the attention Bush is paying to financial aid is impressive, if surprising. Last year, New York state spent almost 10 times as much on student aid as did Texas (\$634 million and \$67 million), and only recently did the governor approve a broad-based aid program for Texas college students.

Texas ranks 45th nationally in the percentage of 19-year-olds attending a US college, according to a study by financial-aid expert Tom Mortenson. For low-income students, the state is 46th.

"Since Bush has been in power in Texas, he hasn't done anything for higher education opportunity," Mortenson said.

Yet Mortenson, a champion of Pell Grants, has cottoned to the Bush proposals in spite of his own traditional Democratic sympathies. "For whatever Mr. Gore has invested in trying to understand K-to-12 education, he hasn't even cracked a book on higher education," Mortenson said.



Gore's silence on Pell Grants is interesting, given its resonance with his political base. Mortenson argues it is because Gore is a Southerner, from a region where politicians tend to favor merit scholarships over need-based aid like Pell Grants. Bush's proposed \$1,000 Pell scholarships in math and science reflect that same spirit, he said.

More likely, however, is that Gore and his advisers think swing voters will see a greater personal payoff from tuition tax relief than from Pell Grants

Tax credits for tuition and fees are now worth up to \$1,500, which Gore would expand to a maximum of \$2,800. A Clinton plan to do just that is now stalled in Congress.

Accepting the nomination last month in Los Angeles, Gore framed his tuition tax plan as a modern-day GI Bill, which transformed both American colleges and the economy by helping about 8 million veterans enroll after World War II.

"I will fight for a targeted, affordable tax cut to help working families save and pay for college," Gore said.

In reality, though, the middle class and the wealthy are the winners so far under the Clinton-Gore strategy. They make up roughly half of the 5 million Americans who claimed the tax credits in 1999; only one-third had incomes under \$30,000. And the average dollar amount claimed was about \$945 for wage-earners between \$50,000 and \$75,000, compared with \$670 for those between \$20,000 and \$30,000. In other words, lower income people generally benefited less. While Gore's tax plan would do little for the poor - some of whom don't owe enough in taxes to even claim the credit - his strategy does tap the pulse of the college world's "silent majority": families that are neither rich nor poor, who qualify for loans but not outright grants, and therefore have to shoulder debt to



cover tuition, housing, and other fees.

"We also have to give middle-class families help in paying for college," Gore said during his convention speech.

In reality, of course, promises made on the campaign trail often hit the skids once they reach Congress.

"Whether it's a Pell expansion or a tax credit for tuition," Schapiro noted, "by the time it goes through committee, you find all sorts of people who might be helped or not helped that might surprise you."



Social Issues - Gore

Washington Post

May 3, 2000; Page A08

Gore Announces Crime Package, Criticizes Bush (Excerpts)

By TERRY M. NEAL

ATLANTA, May 2 -- Vice President Gore today proposed a range of crime-fighting initiatives--from mandatory drug testing and treatment for prisoners to expanding the number of new federally funded police officers--and attacked the crime fighting record of his GOP rival, Texas Gov. George W. Bush.

In doing so, the vice president sought to bask in the glow of seven straight years of falling crime rates and hold on to an issue that once belonged to Republicans. He also sought to steal a page out of Bush's recent strategy by presenting himself as a politician eager to reach out across party lines to create common-sense policies.

(...)

The Gore campaign billed today's speech as an opportunity for the candidate to expound on his own vision of crime fighting, but it was equally an opportunity to go after Bush, much as Gore has been doing in recent days on foreign and economic policy and social security. Gore saved the final five minutes of his 45-minute speech to attack Bush for paying scant attention to crime on the campaign trail, for offering a tax cut plan that would endanger efforts to put more police on the streets and for failing to deal with issues such as drug addiction in his own state.

"From what we have seen it is already clear that there are serious



philosophical difference between us," Gore said. "He seems to believe that there is no national responsibility to help fight crime. I believe it is one of our greatest national responsibilities and as communities we should not have to go it alone."

The vast majority of the dozens of proposals Gore made today or said he supported were not new. But some, such as a plan to allow all off-duty and retired police officers to carry concealed weapons as long as they pass a regular recertification test, were.

The most significant is a proposal that would cost \$ 500 million in the first year and that is aimed at curbing illegal drug use and drug crime. Gore said drug addiction was a major cause of the nation's high recidivism rates. He said access to drugs in jail, combined with prisoners' lack of access to drug treatment programs, virtually ensured the continued cycle of crimes. And he accused Bush of slashing drug treatment in Texas prisons.

Gore spokesman Chris Lehane said drug treatment had been slashed to \$ 188 million a year under Bush from \$ 380 million a year under his predecessor, Democrat Ann Richards. He said that the national recidivism rate was 33 percent, while in Texas it was up from 40 percent under Richards to 50 percent under Bush--a number the Bush campaign said was unsubstantiated. Later, when pressed, Lehane said the 50 percent figure came from news reports, and he did not know the original source.

Under Gore's anti-drug proposal the federal government would provide grants to states to test and treat targeted prisoners, as well as those on probation and parole. Failure to stay drug-free could result in return to prison or a longer sentence. He also proposed expanding drug courts, providing police with technology to determine and fight high-



priority drug zones, and tougher penalties for people to who sell drugs to children.

Bush's campaign responded angrily that Gore had misconstrued the governor's record. Spokesman Ari Fleischer said the \$ 380 million figure Gore used represented a proposed budget from Richards that never passed, and that Bush increased spending on drug treatment in prisons from \$ 101 million in 1994 to \$ 144 million now. "Al Gore invents numbers just like he invented the Internet," Fleischer said.

Bush's campaign also released a list of the governor's crime fighting accomplishments, claiming, among other things, that violent crime in Texas is at a 20-year low, that the parole approval rate is the lowest in more than 20 years and that spending on drug treatment, prevention and enforcement programs has risen substantially.

Gore's proposal to allow all off-duty and retired police officers to carry concealed weapons as long as they pass a regular recertification test would preempt local and state laws and extend to all law enforcement officers the same rights as federal officers to carry their weapons off duty.

Gore reiterated his support for a 10-year, \$ 1.3 billion proposal he first offered last year to add 50,000 new officers to the 100,000 officers approved by Congress in 1994 along with a handful of other crime-fighting initiative. Gore also said he would push for toughening the laws for violent crimes committed in the presence of children.



Los Angeles Times

May 5, 2000; Page 23

Gore Calls GOP Rival Bush a Pawn of NRA (Excerpts)

By MARK Z. BARABAK

CHICAGO -- Al Gore attacked George W. Bush Thursday as a pawn of the Washington gun lobby, quoting a National Rifle Assn. leader who said that electing Bush would make the Oval Office an adjunct of the NRA.

The Texas governor brushed aside the vice president's attack as well as the assertion by Kayne Robinson, first vice president of the powerful lobbying group. "I don't want to disappoint the man," Bush said. "But I'll be setting up shop in the White House. It'll be my office."

The back-and-forth came as Robinson's remarks at a February NRA meeting in Los Angeles surfaced in a TV advertisement financed by the gun lobby's nemesis, Handgun Control Inc. Robinson told NRA members that if Bush wins the White House "we'll have a president . . . where we work out of their office."

Robinson also said the NRA enjoys "unbelievably friendly relations" with Bush and said the governor's election would ensure "a Supreme Court that will back us to the hilt."

The remarks are featured in a new 30-second spot that is set to air in seven cities across the country, including Sacramento. The ad attacks Bush, a staunch ally of the NRA, for liberalizing gun laws in Texas.

Gore quickly seized on Robinson's comments to press his claim that Bush is an extremist masquerading as a moderate. "Gov. Bush has convinced the NRA that he wants to take the gun lobbyists out of the lobby and put them right in the Oval Office," said Gore, who hastily



added a section on gun violence to a speech he delivered to health-care writers in Chicago.

Citing research by the American Medical Assn., Gore said gun violence costs the nation \$ 2.3 billion annually, and Bush as president "would actually make a bad situation much worse."

"Maybe he would pick Charlton Heston as the next surgeon general," Gore quipped, referring to the actor who serves as the NRA's president.

Bush was asked about Robinson's remarks even before Gore spoke.

At a morning news conference in Mission Viejo, on the second day of a California swing, the presumptive GOP nominee dismissed suggestions he would be beholden to the NRA. "It sounds like politics," Bush said of Robinson's boast.

"I make my positions on what I think is right," the governor went on. "If this is an attempt by my opponent to frighten people, I'm not going to let that happen. I make up my mind based on what I think is right and reasonable."

In Washington, Robinson minimized the tempest stirred by his remarks. "I was a little surprised that this is a big surprise that we support George Bush and they support Gore and Clinton," Robinson told reporters, after showing up outside a news conference where Handgun Control unveiled its ad.

"We think that George Bush is more friendly to the 2nd Amendment than Al Gore, and I don't think that's a big news flash," said Robinson, who also serves as chairman of the Iowa Republican Party. "For people like that to complain about us . . . possibly having a seat at the table so that our views can be heard is just a little bit hypocritical."

(...)

Gore in recent days has embarked on an aggressive effort to



persuade voters that Bush is far more conservative than he lets on. Strategists were plainly gleeful at the opportunity to turn the NRA's words against Bush on an issue--gun control--of great interest to swing voters. Chris Lehane, a Gore spokesman, called the tape of Robinson's remarks "the proverbial smoking gun."

For his part, Gore blamed the nation's "absurdly high level of gun violence" on "political malpractice by close allies of the gun industry. . . . This is clearly a major health issue, but my opponent . . . doesn't seem to realize this."

(...)



Los Angeles Times

May 26, 2000; Page 8

Gore Touts Family Tax Credits. Proposal Would Provide \$11.3 Billion Over 10 Years to Expand After-School and Summer School Programs That Give Parents a Choice (Excerpts)

By MARK Z. BARABAK

WASHINGTON -- Shifting his focus to families, Vice President Al Gore Thursday proposed a combination of tax credits and increased federal spending to expand the availability of after-school programs.

Gore, speaking at a YMCA in Nashville, said his proposal would provide care to more than 10 million children during the weekday hours of 3 to 7 p.m. when, studies show, children face the greatest risk of violence.

Separate studies have also shown that children left unsupervised after school are more likely to commit crimes, suffer academically and abuse drugs or alcohol.

"Government doesn't raise children, families do," Gore said. "No policy can teach a child right from wrong. . . . But we can make it easier, not harder, to be a strong family.

"If I'm entrusted with the presidency, that's exactly what I'll do," Gore said.

Specifically, Gore proposed spending \$ 11.3 billion over 10 years to increase funding for expanded after-school and summer school programs nationwide. Just under half the sum would go to subsidize a new refundable child- and dependent-care tax credit for families with children ages 6 to 16. The rest of the money would be used to build on existing programs and create an "after-school quality fund" to recruit and train



staff.

Gore would also encourage schools to stay open late, providing facilities for expanded after-hours care.

Under Gore's plan, schools would be given greater flexibility to use building improvement funds as an incentive to remain open past normal hours.

Jon Schnur, an education advisor to the vice president, said Gore's overall plan seeks to emphasize parental "choice" by providing up to a 50% credit for after-school care, as well as freedom for schools and parents to select the after-school provider they want to bring into their children's classrooms.

"The philosophy here is trying to help communities to create a new system and new markets" that will extend the availability of quality after-school care by giving parents the means to shop for the kind of care that suits their needs, Schnur said.

The \$ 11.3 billion falls under Gore's previously announced budget plans, allocating \$ 250 billion of the projected federal surplus over 10 years to targeted tax cuts and \$ 115 billion to increased education spending.

(...)



Washington Post

June 7, 2000; Page A06

Gore Unveils Proposals to Help Lighten Child Care Burden. Package of Tax Breaks, Programs Would Help Working, Stay-at-Home Parents

(Excerpts)

By CECI CONNOLLY

NEW YORK, June 6 -- Vice President Gore, in his second week of promoting family-friendly themes, focused today on child care, offering a grab bag of tax credits and new programs aimed at helping parents manage the stresses of work and family.

Flanked by his wife, Tipper, and comedian Rosie O'Donnell, Gore said he would use the White House to give parents "the ability to make choices that they think are best for their own families."

Given the small amount of money--\$ 38 billion over 10 years--Gore's day care event may not have seemed presidential in scope but with seven out of 10 parents working today and 10 million youngsters in day care, aides said the issue resonates with voters and may help personalize the Democratic candidate.

"It all comes down to a question of values," Gore said during a stop at the Children's All Day Center here to unveil his proposal to raise standards at day care centers, give bonuses to workers with special credentials and give tax breaks for both working and stay-at-home parents.

But it was O'Donnell, recounting her humble upbringing, who cut to the crux of the issue. "I'm very fortunate that I am very, very rich," she said, explaining how she manages to raise three children on her own. But for many Americans, she said, child care can be a crushing expense.



Full-time day care costs between \$ 4,000 and \$ 10,000 a year, according to the Children's Defense Fund. At the center Gore visited, annual tuition is about \$ 15,000.

