

Chapter 4:

# Government Management

## **Government Management**

Bush

Gore



**IN THEIR OWN WORDS**  
SOURCEBOOK FOR THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

copyright (c) 2000 by The Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University

## **Government Management - Bush**

**George W. Bush**

Knoxville, Tennessee

June 8, 2000

### ***Ending the Blame Game***

...

Today I want to talk about the way we conduct the nation's business. Many Americans believe that Washington's way of doing things just isn't working. That government's purposes are too often forgotten, and opportunities too often squandered - resulting in too few results.

In so many ways, America in the year 2000 is the picture of success. Our economy is more competitive than ever - more efficient. Our technologies are marvels of creativity. Throughout the private sector, we're seeing what people can accomplish with strong leadership, clear goals, fair dealing, and cooperation.

This could hardly be said of the federal government. There is too much argument in Washington and not enough discussion. Too much polling and not enough decision making. Too much needless division, not enough shared accomplishment. Not enough final acts and resolutions, and lasting achievements.

There is blame enough to go around. I do not dismiss the serious disagreements that are part of politics, but the reality is that Americans look upon this spectacle and don't like what they see. They know that this is not the way the world's great power should conduct its affairs. I agree with them. It's time for change.

Consider, by contrast, many of our state and local governments, where the best ideas and boldest reforms of the last decade have taken

place. All across America, governors, state legislators, and city officials have laid partisan differences aside and done what they were elected to do - serve the people.

In New York City, Mayor Rudy Giuliani brought order and civility back to the streets - cutting crime rates by 50 percent.

In Cleveland, Mayor Michael White's bipartisan leadership has led to a revitalized downtown area and a higher quality of life similar to Mayor Ash, here in Knoxville.

In Wisconsin, Governor Tommy Thompson led bipartisan reform and proved that welfare dependence could be reversed - reducing the rolls in his state by 91 percent similar to Governor Sundquist, here in Tennessee.

In Texas, we never lack for partisan battles. Texas is a two-party state where tough politics comes naturally. But when it counts, we work to put the public interest first. In my first term as governor, I worked with a Democratic legislature to reform education, the legal system, juvenile justice, and welfare. These were joint accomplishments of a Republican governor and a Democratic legislature.

Politics has not been my career. And what I've learned in the private sector has proven true in government: a little good will goes a long way. Good will is earned by respecting your opponents, telling the truth, and leaving yesterday's quarrels behind.

And if good will is to prevail, a leader must set the right tone. A leader guided his convictions, not by the counsel of his pollster. A strong leader sets his mind to solving problems, not settling scores. Every successful mayor and governor understands this. And so should the next president.

With just seven months until the end of his term, we will leave our current president to the judgment of history. What matters now is

whether the bitterness that now prevails in Washington will continue after his term.

There is a clear choice in this campaign, and the people are seeing it in the kind of tone we set, and how we talk about the big issues facing America. Take social security, for example. Recently I laid out a plan, a framework, to guide bipartisan reform in social security, to increase its value and keep our commitments to the elderly. There will be reasonable disagreements on this important issue. Surely, all can agree that this is a serious matter requiring the best efforts of both parties.

And yet all we have heard from my opponent are the familiar exaggerations and scare tactics. Ideas he doesn't share are never just the other side of an issue: They are “radical” or “reckless” ideas. Proposals he disapproves of are never just arguable; they are always “risky schemes.”

This kind of unnecessary rhetoric is characteristic of the tone in Washington. It's the war-room mentality - the hostile stance, the harsh charges, the lashing out at enemies. We have had eight years of this, and eight years is enough.

We need a clean break from the recent past. It is time for leadership that sets a new tone - a tone of respect and bipartisanship.

A president can do this. He can refrain from personal attacks, and treat members of both parties with respect. He can reach across the partisan aisle and work with all for the good of the country.

In this same spirit, there are some practical steps we can take to change Washington. I am proposing today a set of six specific reforms relating to the budget process, pork-barrel spending, and nominations.

First, the budget process. I will propose that the federal budget be passed by both houses of Congress and signed by the president into law.

As it is now, the president and Congress work separately on their own budget proposals. Only very late in the year do these two branches

begin working together on the details. Often their separate budgets are just a prelude to battle. A joint budget resolution signed by the legislative branch and the executive branch would start the process on the right footing, encouraging cooperation, and early agreement on fundamentals.

I also support a law putting the entire budget and appropriations process on a biennial basis, as is done in my state and 20 others.

If the discord in Washington never seems to end, this is partly because the budget process never seems to end. Lawmakers spend more than half of their time each year wrangling over budget resolutions, reconciliation bills, and appropriations bills. And often, as many legislators will tell you, they've hardly had time to examine the bills before the vote is taken.

By putting the process on a two-year schedule, we allow more time for thoughtful debate on the whole range of issues facing the Congress - better oversight of the bureaucracy, confirmations, and other long term concerns.

I will also propose a bill ending the annual threat of shutting down the government. These threats have given both parties some moments we all prefer to forget. Disagreements have become deadlocks, the entire budget process resulting in no budget at all. Americans have had to watch federal agencies close for business and national parks and monuments turn away visitors.

These standoffs have undermined public confidence in government. To ensure that the government does not shut down again, here is what I propose.

If an appropriations bill is not signed by October first of the new fiscal year, affected programs would continue to be funded at the level of the president's budget, or the previous year's level as approved by Congress - whichever is lower.

Behind this reform is the simple principle that, above and beyond the quarrels of the moment, the United States government has certain basic commitments, and those commitments must be kept.

Next, I will address a longstanding source of public irritation and outrage - the wasteful habit of pork-barrel spending.

It's often said that one politician's "pork" is another's vital project, one district's "corporate welfare" another district's vital federal investment. But we need a more objective definition of "vital."

This confusion is the source of too much waste, and too much haggling, bargaining, and resentment in Washington. We have all heard examples of wasteful spending, such as the \$250,000 to research caffeinated chewing gum. Or the 750,000 dollars for grasshopper research. New examples come along every year. The process never seems to change.

I support the establishment of a bipartisan commission to eliminate pork throughout the federal government.

There is bipartisan support for such a commission, including the backing of Senators McCain, Thompson, Abraham, and Lieberman. But such an idea needs a presidential push, which I will give it. This panel will submit to Congress a list of all spending projects deemed frivolous and unnecessary. The Congress will then cast a simple "up" or "down" vote. No amendments, no back-scratching, no logrolling.

Further, to bring fiscal discipline to the budget, I will ask