As president, Gore would funnel money to states that are willing to establish and enforce health and safety standards at centers, including background checks on workers. He would also make the existing child care tax credit refundable so that low-income families would enjoy the benefits, and he would give parents who decide to stay at home a \$ 500 tax credit.

Under his plan, families earning up to \$ 60,000 could claim half of their child care expenses, up from the current 30 percent. That would mean that a family of four with an annual salary of \$ 35,000 and child care expenses of \$ 3,100 would receive a tax credit of \$ 1,395--an increase of \$ 775 a year, according to documents released by the Gore campaign.

(...)

After rising before dawn for the show, Gore's motorcade wound through a torrential downpour to the cheery day care center in midtown Manhattan.

Gore told parents that with the nation's economy booming and many businesses vying for workers, corporate America should join the push to make child care more accessible and affordable. "The smarter, more enlightened employers are . . . becoming more competitive by relating to the families of their employees and not just their employees," he said. "I think we can shift the pattern of practice in business a long way toward helping the family."

One way to encourage companies to join the effort is by giving tax incentives to firms that provide on-site child care, he said.



If elected, Gore also hopes to give bonuses to day care providers who receive extra training and a network would be established for home care providers to keep current.

(...)



Los Angeles Times

June 21, 2000; Page 13

Gore Unveils Retiree Savings Plan (Excerpts)

By MATEA GOLD

LEXINGTON, Ky. -- Vice President Al Gore laid out his plan to help people save for retirement Tuesday, even as he upped his criticism of George W. Bush's Social Security proposal, warning that the Republican's idea to privatize part of the entitlement program could endanger the elderly.

Speaking to a friendly audience of about 500 people gathered in Lexington's convention center on a hot muggy day, Gore said his "retirement savings plus" plan would give people matching, refundable tax credits that would help them build up retirement savings.

"Together, let's put an end to the days when savings are a scramble--if not an unthinkable luxury--for too many families," said Gore, standing on the stage in front of a large blue "Prosperity and progress" sign.

Tuesday's announcement kicks off the second week of the vice president's tour through battleground states, designed to highlight the country's economic strength and the possibilities available with growing budget surpluses.

His savings program would target working- and middle-class people, giving the largest tax credit to married couples making \$ 30,000 or less annually. By investing \$ 500 a year each, along with a \$ 1,500 tax credit, that couple would save up to \$ 400,000 after 35 years, Gore said.

The voluntary, tax-free program would augment the traditional Social Security benefit and would build upon individual retirement accounts managed by the private sector, not the government, he added.



(...)

The Bush campaign responded by saying that Gore was modeling his proposal after Bush's plan but was putting out an idea that would not work.

"Al Gore's latest proposal is flawed: Low-income workers living paycheck to paycheck cannot afford it, and it doesn't stop Social Security from going broke," said Bush campaign spokesman Ari Fleischer in a statement. "In contrast, Gov. Bush's plan allows all low-income workers to invest a portion of their own payroll taxes to save for retirement and it provides a blueprint for bipartisan Social Security reform."

(...)



Star Tribune (Minneapolis)

June 23, 2000; Page 1B

Gore, Ventura in Tow, Talks Up His Education Plan (Excerpts)

By NORMAN DRAPER



Vice President Al Gore spent Thursday shoring up his image as the presidential candidate who most wants to improve education.

Gore and Gov. Jesse Ventura arrived at Hopkins North Junior High School in Minnetonka at around 7:30 a.m. and stayed there until long after the school's summer school and special education students had left for the day. That wrapped up Gore's visit to the Twin Cities, which began Wednesday afternoon.

The tour was one of the vice president's "school days" weekly visits, in which he spends an entire day at a school somewhere in the United States. Gore and Ventura held discussions with special education teachers and parents, greeted arriving students, visited classes and answered questions at an outdoor forum.

Much of the emphasis Thursday was on special education, which Gore said the governor had raised as a concern when he and his wife, Terry, visited the Gores in Washington, D.C., earlier this year. Special education children have physical, emotional or mental disabilities that require additional help in the classroom. The Venturas' daughter, Jade,



has a learning disability and has attended special education classes.

State Education Commissioner Christine Jax said her department recommended the Hopkins district to Gore aides when they called looking for a school for Gore to visit. That, Jax said, was based on the district's record of achievement with both special education and regular students.

Gore said he wanted to eventually boost the investment in special education to a point where schools would get reimbursed by the federal government for as much as 40 percent of their costs, instead of the current figure, which Ventura said covers 10 to 11 percent.

Such a shift, Ventura said, could free up as much as \$250 million a year to Minnesota schools that often must raid their general funds to pay for fast-rising special education costs.

(...)

Gore also used the school visit to push his education change agenda. He wants to use the nation's budget surplus to create an Education Trust Fund that not only would help prop up special education programs, but also could assist in paying hefty bonuses to teachers who excel in their profession or pledge to do their teaching in the places that need them most, such as urban areas.

He also advocated establishing tax breaks for investors who buy school building bonds. That would allow school districts to issue the bonds at lower interest rates, resulting in lower property tax increases.

But Gore's plan for education also involves more accountability. He wants new teachers tested and a peer review process for existing teachers, he said. He also wants to make it easier for good teachers to be rewarded, bad teachers to be fired and poorly performing schools to be closed.



But it wasn't all serious education talk Thursday.

"I've learned a lot about pro wrestling," joked Gore, referring to a late-night conversation Wednesday with Ventura. He and his wife, Tipper, stayed overnight at the governor's residence. "You don't get that from most people." The vice president and the governor were interviewed for NBC's "Today" show at the Minnetonka school Thursday morning and by MTV. The MTV reporter noted that informal MTV polling indicated that Ventura was better known nationwide than Gore.

"I think that it clearly means that I need to have an Al Gore live action figure," the vice president quipped.



Social Issues - Bush

Washington Post

June 21, 2000; Pg. A06

Bush Puts Emphasis On Science and Math; \$2.3 Billion Education Plan Outlined (Excerpts)

By TERRY M. NEAL



CUPERTINO, Calif., June 20 -- George W. Bush today came to De Anza Community College, here in the heart of Silicon Valley and considered among the best community colleges for math education, to bemoan America's poor record in science and math education. And he offered yet another plan to spend more money on education: \$ 2.3 billion over five years to improve student performance and recruit people to teach math and science.

Under Bush's plan, the federal government would spend an additional \$ 1 billion on the Pell Grant program over five years for students who take college-level math and science courses. The spending would provide \$ 1,000 in additional money for a one-time grant to about 1 million low-income students over five years. The average Pell Grant is \$



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

3,000.

The federal government would also make \$ 1 billion over five years available to states to form partnerships with colleges and universities to research ways to improve science and math education. The final major element of the plan would provide \$ 345 million over five years to increase the amount of loan repayment forgiveness from \$ 5,000 to \$ 17,500 for science, math, technology and engineering majors and minors who teach in low-income schools or schools that have shortfalls of math and science teachers.

"This is America," the Texas governor said, speaking at one of his "leadership forums." "There's no reason for us to be next to last in the world in math, no reason for us to be last in physics. We're the greatest country in the world. We ought to be first. That ought to be the goal."

(...)



Los Angeles Times

July 12, 2000; Page 14

**Bush Proposes \$2.3 Billion in Child Aid. Texas Governor Would Also
Increase Tax Credit For Adoptions** (Excerpts)

By BONNIE HARRIS

ROYAL OAK, Mich. -- Texas Gov. George W. Bush on Tuesday proposed bigger tax credits for adoptive families and a \$ 2.3-billion investment over five years in child welfare, pointing to his home state as the "leading edge" in securing safe and permanent homes for all children.

Speaking at a foster care center and surrounded by child care officials and the families they have helped, Bush stressed the importance of making sure foster care is a "temporary solution." He said that, as president, he would streamline the adoption process, as he has in Texas, so children won't languish in the system when they could be in safe and loving homes.

"The goal is . . . to reunite the children with the family, but if it's impossible, foster care ought to be a bridge to adoption," Bush told the rapt group crammed in a conference room at the 75-year-old, nonprofit Judson Center. "Adoption is one of the greatest acts of kindness in society."

In Texas, Bush said he supported legislation that reduced final court reviews in adoptions from six months to four and allowed judges to terminate parental rights more swiftly in cases of abuse, neglect or abandonment. Such changes have helped boost the number of adoptions in the state by 175% since 1996, he said, and is "freeing up" more children for adoption than ever before.

The presumptive GOP presidential nominee said he would give states



\$ 1 billion to fund additional programs that would protect children who are at risk of abuse or neglect in their biological families. The goal is to head off the problems that send children in and out of foster care.

The funds, like those for his other proposals announced Tuesday, would come from the projected federal budget surplus.

An additional \$ 300 million would be spread among the roughly 20,000 children who each year "age out" of foster care when they become old enough to leave the system.

Bush said the young adults would receive vouchers of up to \$ 5,000 for college tuition or vocational training, so they can "get their feet on the ground and . . . understand that there is an America that belongs to them as well as everybody else." About 20,000 children will age out this year, and Bush campaign officials said a similar number would be covered each year under the governor's plan.

The governor also proposed increasing the adoption tax credit from \$ 5,000 to \$ 7,500, which would cost the federal government an additional \$ 1 billion. Bush wants to make the onetime tax credit permanent to help parents cover nonreimbursable expenses associated with adopting a child.

(...)



Los Angeles Times

July 29, 2000; Page 14

**Seeking to Toughen GOP's Stance on Abortion, Panel Revises
Platform** (Excerpts)

By MARK Z. BARABAK and MASSIE RITSCH

PHILADELPHIA -- Beating back mild protests, Republicans moved Friday to adopt a platform that favors a total ban on abortion while failing to acknowledge that some in the party--including George W. Bush--disagree.

Abortion foes mustered sizable majorities to crush efforts to strike the platform's anti-abortion plank, then soundly rejected a call to recognize divergent views concerning the emotional issue.

"We are pro-life and proud of it, and our candidates are proud of it," said Chuck Sigerson, chairman of the Nebraska Republican Party.

(...)

As part of the gentler tone, the party released a preliminary platform that softens its official stance on a range of issues, from education to immigration and the environment. After a day spent tinkering, there were no major changes to the draft document. In fact, compared to the bitter debate at previous GOP conventions, Friday's proceedings were downright tame.

Typical was the abortion debate. The issue has been a perennial source of tension within the GOP and was expected to again be a flash point. But the discussion in the party's "family and community" subcommittee lasted scarcely 45 minutes.

The platform calls for a constitutional amendment to ban abortion, without exception, and the appointment of anti-abortion judges. Those



positions go beyond Bush's stance. The Texas governor opposes judicial litmus tests and would allow abortion in cases of rape, incest or to save a mother's life--facts that abortion rights advocates were quick to point out.

Toni Casey, a California delegate from Los Altos Hills, said the platform not only contravened Bush's views but also failed to reflect the beliefs of "thousands and thousands of . . . Republican men and women that are part of this great party and deserve a role and a voice in this platform."

She called for dropping the abortion plank, arguing that the procedure is "a personal issue between a woman and her own religion."

But anti-abortion advocates said the party needed to make a clear and unequivocal statement. "Many of us are under a higher authority," said Meribelle Bolton of New Mexico. "I'm under the authority of the creator of the universe, and he is pro-life. Always has been, always will be."

After Casey's motion was defeated in the subcommittee on a 10-3 vote, she proposed adding a paragraph to the platform welcoming people "on all sides of this complex issue."

"I can't understand why we are afraid of being inclusive," she said.

But other subcommittee members pointed to language elsewhere in the platform recognizing that "members of our party can have deeply held and sometimes differing views." To attach specific language to the abortion section would amount to an asterisk, said delegate Rand Larson of Vermont, and would "defeat the whole purpose of the statement."

Casey's follow-up motion on the inclusion paragraph was defeated by an 11-3 count. Hours later, the full platform committee took up the proposed amendments and overwhelmingly rejected both.



Afterward, abortion rights advocates said they would continue to press their case in hopes of mustering enough support to bring the matter to the floor when the convention opens Monday and delegates vote on adoption of the platform. "It's not over," insisted Ann Stone of the group Republicans for Choice.

(...)



Washington Post

August 2, 2000; Page A20

Bush Plays Down Split With Powell. Affirmative Action Stances Show

Divide (Excerpts)

By THOMAS B. EDSALL

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 1 -- George W. Bush and his campaign aides today sought to soft-pedal the sharp division over affirmative action policy between the prospective Republican presidential candidate and retired Gen. Colin Powell highlighted this week.

Powell, one of the nation's best-known and most popular black leaders, declared in a dramatic convention speech Monday night and in a series of interviews since that he intends to press for support of affirmative action and racial preferences--wedge issues that often have been employed by conservative Republican candidates to appeal to white voters.

To the applause of the GOP delegates, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared: "Some in our party miss no opportunity to roundly and loudly condemn affirmative action that helped a few thousand black kids get an education, but you hardly hear a whimper when it's affirmative action for lobbyists who load our federal tax code with preferences for special interests."

Bush, responding to reporters' questions while flying to West Virginia, declined to deal directly with the conflict between his own opposition to policies that have given preferences to racial minorities and Powell's remarks.

"I don't know what specific policy he [Powell] had in mind, but he did refer [to] children not getting into places of higher education. And in my



state, we took a very positive step toward ensuring that the racial mix of Texas universities reflects the nature of our population," Bush said. He referred to a program he calls "affirmative access" that gives the top 10 percent of every high school graduating class access to elite state colleges. Powell, however, made clear in a CNN interview after the speech that he believes the GOP should support aggressive affirmative action policies.

"You need to be a little careful when you see nothing wrong with that kind of preference or affirmative action, and it's fine, whether it's sugar growers in Florida or somewhere else in the tax code, but suddenly a preference system, as you call it, an affirmative action program, as I prefer to call it, that allows a few thousand kids to get an education, but this somehow is so damaging to our constitutional process that it has to become a major factor for our party and a major reason for the party to attack."

In the CNN interview, Powell was also highly critical of the Republican Party's "old, dead southern strategy," a strategy of using desegregation orders, busing and affirmative action to appeal to whites in the South in the aftermath of the civil rights revolution.

Bush spokesman Ari Fleischer initially argued that there is little difference between the stands of Bush and Powell, saying there "is nothing to be reconciled" between the two men's positions. Pressed, however, Fleischer acknowledged that there is a substantial difference between their positions on affirmative action. "We invited General Powell knowing what he stands for, who he is, knowing that there were some areas they don't see everything exactly the same way."

The Republican platform, approved on Monday, explicitly rejects preferential policies: "We believe rights inhere in individuals, not in



groups. We will attain our nation's goal of equal opportunity without quotas or other forms of preferential treatment."

Bush, who introduced Powell by satellite broadcast to the full convention, said he did not read Powell's speech ahead of time, but "he called me yesterday and said 'I'm going to talk about these issues.' I said, 'Please do. It's an important message to send.' "

Bush contended that listeners to Powell's speech will not hear it as conflicting with Bush, but instead as a reinforcement of Bush's goal of a more inclusive Republican Party; "I thought people heard his message that our party must do a better job of recruiting minorities and specifically African Americans."

(...)



New York Times

August 7, 2000; Page 16

**The Gun Issue: Bush Stand Is Used to Turn Election Into a
Showdown** (Excerpts)

By JIM YARDLEY

AUSTIN, Tex. -- One expectation of anyone running for governor of Texas is that he or she must grab a gun and shoot something. So in 1994, George W. Bush, then the Republican candidate for governor, borrowed a 20-gauge shotgun and invited a group of reporters on a dove hunt.

In the dawn mist, Mr. Bush fired seven times, bagged a bird for the cameras, and then left to continue campaigning. But the dead bird turned out to be a killdeer, a protected species, and a photo opportunity meant to underscore Mr. Bush's kinship with gun owners instead became an embarrassment, as he paid a small fine and apologized.

Yet in the eyes of gun owners in Texas and national gun-lobbying groups like the National Rifle Association, Mr. Bush's illegal shot was the last mistake he has made. The N.R.A.'s chief lobbyist in Washington, James Jay Baker, could not recall a single instance in which Mr. Bush, as governor, had opposed the group. "Not that I can remember," Mr. Baker said.

Governor Bush's record has been decidedly sympathetic to gun owners. He has signed far-reaching pro-gun legislation, including a 1995 law making it legal to carry concealed weapons, an expansion of that law in 1997, and a 1999 law making it extremely difficult for cities to sue gun manufacturers. One national survey by a gun-control group found that only three states -- Louisiana, Arkansas and Maine -- had looser gun



laws than Texas.

This stance has earned Mr. Bush many admirers in Texas, where guns are entwined in the culture. But it has also galvanized his opponents in this presidential campaign, from gun-control groups to Vice President Al Gore, who have eagerly tried to cast Mr. Bush as a willing pawn of the gun lobby.

Both Mr. Bush and Mr. Gore are using the gun issue to pursue broader themes of attack. Mr. Gore has cited Mr. Bush's pro-gun record to try to marry the Texas governor to his party's right wing, and, in contrast, has offered a string of gun-control proposals. Mr. Bush's aides, noting that Mr. Gore once opposed gun control, only to change his position, have used the issue as part of their effort to depict Mr. Gore as opportunistic.

(...)

In February, a high-ranking N.R.A. official was videotaped telling supporters that in a Bush presidency, "we work out of their office." The official said the association and Mr. Bush would have "unbelievably friendly relations."

Mr. Bush bristled at that remark and has sought to signal his independence from the association by endorsing ideas that include background checks on the buyers of firearms at gun shows and raising the minimum age for buying handguns to 21 from 18. This spring, when the Million Mom March on Washington was held in support of gun control, Mr. Bush announced that he would spend \$1 million a year of state money to hand out free trigger locks to handgun owners. He said that if elected president, he would support a similar national program.

But critics note that Mr. Bush declined to put his clout behind gun-show background checks in Texas even though he is now supporting



them nationally.

Texas residents recall that Mr. Bush ran for governor on four issues in 1994 -- juvenile justice, tort changes, and overhauling education and welfare. But guns were also an issue. The incumbent Democrat, Ann Richards, had vetoed a 1993 bill to permit a statewide referendum on allowing Texans to carry concealed weapons. Mr. Bush pledged to sign such a bill, and gun lobbyists now say the issue was crucial to his victory.

In 1995 the Legislature again passed a concealed-weapons bill. Many law enforcement agencies, including the Texas Association of Police Chiefs, opposed the bill, but Mr. Bush, as he had promised, signed it into law. The law, which did not require a referendum, allows residents to carry hidden weapons if they undergo a background check and 10 to 15 hours of training. Two years later, Mr. Bush signed an amendment that allowed people to carry concealed weapons into previously excluded institutions, including churches, nursing homes and hospitals, unless those institutions expressly prohibited it.

(...)

When asked about gun control, Mr. Bush often repeats the theme that government should enforce existing laws, not restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens. As part of his juvenile-justice package, Mr. Bush increased the penalties for minors committing crimes with a gun. In 1999, he helped institute the Texas Exile Program, which helps law enforcement agencies prosecute gun crimes under stricter federal sentencing guidelines. In 1995, he signed the Texas Child Access Prevention law, which holds adults criminally responsible for not keeping loaded guns out of the hands of children.

But while gun-control advocates applauded the child access law,



they noted that it included something for the N.R.A. -- a provision that "strongly encouraged" school districts to provide gun-safety programs beginning in kindergarten. And the provision instructed schools that the safety program must comply with the rifle association's safety course for children, with the cartoon character Eddie Eagle, essentially allowing the association to dictate the curriculum.

Finally, gun-control advocates say Mr. Bush should be judged not only by what he has done, but what he has not. Last year, Debra Danburg, a Democratic state representative from Houston, introduced a bill to close the loophole that allows people to buy weapons at gun shows from unlicensed sellers without a background check. Texas has the most shows of any state, with 472 in 1998. A day after the Columbine High School shootings, Mr. Bush said that a popular culture that romanticizes violence had been partly to blame. But in remarks to reporters, Mr. Bush endorsed the idea of background checks at gun shows. This stunned Ms. Danburg. Just hours before the governor's comments, Ms. Danburg's bill had died in a House committee. Mr. Bush had done nothing to get the bill passed.

Mr. Bush's aides and pro-gun lobbyists say the Danburg bill was flawed and would have essentially closed down all gun shows. Ms. Danburg said she would have amended the bill and could have passed it, if Mr. Bush had helped.

"If he supported it, he should have put his money where his mouth is," she said.

"He's made enough promises to extremists who are pro-gun that they have passionately adopted him," she said. "Yet he doesn't talk with people who are concerned with gun safety."



CNN Inside Politics

Aug 25, 2000, 5 pm EST

Ad Watch by Brooks Jackson of a George Bush Ad on Social Security

(Video)



Transcript:

SESNO: And today, the Bush campaign begins airing a new television commercial dealing with issues that hit many senior citizens close to home.

Our Brooks Jackson has been checking the ad and the facts. (BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BROOKS JACKSON, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): He said it at the convention...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: We will strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Now he's repeating the promise a thousandfold in a new TV ad starting Friday night in targeted states.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, AD)

BUSH: We will strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the Greatest Generation and for generations to come.



(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Nothing new here, but you could get the wrong impression.

On Social Security, Bush says:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, AD)

BUSH: No changes. No reductions. No way.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Actually, that promise only applies to persons already getting Social Security, or about to. For everyone else, Bush favors big changes -- private investment accounts, funded by a portion of Social Security taxes. Highly controversial. The Ad doesn't mention that. And Medicare? He sounds like Al Gore.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, AD)

BUSH: We will make prescription drugs available and affordable for every senior who needs them.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JACKSON: Actually, Bush does not favor expanding the current Medicare program to include drug coverage, as Gore does, and he opposes any increase in Medicare payroll taxes. Bush favors the sort of approach endorsed by a majority of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. That would give the elderly a certain amount of money to buy private health insurance, choosing from a variety of government-approved plans, including some covering prescription drugs. But the idea is controversial, opposed by the Clinton administration, among others.

(on camera): So this latest Bush ad doesn't tell the whole story, and it could be part of a one-two punch. CNN has learned the Republican National Committee has prepared a companion ad, accusing Gore of



backing a "big government" Medicare plan that let's bureaucrats decide medication for seniors. So the campaign could be about to get rougher, and it's not even Labor Day yet.

Brooks Jackson, CNN. Washington.



Foreign Policy and Defense

CNN Inside Politics

Aug 22, 2000, 5 pm EST

CNN's Bernard Shaw Interviews Bush Advisor Richard Armitage and Democratic Sen. Carl Levin On Military Strength (Audio)



Military Strength
Richard Armitage, Carl Levin



Transcript:

SHAW: The Bush and Gore campaigns are offering two vastly different pictures of the United States military. Joining us now to talk more about readiness and politics, Bush international policy adviser Richard Armitage, and Senator Carl Levin, ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee. From Michigan, he joins us from Detroit.

Mr. Armitage, first to you, is stewardship of national defense better under Republicans than Democrats?

RICHARD ARMITAGE, BUSH INTERNATIONAL POLICY ADVISER: Well, I think if you look at the last eight years and you ask anyone in the Department of Defense if they're better today than they were eight years ago, the answer would clearly be no, not prepared to say that Democrats and Republicans over the long history of our country are lesser or able to be good stewards. SHAW: Well, why do you claim that the U.S. military



has declined under President Clinton?

ARMITAGE: Well, I think we feel very strongly that they're overextended, they're under-resourced. We don't want to wait until we have a "desert one" debacle to bring this toward the American people, and Governor Bush made the decision a year ago to start talking out about this, because he feels that being able to provide for the national defense is the paramount duty of a commander-in-chief.

SHAW: Desert one -- you are referring to when the U.S. military plane transport plane collided with American helicopters in Iranian desert in the attempt to rescue the American hostages at the U.S. embassy in Tehran?

ARMITAGE: Yes, and that brought forward to the American public the dismal state of readiness at that time. We don't want to wait for another one of those.

SHAW: Senator Levin, any truth in what he's saying?

SEN. CARL LEVIN (D-MI), ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE: Well I'll tell you what Governor Bush has said is not only overblown, in some cases flat-out wrong. For instance, he said when he was speaking in Philadelphia that two full army divisions are not ready for duty. Well, those divisions are on duty. And so for him to say that they're not ready for duty, number one, is wrong. But it seems to me that the men and women in those divisions, on duty in Bosnia, in Kosovo -- because those are the two brigades of divisions that he's talking about -- have a right to be mighty upset with his comments that they're not ready for duty when they are on duty. And then he uses an example of food stamps. He says, we've got a lot of soldiers on food stamps. We've got one quarter of the number of soldiers on food stamps that we did when Governor Bush's father was president of the United States. We've reduced the number of



soldiers on food stamps down from 20,000 down to about 5,000. And it seems, that's the right direction to go, and that is 5,000 too many.

But to use those kind of examples to argue that then we're not ready or that morale is low, it seems to me is way off the mark, highly partisan. And in my judgment, defense should be a bipartisan issue, and not such a partisan issue, as Governor Bush is making it.

SHAW: Richard Armitage, you've got a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee saying your candidate is flat-out wrong in the claim he made in Philadelphia. What say you?

ARMITAGE: Senator Levin has clearly forgotten the testimony of some of the chiefs of services in front of his own committee, where the chief of staff of the U.S. Army, General Eric Shinseki, has said flat out, we're not a C-1 army, but the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff has said flat out that we are not able to run a two major theater-war, a construct today, as well as we could of six years ago. So I think the senator has to be a little careful about playing politics with this himself.

SHAW: Senator.

LEVIN: I've heard the testimony of General Shinseki, who says we are ready to carry out our mission, so we can't -- I am perfectly happy to go to the record and argue with Richard about that.

But the flat-out statement that Governor Bush said, that those two divisions, full divisions, are not ready for duty, when they are out duty, was flat out wrong. General Shinseki immediately said it was flat-out wrong, and also Secretary Cohen, a Republican, who we all have confidence in -- Democrats and Republicans came on the next day and said that Governor Bush was flat-out wrong when he said two division were not ready for duty.

SHAW: I take it, Mr. Armitage, you are unimpressed by the claims



made by the secretary of defense?

ARMITAGE: Well, let me say, I am very impressed by Senator Levin at any time. But interesting enough, Senator Levin didn't respond to the comments of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff immediately in the wake of Mr. Bush's discussion at the Republican convention. When the chairman of the joints chiefs of staff said that what he heard at the Republican convention was a reflection of many of the concerns that the joint chiefs of staff had been putting forward on Capitol Hill. So I think that a full exposition of the record will show that there is a serious readiness problem in the U.S. Military. There is a serious retention problem. And we're delighted that money has been put forward this year against that problem. But that's simply going after the problems of today, and it is not in any way trying to handle the future challenges which will come down the pipe.

LEVIN: The largest increase in the defense budget since Ronald Reagan, largest pay increase in 20 years -- it's all just dismissed by the Republicans in order to try to gain an advantage, those are facts.

But I want to go back to the two divisions not being ready for duty, because Mr. Armitage has not answered that. Are those two divisions ready for duty, or aren't they.

ARMITAGE: I believe those two divisions, senator, are ready for duty.

LEVIN: That's not what Governor Bush said the other night, and that's why I think an apology is appropriate.

ARMITAGE: Senator, those two divisions, I believe, are ready for duty, but one would wonder which Peter was robbed to pay that Paul, which artillery units, for instance, are not ready for duty. And you know the game as well as I do. We're delighted that those units are combat ready for C-1 -- that is their wartime mission -- couldn't be more happy.



LEVIN: I am glad to hear the adviser to Governor Bush now say that those divisions are ready for duty, sir, because that's not what the governor said. He said, not ready for duty, sir, and that hurts. That's wrong. It's responsible. I am happy to hear Mr. Armitage correct it. I hope Governor Bush corrects it. SHAW: Well, let me cut through this and ask this very basic question -- Richard Armitage, are you implying that President Clinton has been derelict in his duty as commander in chief?

ARMITAGE: I am implying that the President of the United States Clinton has underfunded the U.S. military for the past several years. It is not for me to say he's derelict in his duty or not. That is a simple statement, and I'll stand behind it.

SHAW: Senator?

LEVIN: Republicans have controlled the Congress, by the way, for the last six years, really want to appropriate money. But putting that aside. largest increase since Ronald Reagan in defense, biggest pay increase in 20 years; that's a pretty good record, a pretty solid record, and I think that the president can be proud of it. More important, when you talk to General Shelton, chairman of the joints chiefs, he says, we are ready to carry out our mission. Secretary Cohen says we are the readiest, the best-trained force we've ever had in history. There is, to me, a very reliable source. Secretary Cohen will not misstate a fact for any political or partisan purpose. He is a straight shooter, and he is shooting on this one and I think the people can rely on him.

ARMITAGE: I think the people should also be aware, senator, that Republican-led Congress has each year but one since 1994 added money to the administration's budget request.

LEVIN: We've added slightly; the president has signed the bills.

SHAW: Gentlemen, on that note, thank you, Richard Armitage and



Senator Carl Levin for joining us on INSIDE POLITICS.

LEVIN: Thank you, Bernie.

ARMITAGE: Thank you.

SHAW: Quite welcome. Very interesting.



Times-Picayune

August 23, 2000; Page 1

Bush, Gore Off-Base, Defense Experts Say (Excerpts)

By DAVID WOOD

WASHINGTON -- Hot on the campaign trail, presidential candidates George W. Bush and Al Gore are trading accusations and boasts about U.S. military readiness. So far, at least, what passes for a debate on this critical issue is more likely to confuse than to inform.

Pentagon analysts and defense experts dismiss much of the rhetoric as political blather.

It glosses over very real problems in the military, they say, and fails to address the central issue of readiness: ready for what?

"That's an issue neither side has really explored because, quite frankly, it's not something you can get into in 10 seconds or less," said Andrew Krepinevich, executive director of the nonpartisan Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

In a speech Monday at the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Milwaukee, Texas Gov. Bush, the Republican nominee, said the armed services' recruiting difficulties, spare parts shortages and other problems "are signs of a military in decline, and we must do something about it."

On Tuesday, Vice President Gore, the Democratic nominee, told those at the VFW convention that it is "wrong....when others try to run down America's military for political advantage."

Gore said, "Our military is the strongest and the best in the entire world....I pledge to keep it that way with whatever it takes."

'Tiny red flags'



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

Like many analysts, Krepinevich, a retired Army lieutenant colonel, said the basic strength of U.S. forces is sound, and that many of the arguments over readiness amount to fussing over the fine print, "tiny red flags" that could signal significant readiness problems in the future.

Franklin Spinney, a senior Pentagon analyst, said the candidates are ignoring deeper problems than the military's day-to-day readiness.

One such problem, he said, is that the Pentagon's financial books are in such disarray that "we don't have the information to sort things out."

As a result, Spinney said Tuesday, "This thing has become totally politicized. Neither (candidate) has a clue what to do because the basic information isn't there....and if they just throw more money at it, that will make things worse."

The United States spends about \$300 billion a year on its military. Adjusted for inflation, that's about what it was spending at the height of the Cold War in 1980 when U.S. forces were prepared to fight a global war against the 5 million-man Soviet armed forces.

That \$300 billion a year also is more than the next 10 largest military powers spend combined, including Russia, China and the NATO allies.

Still, that sizable budget goes to a military significantly smaller than the force that Bush's father commanded a decade ago.

This year, candidate Bush has accused Democrats of squandering U.S. military power. He has charged that in sheer numbers of soldiers, jet fighters, combat ships and tank divisions, that power has slipped seriously in the past decade.

GOP initiated reductions

But these reductions were set in motion in 1990 by then-President



Bush and his defense secretary, Dick Cheney, the younger Bush's running mate. Their rationale is applicable today: With the Cold War over and the Soviet military shrunken to a shadow of its one-time power, there is no need for the United States to maintain a large combat-ready force.

The likelihood that the United States would realize savings from developments in Europe was popularly referred to as the "peace dividend."

In his 1990 State of the Union speech, a few months after the Berlin Wall was torn down, President Bush proposed deep cuts in U.S. troops based in Europe. Cheney went on to press Congress to authorize a 25 percent across-the-board cut in U.S. military forces.

Army Gen. Colin Powell, who was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time, said the cuts not only were justified because of the vastly reduced global threat, but were necessary because Congress would cut even deeper if the administration didn't hold the line at 25 percent.

(...)



Los Angeles Times

September 13, 2000; Page 1

Bush, Gore See Global Issues in Different Terms (Excerpts)

By ROBIN WRIGHT

WASHINGTON -- When George W. Bush looks out at the world, he describes himself as a "clear-eyed realist" whose approach is "idealism, without illusions." He sees America's enemies falling into four categories: "terrorists and crime syndicates, drug cartels and unbalanced dictators." And he promises to proceed with caution before getting America involved beyond its borders.

Al Gore looks out at the world as a globalist who favors "forward engagement." He's expanded the definition of national security threats to include AIDS, environmental degradation and the growing gap between rich and poor. And he advocates selective early intervention to contain problems before they explode into regional or international crises.

Although foreign policy has yet to emerge as a major theme in the campaign, the two presidential candidates have quite distinct visions of the world in the 21st century--and quite distinct approaches to its problems.

"The big difference is that Bush appears to view foreign policy from the pragmatic, problem-solving perspective and Gore has a somewhat messianic approach. He wants to do sweeping things that will change the world in one fell swoop," said Fareed Zakaria, managing editor of Foreign Affairs magazine, published by the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.

Neither Favors U.S. Isolationism

A close examination of the two candidates' foreign policy views, as



articulated in a half-dozen speeches and their parties' platforms, reveals several fundamental distinctions: Bush views the world primarily in terms of where it came from, Gore from where it could go. Bush talks frequently about the post-Cold War world. Gore opines about the new "Global Age." Bush defines foreign policy on the basis of "security threats." Gore frames his agenda in terms of "unprecedented opportunities."

Tactically, Bush wants to move incrementally when crises challenge American interests. Gore wants to be more engaged on a wider variety of fronts to preempt U.S. interests from being threatened.

Both candidates agree on two important premises in U.S. foreign policy: They oppose isolationism and protectionism, and don't want the United States to serve as the world's policeman.

Last November, in his premier foreign policy speech at the Reagan Presidential Library, Bush called isolationism "an approach that abandons our allies and our ideals" and that would produce "a stagnant America and a savage world." Gore warned that the United States "must reject the new isolationism that says: Don't help anywhere because we cannot help everywhere," in his major foreign policy speech in April in Boston.

They differ significantly, however, on when and how the United States should intervene in the affairs of other countries and what kind of relationship it should have with international agencies.

Bush emphasizes unilaterally asserting American interests. He would engage with the United Nations and related institutions only if major reforms are carried out and if America's share of the budget is lowered. And he has pledged never to put American troops under U.N. command.



Still, Bush looks to U.N. agencies to address key challenges.

"I don't like genocide and I don't like ethnic cleansing, but the president must set clear parameters as to where American troops ought to be used and when they ought to be used," Bush said in January on ABC-TV's "This Week" program. "The United States is going to have to work with organizations like the United Nations to encourage them to stop genocide."

Gore advocates paying long-deferred U.N. dues in full and strengthening cooperation with international institutions to promote democracy and fight terrorism, drugs and corruption. "A realistic reading of the world today demands reinvigorated international and regional institutions. It demands that we confront threats before they spiral out of control," he said in Boston.

(...)

On individual issues of foreign policy, the distance between Bush, a moderate Republican, and Gore, a centrist Democrat, is not as great as the gaps between the candidates in previous presidential elections.

"They have a lot in common. They say similar things on Iraq and rogue states. They're strongly pro-Israel and pro-trade. They both support American leadership and engagement," said Lee H. Hamilton, director of the Smithsonian Institution's Woodrow Wilson International Center and a former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Added Zakaria: "The end of the Cold War and the Democratic party's move rightward have narrowed the differences. Gore may have on his populist hat on other issues, but he's consistently conservative on defense, and he favored bombing Kosovo, the North America free trade zone and bringing China into the World Trade Organization, which is why Bush has to find issues on which to differentiate himself."



Yet on a handful of hot-button issues, the candidates differ significantly:

* **Arms Control.** Bush opposes the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which is supported by the Clinton administration. He wants to build a more ambitious missile defense system than the one under development, even if it means pulling out of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and antagonizing Russia and key allies. Gore supports the nuclear test ban treaty and views the ABM Treaty as "the cornerstone of strategic stability in the U.S. relationship with Russia."

* **The Balkans.** Bush has proposed a timetable for removing American troops from Kosovo and handing over peacekeeping responsibility to European allies. Gore supports an ongoing role for American troops in a NATO force.

* **China.** Bush is highly critical of China for investing its growing wealth in advanced weaponry and characterizes its government as an "enemy" of religious freedom and a "sponsor of forced abortion." "China is a competitor, not a strategic partner. We must deal with China without ill-will--but without illusions," he said at the Reagan Library. Under a Bush presidency, he said, China would be "unthreatened but not unchecked." He supports the "One China" policy--where the U.S. recognizes Beijing as the only legitimate government of China--but also endorses the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which commits closer U.S. defense cooperation with Taiwan.

Gore is highly critical of China's human rights record and repression of Tibet, and expresses impatience with the slowness of political reform. But he supports future engagement with Beijing. "It's wrong to isolate and demonize China, to build a wall when we need to build a bridge," he said in Boston. Like Bush, he supports the "One China" policy. But he



predicts the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act will lead to a "sharp deterioration" in regional security by spurring a regional arms race.

* Russia. Bush calls Russia a great power but laments the past decade as "an epic of deliverance and disappointment." At the Reagan Library, he warned that its brutality in Chechnya should influence future U.S. aid. "Russia cannot learn the lessons of democracy from the textbook of tyranny," he said. Cooperation is "impossible" unless Moscow operates with "civilized self-restraint."

Gore's main concerns are Russia's sales of arms technology, its repression in Chechnya and its failure to achieve greater reforms and to diminish corruption. But his position is less threatening. "A new Cold War is not the right path to progress. Engaging Russia is the right thing to do," he said in Boston.

(...)



New York Times

September 14, 2000; Page 23

**Bush Challenges Clinton-Gore Record on Protecting the
Environment**

By FRANK BRUNI

MONROE, Wash., Sept. 13 -- Gov. George W. Bush aggressively challenged Vice President Al Gore today on one of his signature issues, calling Mr. Gore's commitment to the environment into question by saying that the Clinton administration had seriously neglected the upkeep of national parks.

Mr. Bush proposed spending an additional \$3.75 billion in federal money over five years to repair and maintain them. And he framed that plan in terms of his own love of the outdoors, which he extolled from the wooded banks of a salmon-filled river here.

"Under this administration, the parks are in worse shape than ever before," said Mr. Bush, the Republican presidential nominee. "Sewage flows untreated into the lakes and streams of Yellowstone National Park. Civil War relics have been soaked by a leaky roof at Gettysburg.

"For eight years," Mr. Bush added, "this administration has talked of environmentalism while our national parks are crumbling."

Mr. Bush did not stop there. He also lashed into Mr. Gore for not saying whether he supported breaching hydroelectric dams in Washington that have hindered spawning salmon. Environmentalists are pushing hard for such a measure.

Mr. Bush opposes it, saying that technology should be developed to save both the dams and salmon, a position supported by many prominent Democratic officials in the state for economic reasons.



Mr. Gore, who has courted the support of nationwide environmental groups, has said he would convene a summit of people on different sides of the issue to discuss possible resolutions.

"He's refused to say whether he would breach the dams or not," Mr. Bush said today, after first emphasizing his concern for salmon. He was standing on a piece of private property that, with government aid, had established a kind of salmon nursery to feed and fatten the fish and increase their chances of surviving and reproducing.

"Before the people of this good state vote," Mr. Bush said, "I think you deserve an answer. I think you need to know where he stands on this important environmental issue."

Mr. Bush had spent much of the past few weeks of the presidential campaign either on the defensive or immersed in subject matters unrelated to his chosen themes. But his strongly worded remarks were a clear attempt to seize the offensive against Mr. Gore and leave the vice president with some explaining to do. Mr. Bush was also tapping into issues of special concern to residents of Washington, the state on the West Coast that his aides feel he has the best chance of winning.

At the least, the Bush campaign would like to do well enough along the West Coast, which Mr. Gore is counting on winning, to force the vice president to spend precious time and money here. After Washington, Mr. Bush was scheduled to spend two days in California.

The environment is especially important to voters in this region and one reason they often tilt Democratic. But Mr. Bush has been devoting this entire week trying to blunt Democrats' typical advantages on health care, the environment and education.

Mr. Gore's aides said today that Mr. Bush's environmental record in Texas contradicted his claims. The Sierra Club, a liberal advocacy group,



echoed that assessment, quickly issuing a statement that expressed deep skepticism about the genuineness of Mr. Bush's commitment to national parks.

The Gore campaign and the Sierra Club noted that Texas ranks near the bottom of states according to several environmental measures, including spending on parks. Mr. Gore's aides further noted that Mr. Bush supports oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a wilderness area that Mr. Gore has pledged to protect.

"It's laughable that Bush would reinvent himself as an environmentalist," said Douglas Hattaway, a spokesman for the Gore campaign.

Mr. Gore's aides took issue with Mr. Bush's portrait of a national park system in decline. Literature distributed by the Bush campaign said that the Clinton administration, for the coming fiscal year, had requested a 22 percent decrease in financing for maintenance of national parks, to \$180 million from \$230 million.

But Mr. Gore's aides said that those figures ignored the fact that the administration had developed other sources of revenue, outside the appropriation process, for the maintenance of parks. They also said that the administration was spending much more on parks than the last Republican administration -- that of Mr. Bush's father.

Mr. Bush said the spending was too focused on converting more and more private land into public parks and that, as a result, there was a roughly \$5 billion backlog of necessary maintenance work in parks. He said that he would eliminate this with the additional spending he was proposing, which he cast as a cultural and moral imperative.

"Our national parks contain America's memories and America's grandeur," Mr. Bush said in a 13-minute speech rife with poetic



flourishes. He read it from teleprompters, an incongruous addition to the sylvan surroundings.

The Texas governor said that he also wanted to increase, to \$38 million a year from \$18 million, the federal spending on scientific surveys and monitoring of the land and water in national parks.

But he said that while he welcomed federal responsibility for national parks, local wilderness areas and natural resources should be managed by local governments.

Explaining the roots and the depth of his environmental sensitivities, he talked about his ranch in a remote, unspoiled patch of central Texas and of the many birds there.

And he was close to rhapsodic in his praise of the salmon being nurtured in the nursery along the Skykomish River that he was visiting.

"For all of us," he said, "these fish are a wonder."



Foreign Policy and Defense - Gore

Washington Post

May 1, 2000; Page A01

Gore Vows 'Forward' Foreign Policy; Democrat Casts Bush With Isolationists

By CECI CONNOLLY

BOSTON, April 29 -- Vice President Gore sketched out a foreign policy today that is based on a broad engagement with "vital partners" such as Russia and China and a willingness to move swiftly to counter threats from "rogue states" with nuclear capability.

In his first foreign policy address of the presidential campaign, Gore touted his new strategy of "forward engagement." He said it is time to abandon the Cold War mentality propagated by his Republican opponent, Texas Gov. George W. Bush, and to embrace this new era in which "our grand domestic and international challenges are intertwined."

In a Gore White House, he said, international crises would be detected early, NATO would likely be expanded and America would continue its role as peacemaker in places such as Northern Ireland, the Middle East and the Balkans. He promised to boost military pay, "selectively" send American troops into regional conflicts and use a "diplomacy backed by force" in hot spots such as Iraq.

"We must make forward-looking investments at home and abroad to conquer the new threats that are jointly menacing to us all--and to rise to the possibilities of the moment and to reshape the world," he told a group of international journalists at the Old South Meeting House here.

The quality of national security decision-making and the condition



and preparedness of the U.S. military could become important issues in this year's presidential election. Although foreign policy rarely determines the outcome of presidential elections, both candidates have signaled their desire to set themselves apart on critical issues such as military preparedness and the appropriate use of American forces overseas. In a recent speech, Bush criticized the preparedness of U.S. armed forces.

Gore's advisers, citing his experience in Vietnam and his hawkish reputation in Congress, argue that the vice president has a political edge over Bush on international affairs.

Gore said little in his speech about the defense issue dominating much of the current debate: missile defense. But in an interview afterward, he disputed the notion that Russia is adamantly opposed to renegotiating the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

"There are Russians who clearly recognize that the emerging threats they face now and could face in the future on their southern border have created an awareness that there's some considerable advantage to Russia in being able to defend itself against a small number of ballistic missiles launched by an extremist organization or a rogue state that's taken over by extremists," he said.

Central to Gore's international philosophy is the inclusion of economic and social issues in national security decision-making.

"I believe that now we have a profound responsibility to open the gates of opportunity for all the world's people," he said. "Let me be clear: Promoting prosperity throughout the world is a crucial form of forward engagement."

The vice president adhered closely to current administration dogma today, making the case for limited interventions on humanitarian grounds even when there is not a clear and imminent threat to U.S.



security.

In the interview, Gore said that "our national security interests can be defined by our values." Citing debates over President Clinton's decision to intervene in Bosnia but not Rwanda, Gore said the major difference between the two cases was that "in Bosnia we had NATO allies in the region ready, willing and able to carry a major share of the burden."

In large measure, Gore used the speech today to draw sharp contrasts with Bush.

The Texas governor, Gore charged, aligns himself with isolationists and "dangerously fixates on the Cold War past when speaking of the use of force." He criticized Bush for opposing U.S. intervention in cases of ethnic repression.

"No wonder it took him six weeks to say anything about our action against the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo," Gore said.

The Bush team, reacting before Gore even delivered his speech in the historic building, said Gore's charges were "ludicrous."

The vice president went "out of his way to distort" Bush's views, said Condoleezza Rice, the governor's chief foreign policy adviser. She said Gore's speech today typified a say-one-thing, do-another political style that ultimately sends contradictory signals.

Although the two candidates agree broadly on the goals of military readiness and free trade, Rice said the Gore record does not match his rhetoric.

Despite Gore's pledge today to increase military spending, for instance, the Clinton-Gore team presided over years of Pentagon budget cuts and "used the military around the world promiscuously," Rice said in a conference call with reporters. "You can't just pander and say you'll



do everything."

On free trade, she accused Gore of being "unwilling to tell his allies" in labor to back down from protests such as those against the World Trade Organization in Seattle last fall and the International Monetary Fund and World Bank two weeks ago in Washington.

Although there is little to separate Gore and Bush on the major issues involving Russia and China, both sides appeared eager today to inflate any slight differences.

Gore repeatedly asserted that the United States must engage with both countries, despite disagreements.

"During the Cold War, we worked to contain these two powers and limit their reach," he said. "Our task in the 21st century is not making them weak--but instead to encourage forces of reform."

Russia and China are "indeed competitors," Gore said, "but also vital partners in our efforts to tackle problems menacing to us all."

In addition to promising to "prod" China on human rights abuses, Gore said during a brief question-and-answer period that promoting economic growth in the Taiwan Straits will "have a stabilizing peacemaking effect."

But Rice mocked Gore for joining Clinton in referring to a Chinese leader during the 1992 campaign as the "butcher of Beijing," while now embracing the country.

She also said the vice president lacks "credibility" on Russia after working so closely with leaders who were "actually stealing the country blind."

Rice acknowledged Bush has not covered the full spectrum of international issues confronting the United States, but she promised more details soon--including a speech devoted entirely to trade. If



elected, Bush also would conduct a "top-down review" of defense spending, she added.



New York Times

May 28, 2000; Page 1

Bush's Statements On Missile Defense Criticized by Gore

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

WEST POINT, N.Y., May 27 -- Vice President Al Gore, speaking today at the United States Military Academy, criticized Gov. George W. Bush's support for a national missile defense system along with a possible one-sided reduction in American nuclear warheads.

"An approach that combines serious unilateral reductions with an attempt to build a massive defensive system will create instability and thus undermine our security," Mr. Gore told the West Point graduates in a sun-splashed ceremony at the academy's Michie Stadium.

"Nuclear unilateralism will hinder, rather than help, arms control," Mr. Gore said, before handing out diplomas to the 944 graduates who trooped across the stage in their dress uniforms and white gloves.

Without mentioning Mr. Bush by name, Mr. Gore issued the most detailed rebuttal yet of the foreign policy address that Mr. Bush delivered in Washington on Tuesday. Again and again, Mr. Gore assailed the notion of one-sided arms reductions, a prospect that Mr. Bush had raised at an appearance with a cast of well-known Republican foreign policy leaders.

Mr. Gore emphasized that reductions should be pursued within negotiations and the framework of existing arms control treaties.

The vice president said that the Clinton administration was already negotiating for bilateral cuts in nuclear arms and was considering a limited missile defense, but said the kind of approach recommended by Mr. Bush was misguided.



"Reductions alone do not guarantee stability," Mr. Gore said. "It is how reductions are made and how they interact with defensive systems that makes the difference."

Mr. Gore, who became a specialist in arms control after he was elected to Congress in the mid-1970's, said: "Reductions have to be carried out in a way that reduces the risk of confrontation. If you're not careful, you could have a reduction of missiles and a more dangerous world."

Mr. Gore's remarks were unmistakably pointed in criticism of the Bush speech, which called for a reduction -- possibly unilateral -- in American nuclear weapons combined with an expanded missile defense system.

Mr. Bush has said he would pull out of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty if the Russians did not agree to adjust it after "a reasonable amount of time."

Mr. Gore was invited to the academy in his capacity as vice president, and the speech was billed as an official vice presidential event, not a campaign appearance. As such, he told reporters on Friday night, his remarks on the academy grounds would not be "political" in nature. "I will not make a partisan remark," he said.

But his comments today were Mr. Gore's first in public since Mr. Bush made his proposal on Tuesday, and they were being written by the vice president and his longtime national security adviser, Leon Fuerth, as the vice presidential entourage flew to the Hudson Valley on Friday night aboard Air Force Two from a campaign appearance in Memphis.

After today's speech, Mr. Fuerth and Louis Caldera, the secretary of the Army, who is a political appointee of the president, asserted that Mr. Gore's remarks today had not been political.



Mr. Fuerth told reporters that the vice president's comments were based on his long-standing principles and the fact that President Clinton was going to Russia next week, and that they were not intended as a response to Mr. Bush.

"Everything he said about strategic stability and so on came straight out of things that he was writing and talking about in the House of Representatives and as a Senator when he first began to enter the field of arms control, and it is mainly triggered by the fact that the president is about to leave for Moscow in a matter of a few days to engage in exactly this set of issues," Mr. Fuerth told reporters after today's speech.

"The speech is not political, the speech is policy-based," Mr. Fuerth said. "The ideas that the vice president presented have been in his record for a very long time."

Similarly, Mr. Caldera, asked if the remarks did not violate West Point's policy of barring political speeches, said: "Absolutely not. I think there was great care taken to make sure that this was not a political speech."

In Mr. Gore's discussion with reporters on Friday night on Air Force Two, he sharply criticized Mr. Bush's proposal. He said it would re-ignite the arms race, and by saying so, he seemed to ensure that his differences with Mr. Bush would be part of the news media's coverage today.

Today, at the graduation exercise, Mr. Gore outlined the Clinton administration's efforts toward creating a national missile defense system that would protect all 50 states from a limited attack.

"We believe, however, that it is essential to do this in a way that does not destroy the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty," Mr. Gore said. "The A.B.M. Treaty is the cornerstone of strategic stability in our relationship with Russia."



What Mr. Bush proposed would almost surely entail violating the A.B.M. Treaty of 1972.

The Texas governor proposed measures that would include building a defensive system that would cover all 50 states and could be extended to protect allies in Europe, the Middle East and Asia. In addition to holding out the possibility of large unilateral arms cuts, he said most American nuclear weapons should be removed from hair-trigger alert status.

Mr. Bush said he wanted to reduce the size of the United States' nuclear arsenal to the "lowest possible number consistent with our national security" and below the levels called for under the Start II accord with Russia.

Mr. Gore also noted in his speech to the cadets that President Clinton was headed for Moscow next week. "This is an historic meeting," he said. "The president should leave with the full support of the American people," a subtle reminder to Republicans that partisan differences over national security traditionally stop at the water's edge when the president travels abroad.

Mr. Bush's speech on military preparedness, delivered in Washington as he was flanked by foreign policy experts from four Republican administrations, earned the governor widespread news media coverage on a topic on which the Gore campaign has hoped Mr. Bush would appear inexperienced and politically vulnerable.

Gore advisers have believed that the vice president's expertise in international affairs, and particularly arms control, would give him an edge in November.

While Democrats had expected Mr. Bush to try to bolster his foreign policy credentials in the campaign, few expected the kind of speech that



Mr. Bush delivered on Tuesday.

The speech was hailed by some foreign policy experts as a "breakthrough" in Republican thinking -- particularly the unilateral reduction of warheads -- and seemed to put arms control squarely on the debate agenda for the presidential campaign.

The graduation ceremony at West Point, one of the most prestigious forums in the nation's military culture, offers an almost irresistible platform for anyone who wants to influence the national debate. But for just that reason, the military academy limits its speakers who are officeholders to the president, the vice president and the speaker of the House and bars political activities by them, according to Maj. James Whaley, a West Point spokesman.



Foreign Policy and Defense - Bush

Los Angeles Times

May 24, 2000; Page 4

Bush Pushes For Missile Defense For All 50 States

By T. CHRISTIAN MILLER

WASHINGTON – Surrounded by Cold War veterans, Texas Gov. George W. Bush on Tuesday called for a new post-Cold War arms policy based on an extensive missile defense system combined with reductions in offensive nuclear weapons.

The presumptive Republican nominee said that he would support an antiballistic missile system capable of protecting all 50 states from attack by rogue nations or accidental launches, accompanied by what he said would be deep cuts in the nation's strategic nuclear arsenal.

As Republican luminaries ranging from retired Gen. Colin L. Powell, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to former secretaries of State Henry A. Kissinger and George P. Shultz looked on, Bush suggested that an effective missile defense system would allow him to reduce nuclear weapons, even if the Russians refused to do the same.

"The Cold War logic that led to the creation of massive stockpiles on both sides is now outdated," Bush said. "Our mutual security no longer depends on a nuclear balance of terror."

Nevertheless, Bush's call for a far more extensive missile defense system than the one being tested by the Pentagon places him in the center of a growing transatlantic controversy.

For different reasons, both Russia and Washington's European allies oppose any change in the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which



clearly prohibits both the sort of system advocated by Bush and the far less ambitious plan under consideration by the Clinton administration.

Moscow has expressed concern that a new U.S. missile defense would upset the delicate 40-year-old policy of mutually assured destruction that kept peace between the United States and the Soviet Union. Most European NATO countries oppose an American missile defense because they fear that if U.S. leaders felt safe from missile attack they would be less concerned about the fate of Europe.

Kissinger, who negotiated the 1972 ABM pact, endorsed Bush's defense plan.

Technology Is Still Unproved

The technology itself, to shoot down missiles from the sky, is controversial and unproved. The Clinton administration will decide later this fall whether to go forward with a modest, land-based system that has already failed in several tests.

Clinton is trying, so far without success, to persuade Russia to accept amendments to the ABM Treaty permitting the limited system. Even if Moscow changes course and accepts Clinton's proposals, it would be unlikely to endorse Bush's plan. The treaty permits either party to abrogate it, but that would be a very drastic remedy, which would raise questions about all arms control agreements.

Arms control experts said Bush's approach might erode stability in a post-Cold War era in which Russia, China, France, Britain, India and Pakistan possess nuclear weapons.

Vice President Al Gore's aides immediately attacked Bush's proposal as "irresponsible." They continued their efforts to paint Bush as too inexperienced to handle the nation's affairs abroad, a tact they have turned to increasingly in recent days as Bush has focused on foreign



policy.

Gore supports the Clinton administration's vision of a limited missile defense system based in Alaska. He also supports the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which Bush opposes. The Senate last year refused to ratify the pact.

"Abrogating the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty for an untested 'Star Wars' system and opposing the comprehensive test ban treaty is irresponsible and unrealistic," said Doug Hattaway, a spokesman for Gore, the presumptive Democratic nominee. Bush "may have surrounded himself with foreign policy heavyweights, but his irresponsible agenda shows he lacks the depth to keep America safe and secure."

Bush said he would direct the Pentagon to conduct a thorough review of the U.S. offensive missile arsenal and recommend a level of post-Cold War armaments. He implied that the number would be below the levels called for in the START II Treaty, which required the countries to reduce their arsenals to between 3,000 and 3,500 warheads.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff recently warned that it would be dangerous to cut warheads to the 1,500 level suggested by Russia for START III negotiations, which are expected to begin later this year. The U.S. objective for START III is to reduce warheads on both sides to between 2,000 and 2,500.

Bush's top foreign policy advisor said it was "conceivable--though unlikely" that his proposed review would recommend a level below 1,500.

Bush also said it was too early to spell out the shape or cost of his missile defense plans but said he would pursue all options, including a space-based system improved from the controversial "Star Wars" model envisioned by former President Reagan.

The system under development, which envisions bases in Alaska



with 100 interceptor missiles, is expected to cost about \$ 60 billion, according to a recent Congressional Budget Office estimate. A more aggressive, broader system of the type sketched out by Bush could cost \$ 116 billion, according to a 1996 estimate.

Bush said he hoped to share the missile defense technology with U.S. allies, including Israel and perhaps even Russia.

And while he pledged to "significantly" reduce the number of missiles, he dodged questions about how those cuts would be linked to the development of an effective system to shoot down incoming warheads.

Advocates of missile defense have long argued that if the United States had an effective shield, it would need fewer retaliatory offensive missiles. However, a missile defense would reduce the power of the Russian arsenal. Moscow has said that if the United States builds a missile defense system, Russia would build up its offensive arsenal to guarantee that it would be able to overwhelm the defenses. If Russia built up its offensive arsenal, the U.S. would probably follow suit.

During a flight to Ohio, Bush said he did not want to use the phrase "unilateral cuts" to describe his strategy because of its connotations. He responded to further questions by asking for a copy of his speech.

Searching about for a pair of reading glasses, Bush pointed to a line declaring that "deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack."

Russia, China Wary of U.S. Motives

"The way I want to phrase this is, the idea is to rapidly move toward a safer world and at the same time protect the United States' interests with the level of weaponry necessary to protect our interests," Bush said. "I suspect it's going to be substantially lower, like I said in my speech,



lower than anticipated, and I'm prepared to move on it."

Although Bush insisted that his program is not directed against either Russia or China, both countries have viewed America warily in recent years. The U.S. bombing of the Chinese embassy during the Kosovo conflict and U.S. moves to expand NATO to the border of Russia have left the two countries unsure about America's motives.

One area of instability would come in the time between the U.S. announcing its plan to develop a missile defense and actually deploying one. That transition would invite close scrutiny from China and Russia as to how to respond to a new system that could remove their ability to attack the globe's remaining superpower.

"The more aggressively you pursue defense, the less stable the global security system becomes," said Jon Wolfsthal, an arms control specialist at the Washington-based Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Bush's decision to grapple with the issues is further evidence of his determination to erase any perceived weaknesses in the foreign policy arena after stumbles last fall that included his failure to name some of the world's top leaders.

After the announcement, Bush met with House Republicans, then flew to Ohio, a swing state with 21 electoral votes at stake. Bush spoke to a library filled with children about the importance of Dr. Seuss and after-school reading.



Houston Chronicle

June 03, 2000; Page 24

Bush Forced to Defend Foreign Policy Credentials (Excerpts)

By CLAY ROBISON

SACRAMENTO, Calif. - George W. Bush, who has spent much of the past week talking about military preparedness, was forced Friday to defend his foreign policy credentials after addressing an audience of international business people and journalists.

The issue of Bush's inexperience in foreign affairs, which periodically surfaces in the presidential race, was raised by a Saudi Arabian television journalist, who questioned Bush after the Texas governor spoke, via satellite, to a world affairs conference sponsored by Cable News Network in Atlanta.

"There's concern internationally that you're inexperienced on international issues. What role does former President Bush, if any, play in formulating your domestic or international policies?" the Saudi Arabian asked Bush, son of the former president.

The probable Republican presidential nominee said that his father's "major role is to be a loving father."

The governor said that he had assembled a team of experienced foreign policy advisers and promised that, if elected, he will be a "predictable leader" who will know how to protect America's national strategic interests.

"I've got great advisers when it comes to foreign policy," the governor added, ticking off the names of four of them - Stanford University Professor Condoleezza Rice, former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell and former Secretary



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

of State George Schulz.

Rice, Cheney and Powell all served in former President Bush's administration, and Schulz was a member of former President Reagan's Cabinet.

"These are members of my party who are distinguished in their experience," Bush said.

"I don't think anyone can expect any president to know all things about all subjects, and that's why the fundamental question is: Can a president know how to lead?"

Bush vowed to make clear decisions based on the "national strategic interests of America . . . so that leaders, whether it be in Saudi Arabia, your country, or anywhere else will know there's a predictable leader in the White House."

(...)



New York Times

August 3, 2000; Page 27

The Republicans. In Context: Promises of Changes, But Unspoken

Details (Excerpts)

By R. W. APPLE Jr.

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 2 -- It is all so murky, the rhetoric here, that you might think yourself back in the presidential campaign of 1952, when Dwight D. Eisenhower promised, "I shall go to Korea," but supplied no details about what he would do to end the war once he got there.

Or maybe 1968 or 1972, in the heyday of Richard M. Nixon, another campaigner often short on specifics. Confident that he was well ahead of Hubert H. Humphrey in 1968, he told the nation he would end the war in Vietnam, but he never bothered to say what he had in mind. Four years later, more confident, he stayed off the stump, running the first Rose Garden campaign.

This year, en route to nomination for president, Gov. George W. Bush of Texas has hammered the Clinton administration's foreign policy, suggesting that it has been inept, ill-focused and lacking in priorities.

In a speech in Washington on May 23, he said that "the world has changed faster than United States policy" and called for a fresh approach to nuclear weapons and a more comprehensive missile defense system. At other times he has hinted he would spend less energy on humanitarian missions and more on dealing with great powers like China and Russia and on shoring up America's alliances.

(...)

Like Mr. Clinton eight years ago, Mr. Bush began the campaign with an inconvenient dearth of foreign policy experience. Like Mr. Clinton, and



unlike Vice President Al Gore, his Democratic rival, he has no service in Vietnam to dwell upon with pride.

Early on, Mr. Bush surrounded himself with an impressive array of national security experts, most of them veterans of past Republican administrations, including Ms. Rice, Paul Wolfowitz, Robert Zoellick and Richard Perle. (The notable exception is James A. Baker, one of his father's secretaries of state, whose performance in his father's unsuccessful 1992 campaign the younger Mr. Bush has often faulted).

In a "coming-out" speech at the Ronald Reagan Library near Los Angeles on Nov. 19, George W. Bush won good marks for what most experts considered a polished performance. His choice of Mr. Cheney lent the ticket further heft on foreign policy.

But there remains a long list of issues on which the delegates, and those across the country following the convention in the news media, have so far heard little. Among them are strategies for dealing with the intractable problems of Russia and China, the issue of expanding NATO farther into Eastern Europe, the manifold complications of expanding free world trade and the doubts that surround the present requirement that the Pentagon be prepared to fight simultaneous wars in two different theaters of war.

There are divisions within the Republican party on issues like Kosovo that have yet to be resolved.

If Mr. Bush leaves too much unspoken for too long, he may hand Mr. Gore a significant opening. Mr. Gore, after all, has had broad experience in foreign policy matters, first on Capitol Hill, then in the White House. And while the Clinton administration has had its flops overseas, in places like Africa and Haiti, it has also recorded significant achievements, particularly in peace efforts in Northern Ireland and the



Middle East.

But then, Mr. Bush may have decided that too much talk about foreign policy is bad business. He has talked often to friends and acquaintances about his father's loss to Bill Clinton eight years ago, when the elder Bush focused on foreign affairs and the Arkansas neophyte emphasized the economy.



St. Louis Post-Dispatch

August 11, 2000, Page A1

**Pentagon, Bush Differ on Readiness of Military. Defense Experts Say
His Warning is Off Base; Bush's Aides Defend His Stand** (Excerpts)

By PHILIP DINE

WASHINGTON -- Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush's recent warning about gaps in U.S. combat readiness is raising questions among some defense experts about the Texas governor's grasp of military issues.

As part of his contention that the military has declined under the Democrats, Bush charged in his speech accepting the GOP nomination last week that two Army divisions -- one-fifth of the Army's active-duty fighting force -- weren't ready to fight.

"If called on by the commander in chief today, two entire divisions of the Army would have to report -- 'Not ready for duty, Sir,' " Bush said at the Republican convention in Philadelphia. Since then, he has engaged in some back-and-forth statements with the Pentagon and Army.

There are two problems with Bush's comments, critics say:

* The allegation about a lack of readiness was factually wrong, because the two divisions in question are ready for duty. Bush's remarks, according to his aides, stemmed from an Army briefing to Congress late last year about a temporary readiness problem.

Military officials say that problem was resolved shortly thereafter.

* In discussing issues of readiness in such a public forum and later challenging defense officials to respond, Bush seemed unaware that such matters are generally kept secret for security reasons.

"There's no point in tipping our hat to the world about these things,"



said a Pentagon official.

"What it tells me, is he's not conversant with these issues - not to know that those readiness reports are some of the most classified things," said Lawrence Korb, who was responsible for U.S. military readiness as assistant secretary of defense under former President Ronald Reagan.

John Steinbruner, director of the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland, said Bush mistakenly linked a technical readiness question with the critical matter of military preparedness.

"It suggests that he has quite a lot to learn about what that term 'readiness' means, that he's not familiar with these topics," Steinbruner said. "He's making rather casual political comments not based on a real understanding of what the issues are."

The Bush campaign is raising its own question - whether the Pentagon is playing politics with defense issues in denying Bush's allegations.

Bush campaign spokesman Ray Sullivan said Bush raised the issue because the need to rebuild the military is one of five central issues in his campaign.

"Clearly the Clinton-Gore administration has squandered the opportunity to maintain and strengthen America's military, and our military has suffered neglect," Sullivan said.

Sullivan said it was odd that the Pentagon and Army said all divisions were ready only after Bush spoke out.

"We hope that the United States military is not getting involved in politics," Sullivan said. "It does seem curious that in the days before the governor's speech, the military was not prepared and the day after the



governor's speech, they claimed they are prepared."

But a supporter of Bush's general stand on military issues said the two divisions in question are indeed ready for combat. "What Bush said is technically incorrect," said Jack Spencer, defense and national security analyst at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank.

Spencer also said that the military should not be expected to publicly comment on the readiness of its units. But he did agree with Bush that the White House has neglected military needs for much of the past eight years.

The controversy started when Bush gave his acceptance speech at the convention Aug. 3. The Pentagon and the Army responded the next day that all 10 Army divisions were "combat ready and able to answer the nation's call."

That same day, last Friday, Bush replied: "Well, my answer to that is that last November there was a report that said two divisions were not ready for combat. . . . And if in fact the Army now changes its tune from that report last November, then they need to let the country know."

Asked if he would acknowledge that the military is now combat-ready, Bush demurred.

"No, I wouldn't concede that necessarily," he said. "I mean, I'm amazed that they would put out a statement right after our convention. I'm curious why it took them this long to say that they were combat-ready after the report from last November that said they weren't."

But Army Maj. Thomas Collins says that the military does not issue press releases about readiness.

"The Army as a matter of policy does not publicly go forward with information on our readiness," Collins said. "Those who have a need to know are kept fully abreast of our readiness. But you're not going to see



it floating around in the public."

The Pentagon and the Army responded to Bush's statement, Collins said, "to clarify the record, to insure that the public gets a true picture of our readiness levels."

(...)

Military experts said that the larger point being made by Bush - that the military has suffered in recent years because it has received fewer resources - is open to discussion. Recruiting and retention remain problematic though they've improved recently. Budget cuts began under former President George Bush as the Cold War ended, they note, and continued through most of President Bill Clinton's tenure, though military funding has risen the past couple of years.



Environment and Natural Resources

Washington Post

June 24, 2000; Page A06

Bush Quotes Gore as Favoring Higher Gas Taxes. Republican Brandishes Rival's Book on the Environment Amid Debate Over Fuel Prices

By TERRY M. NEAL

In the presidential election scrum over higher oil prices, George W. Bush is trying to make Vice President Gore eat his words from the book "Earth in the Balance."

The Texas governor, a former oil company executive, said he would not allow Gore to pin higher gasoline prices on him. On his campaign airplane yesterday, Bush brandished a copy of Gore's 1992 environmental treatise.

He noted that on Page 173, Gore wrote: "In fact, almost every poll shows Americans decisively rejecting higher taxes on fossil fuels, even though that proposal is one of the logical first steps in changing our policies in a manner consistent with a more responsible approach to the environment."

Bush, whose father derisively referred to Gore as "Ozone Man," suggested that Gore's statement demonstrated his long support for higher fuel taxes and that he is now vacillating as political pressure mounts.

"I just want to remind everybody that in this book, this is a man who advocated raising gasoline taxes," said Bush, arguing that the Clinton administration's own failed oil policies are to blame. "Now that the price



of gas is high under their watch in this current administration he seems to be running from his position."

The Gore campaign has suggested that oil company collusion is to blame for high gasoline prices and has emphasized Bush's oil industry background and heavy financial support from oil industry officials.

A Gore campaign official said yesterday that Bush, through selective editing, is mischaracterizing Gore's position on gas taxes.

What Gore proposed in the book, as noted on Page 349, was the creation of an "environmental security trust fund" that would offset the price of consumer purchases of "environmentally benign" products, such as high-mileage cars. It would be funded by oil producers based on the amount of carbon dioxide they put into the atmosphere. The amount paid would be offset by a corresponding decrease in income and payroll taxes to discourage companies from passing on the cost to consumers.

"The Texas oilman is obviously feeling the heat over gas prices and his close ties to the oil industry," Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway said.



Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

July 16, 2000; Page 01A

**Candidates' Energy Plans Elicit Doubt: Bush Would Increase Oil
Production, While Gore Emphasizes Conservation**

By CRAIG GILBERT

Washington -- Amid the uproar over high gas prices in the upper Midwest, the presidential candidates took turns offering remedies.

For George Bush, it was boosting U.S. energy production -- including drilling for oil in an Alaskan wildlife refuge.

For Al Gore, it was promoting "clean" technologies, energy savings and alternatives to oil.

"None of that would affect the price of gasoline," observed one analyst, Pietro Nivola of the Brookings Institution. "None of it would have made any difference in terms of whether motorists in Milwaukee were spending \$2.20 per gallon at the pumps."

May's gas-price eruption in the Midwest has helped revive an old issue: America's ever-rising dependence on foreign oil. Whether Bush and Gore have the answers is debated by experts. Some are skeptical. Each candidate has accused the other of lacking an energy policy.

What is clearer is that the two would take different approaches to the problem. Everybody wants cheap oil and clean air. But Bush is a former Texas oil executive, Gore an environmentalist author. Bush is a Republican, Gore a Democrat.

"Gore . . . would try to attack the problem from the demand side: What can we do to reduce demand? Bush would likely attack it from the supply side: What can we do to expand supply? That would probably be the major difference," said Robert Ebel, an energy expert with the Center



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

The United States now imports 56% of its oil, up from 50% in 1993. Politicians on both sides of the aisle see that as a national security threat and a major economic burden. This year's tight supplies of crude have added 33 cents to the average price of a gallon of gas nationwide, the government says.

One remedy Bush offers is to look for more oil in the U. S., where coastal drilling is restricted and controversial. His starkest difference with Gore is over the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an Alaskan expanse that is the largest untapped onshore oil basin in the U.S. A 1998 government study said reserves there could range from roughly 6 billion barrels of recoverable oil (a 95% probability) to 16 billion (a 5% probability). The U.S. uses almost 7 billion barrels each year.

Republicans have a bill in Congress to open up the refuge for drilling. Bush backs the idea. President Clinton has vowed to veto it. In testimony last April, an Interior Department official called the area a "pristine, unique ecosystem" important to caribou, polar bears, swans, snow geese and musk oxen.

"What you're talking about is the possibility of a few days of oil consumption at a cost of spoiling an environment that is valuable to the country," Gore told the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel in a phone interview last month.

Oil interests and some critics of rising oil imports disagree. They downplay the area's splendor (Newsweek recently termed it a "treeless, mosquito-infested plain"), dispute the environmental costs and tout the economic returns.

Bush spokesman Scott McClellan says "environmentally responsible" drilling is " part of a long-term solution to meet our nation's energy



needs."

Ebel, a former CIA and Interior Department official, says giving up on domestic oil means "our dependence on foreign oil will only increase."

He admits the numbers aren't huge. The U.S. has only 2% to 3% of the world's known oil reserves, the government estimates. And it would take 20 to 30 years of drilling to achieve peak production in the Alaskan refuge.

"Those who are opposed to, let's say, opening up (the refuge) say, 'You're only going to get enough oil to cover demand for a year or two,' " Ebel said. "That's really the wrong way to look at it. You don't say, 'I'm not going to go to work for the next two weeks because I'm only going to earn enough money to last a short time.' "

Bush has also accused the Clinton-Gore administration of mismanaging its relationship with OPEC nations, saying earlier this year that if he were president, he would "use the capital that my administration will earn, with the Kuwaitis or the Saudis, and convince them to open up the spigot."

This is not a policy difference so much as an argument over effectiveness. Bush says he would be more persuasive than Gore in pressuring OPEC countries to produce more oil, resulting in cheaper imports.

"That's the quickest way to reduce the price of gasoline," said Bush aide McClellan.

But oil analysts and OPEC-watchers caution that there's a limit to America's control over foreign oil production. In a column for the Washington Post March 7, former energy secretary James Schlesinger, noting the chinks in the OPEC cartel and the wild history of oil price swings, said the "goal of price stability may be largely unachievable."



Bush aides say their candidate also believes in promoting renewable and alternative energy sources, but his focus in the gas debate has been on boosting oil supplies.

"Opening wilderness areas and charming OPEC -- that's not an energy policy," Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway said of Bush. "If he's going to criticize the administration for not having an energy policy, you'd think he'd come up with one himself."

Gore's approach to these issues is rather different, and raises questions of its own.

In his 1992 book, "Earth in the Balance," Gore placed great stress on conservation and efficiency. His current energy proposals include government promotion of mass transit, energy-saving vehicles and appliances, home insulation and "environmental technologies." Gore says his approach is "market-based;" it relies heavily on tax incentives.

"What he's offering are a number of recycled ideas that really are not going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil," said McClellan, the Bush aide.

Among other things, Gore wants to give consumers a tax credit of up to \$6,000 for buying more fuel-efficient cars or sport utility vehicles. Gore has helped lead a government effort to promote more efficient car technologies. He also supports higher mileage standards for SUVs, which under current rules are exempt from the standards applied to cars. Bush disagrees, saying the current mandates are sufficient.

A premise of the Gore plan is that technological advances and reasonable government subsidies make cheaper, cleaner energy possible.

"People want it all. They want the independence of getting in the car and driving anywhere they want to go on their own schedule and without emptying their wallet at the filling station," said Gore spokesman



Hattaway. "That's fair. They want that independence along with clean air and a strong economy."

One skeptic is Brookings' Nivola, who has written widely about energy policy and politics. He points out that the central issue with foreign oil dependence lies with the transportation sector, since other sectors (utilities, industry, residential) have actually cut their reliance on petroleum.

Transportation "is where the voracious consumption of oil occurs," he says. It's responsible for two-thirds of U.S. oil use.

The only effective tool to promote conservation and alternative energy sources, he argues, is higher gas prices, since they curtail consumption and make other technologies more competitive. Even rules mandating better car mileage fail to reduce fuel usage, he says, because people simply end up driving more in their cheaper-to-drive cars.

"One of the ironies of what politicians do is they complain about high prices and, in the same breath, say what we need to do is encourage alternative fuels and more conservation and efficiency," said Nivola. "You simply cannot have it both ways. If you want more energy efficiency, you have to live with high prices."

Nivola doesn't expect candidates to buy into this reasoning.

"No politician is going to in any way look like he is apologizing for high gas prices," he said.



Environment and Natural Resources - Gore

New York Times

June 28, 2000; Page 24

Gore Unveils \$125 Billion Energy Plan (Excerpts)

By FRANK BRUNI



PHILADELPHIA, June 27 -- Offering a sweeping vision of a future in which pollution is conquered and cars run without a "drop of oil or gasoline," Vice President Al Gore proposed tax breaks and other incentives today for both reducing America's dependence on oil and cleaning up the environment.

And he made clear that he wanted to claim these issues in the presidential election not only with his soaring oratory but with the amount of money that he was willing to devote to them, more than \$125 billion over 10 years.

The plans that the vice president outlined today -- mostly various forms of tax breaks for businesses that provided or invested in more efficient, less conventional or less polluting sources of energy -- represented an estimated \$75 billion in lost federal tax revenue or



spending over 10 years, aides said. But they said that the additional proposals that Mr. Gore was expected to make on Wednesday and Thursday would bring that figure up to more than \$125 billion.

Mr. Gore framed that investment as both an opportunity and an obligation created by the country's current period of extraordinary prosperity.

"There can be a next stage of prosperity in which American creativity builds not just a better product but also a healthier planet," Mr. Gore said outside an energy plant here that was a model for the use of newer, cleaner, more efficient technology.

"We will say to the nation's inventors and entrepreneurs: if you invest in these new technologies, America will invest in you," Mr. Gore continued. "And we will prove, once and for all, that we can clean up pollution, make our power systems more efficient and more reliable, and move away from dependence on others all with no new taxes, no new bureaucracies, and no onerous regulations."

While economists and business executives often worry that more clean-air efforts and stringent environmental regulations would hamper industry and limit the creation of new jobs, Mr. Gore's approach emphasized the carrot of tax savings rather than the stick of restrictions, and it anticipated the growth of new companies and new jobs on the cutting edge of fuel technology.

But Mr. Gore's pitch was more than just an exhortation for a cleaner environment. It also reflected the sudden emergence of high gasoline prices as a potent issue in the 2000 presidential elections. Republicans have assailed the Clinton administration for an energy policy that they say has left the country too vulnerable to the whims of foreign oil producers.



Mr. Gore even folded into his speech a call for the Federal Trade Commission's investigation into possible price-gouging by the oil industry to include public hearings, possibly with testimony from consumers.

Earlier this month, when Mr. Gore embarked on what he called a "prosperity and progress" tour, he said he would spend this week talking about environmental policy. But since then, gas prices have become an increasingly heated point of contention between Republicans and Democrats, and today, the word energy accompanied and even preceded the word environment in the headlines atop the written remarks and policy summaries that Mr. Gore's aides distributed to reporters.

And Mr. Gore frequently alluded in his 26-minute address to the problems of American dependence on "big oil," a phrase undoubtedly meant as a dig against his Republican rival, Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, a former oil company executive. Democrats have said that Mr. Bush's former professional ties and the enormous sums of campaign money he has received from oil companies would make him unwilling to press for lower prices at the gas pump.

In any case, Mr. Gore said in his speech, "Our next-stage prosperity must be built on our ability to make sure Americans will be free forever from the dominance of big oil and foreign oil."

Mr. Gore said that America today stood "on a new frontier of energy independence and environmental protection" and should not fail to explore it. "It is an old, timid way of thinking to build our lives and livelihoods around a fuel source that is distant, uncertain and easily manipulated," he said. "It is a new, bold way of thinking to demand and develop new technologies to free ourselves from gas-tank price-gouging."

Later, in a satellite interview with an ABC affiliate in Green Bay,



Wis., Mr. Gore attacked Mr. Bush more directly.

"I have never been afraid to take on big oil," Mr. Gore said. But, the vice president added, "My opponent comes out of the oil industry. His experience is as an oil company executive. He called for higher oil prices to boost the oil companies' profits."

Officials with the Bush campaign noted that Mr. Bush had endorsed the Federal Trade Commission's investigation into oil companies and said that Mr. Gore was merely trying to deflect attention from the Clinton administration's responsibility for gas prices that have risen as much as 50 cents a gallon in some areas of the Midwest. Mr. Gore, as it happens, will be taking his new energy message to that region over the next few days.

Mr. Bush's aides further said that what Mr. Gore unveiled today was really a set of environmental proposals, none of them especially visionary, that were recast and reconfigured to sound like an energy plan because the political landscape had changed so quickly.

"The vice president seems to forget who's been in office for seven years," Mr. Bush said at a news conference in Michigan this afternoon. "This is an administration that's been in charge and the price of gasoline has risen steadily."

The plan that Mr. Gore began to outline today centered on an unspecified "menu of financial mechanisms," as material distributed by his aides called it, of tax incentives, loans, grants and bonds to help "power plants and industries that come forward with projects that promise to dramatically reduce climate and health-threatening pollution."

Some of Mr. Gore's proposals represented expansions of current federal programs, while others were new. They included doubling the tax



credit for businesses that turn wind or landfill methane into electricity and giving accelerated tax deductions to companies for the purchase of equipment that makes cleaner and more efficient use of fuel. In the coming days, Mr. Gore's aides said, the vice president will talk about tax breaks for consumers who use solar energy or buy products, like cars, that do not use traditional sources of fuel like oil.

(...)



Los Angeles Times

July 1, 2000; Page 6

Questions Raised Over the Effect of Gore's Energy Plan (Excerpts)

By MEGAN GARVEY

California, hands down, leads the nation in putting alternative-fuel vehicles on the road. Which so far is about the same as saying the Chicago Cubs have won more World Series than the Texas Rangers.

True, but so what?

Despite the most aggressive efforts in the nation to get motorists behind the wheel of non-gas-guzzlers, the number of such vehicles on California roads remains inconsequential--just 50,000 among 27 million registered vehicles.

California's skimpy track record raises questions about the potential of a plan, quite similar to the Golden State's effort, unveiled this week by Vice President Al Gore. But some environmental groups say Gore has added a twist to his proposal that may make all the difference: billions of dollars in tax credits to get oil companies and car manufacturers to develop more energy-efficient cars.

The initiative announced this week also would provide \$ 46 billion in tax credits for consumers who buy energy-efficient cars and homes. The plan earmarks a \$ 5,000 tax credit for hybrid vehicles--those running, say, on gas and electricity--and the credit would rise to \$ 6,000 for vehicles that are electric or propelled by fuel cells.

Federal tax credits of up to \$ 4,000 are currently available for purchasers of electric cars.

(...)

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. a senior attorney with the Natural Resources



Defense Council, said the key has always been getting manufacturers to make alternative fuels, and the cars that run on them readily available at prices motorists can afford.

"The question is how do you do it?" he said, during a conference call arranged by the Gore campaign Thursday. "It's a question that has always baffled the environmental community and put them at odds with the business community."

Kennedy and others think Gore's plan may finally answer the question.

Those who already provide alternative fuels to the public say they would have far greater strength in greater numbers. At one of only a handful of commercial stations in Los Angeles where you can pump up on compressed natural gas--99 cents a gallon right now--the vehicles that pull up almost all carry a company or city logo on their sides. Aramis Margaryan, a smog technician at the Shell station, said the smog-free cars seem the same as any other. Still, he said he's noted how frequently the drivers have to fill up and he is in no hurry to buy one of the cars himself.

"You can't fill it up and head all the way to Vegas," he noted. "Where would you stop for gas?"



Environment and Natural Resources - Bush

Daily News (New York)

June 2, 2000; Page 29

Bush Barks Environment Plan But Foes Says He's Turned Texas Toxic

By THOMAS M. DeFRANK



WASHINGTON - It was Environment Day for Texas Gov. George W. Bush at Lake Tahoe, Nev., yesterday.

With one of America's most beautiful bodies of water as his backdrop, the Republican presidential candidate proposed tax incentives to encourage private conservation efforts and criticized the Clinton administration for preserving land by executive fiat.

Meanwhile, in Houston, a newly arrived law clerk surveyed a surreal vista on his morning commute - the top floors of the skyscrapers in America's fourth-biggest city had disappeared, sheathed in a heavy, gray-black cloud of pollution. "It was this awful, nasty ooze," he said. "You'd think this was L.A."

Actually, Houston is worse. For while Los Angeles has cleaned up its act, Houstonians breathe the nation's dirtiest air - and Texas leads the



Political Communication Lab., Stanford University

nation in the number of days with unhealthy ozone levels. The state also has some of the nation's dirtiest waterways.

Bush's critics insist that is no coincidence. The state's vile air and water, they say, is the inevitable result of his industry-friendly environmental policies. "Bush treats polluters like kids in a candy store," charges Robin Schneider of Public Research Works, a nonpartisan watchdog group. "Whatever they want, he gives it to them."

In return, Bush has reaped nearly \$1.5 million in campaign cash from the oil and gas industry - 15 times more than Vice President Gore has gotten from the same folks.

Environmentalists view Bush as a wolf in sheep's clothing. "His environmental policy is more of a protective crouch," says University of Texas political scientist Bruce Buchanan.

Counters Bush spokesman Ari Fleischer: "Texas is one of the fastest-cleaning states in the nation, and that's because of a healthy mix of voluntary and compulsory regulations. . . . Too often, government takes the attitude that it's better to sue than solve."

In 1997, Bush cut a controversial deal exempting many of the state's heaviest air polluters from tough emissions standards under the state's clean air law. In exchange, refiners, power plants and other industries promised to clean up anyway. In Nevada, Bush crowed yesterday: "We have succeeded not by antagonizing people, but by inviting folks to become part of the solution."

So far, though, Bush's laissez-faire scheme has been a bust. More than 800 plants are still grandfathered - meaning they don't have to clean up if they don't want to - and only 74 of them have signed on to his voluntary plan.

Bush's defenders point out that last year he signed a bill forcing



Texas power plants to meet stringent new emission standards.

Critics note he acted only after the Environmental Protection Agency threatened to cut off federal highway money.

Bush's environmental appointments, moreover, are generally sympathetic to industry. His state environmental agency head is a retired Monsanto engineer who has called ozone "a relatively benign pollutant."

"It's not on the radar screen at the moment," Buchanan says, "but when swing voters . . . decide whether to take a risk on a Republican, the issue might get some legs."

Bush campaign aides say they aren't worried. "His record isn't particularly strong," acknowledges one adviser. "But there's no evidence it cuts politically."



San Francisco Chronicle

June 2, 2000; Page A3

Bush Urges Commonsense' Conservation. At Tahoe, he says local control would help preserve environment (Excerpts)

By CARLA MARINUCCI

Sand Harbor State Park, Nevada -- Striving to distance himself from criticism that he heads one of the nation's most polluted states, Texas Gov. George W. Bush went to the pristine shores of Lake Tahoe yesterday to call for "commonsense conservationism" and more local control to save America's environmental treasures.

But even as he prepared to deliver the address, Bush couldn't quite bring himself to use the "e" word. Asked by reporters traveling on his plane this week if he would consider himself an environmentalist, Bush demurred.

"I consider myself someone who cares deeply about clean air and clean water," he said.

Speaking to an invited crowd of about 100 at the shores of the lake, Bush promised yesterday that he would be "a president who would set a new tone . . . to come up with commonsense conservation policy."

"Our philosophy is we trust local folks to make the right decisions for the community in which they live," Bush said. "Somehow the mentality of Washington is we know better.' "

Bush called for "conservation partnerships" that encompass federal, state and local governments and private landowners. He also said the government should provide tax incentives for private landowners who engage in conservation efforts, and eliminate estate taxes so they can more easily pass on their lands to their children.



But the Texas governor's heralded environmental event proved a contrast to some of his home runs hit in recent weeks, in which he delivered strong addresses on issues such as Social Security, military funding and education. Even with the azure blue Tahoe waters and stunning mountains as a backdrop, yesterday's "major policy address" was hardly a blockbuster. He included parts of his usual stump speech and spent only 10 minutes on environmental issues.

More tellingly, prominent Lake Tahoe conservationists who were invited to attend, such as Rochelle Nason, executive director of the nonpartisan League to Save Lake Tahoe, appeared largely unimpressed.

Bush's foray into environmental issues also gave Democrats and ecology activists an opening to raise his Texas record. And they argued that Vice President Al Gore -- who appeared at nearly the same site with President Clinton two years ago for a major summit on Tahoe issues -- has established far stronger credentials on the environment.

In his speech, Bush proposed a handful of initiatives, including giving a 50 percent tax break on capital gains incurred when private landowners sell property for conservation purposes, and abolishing the inheritance tax so landowners won't be encouraged to sell property to developers to pay taxes.

Bush called for full funding of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and for mandating that 50 percent of the proceeds be spent on state and local efforts. Created by Congress 35 years ago, the fund was about \$900 million at its 1978 peak, but today is at about \$500 million.

The Texas governor also called for providing \$50 million in matching grants for states to offer incentives to private landowners, including farmers and ranchers, if they engaged in conservation efforts that would



protect rare species and restore habitats. Bush said he would recommend \$10 million toward the establishment of a stewardship grant program for private conservation efforts.

In a news conference later, Bush also repeatedly criticized Clinton for "making a grand promise he couldn't fulfill" on Lake Tahoe preservation, although Bush provided no details. His staffers said later the reference was to \$300 million in funding that the president and Gore had promised after their 1997 summit for the purpose of conserving water and land at Tahoe, the balance of which was not included in Clinton's budget.

Gore spokesman Doug Hattaway called it "another charge with no basis in fact."

Sen. Harry Reid, D-Nev., was scathing. "George W. Bush speaking on the environment is like Josef Stalin talking on human rights. . . . He has the worst environmental record in America," Reid said. "His idea of saving the lake to is to repeal the estate tax."

Nason, of the save-Tahoe league, said Bush's ideas -- while differing in tone from Democratic proposals, particularly in the calls for local control -- differed little in substance from policies supported by the Clinton-Gore administration.

"Tax credits can be effective" as a tool for environmental preservation," she said. "But they're not as precise a tool. . . . They're one of a number of tools that would be needed."

Nason noted Bush's reluctance to call himself an environmentalist. "Most Americans call themselves environmentalists," she said. "I'm not sure what distinction he has in mind.

"He doesn't have the proven track record of many years that Gore has," she said, "but that doesn't mean he doesn't have credibility."

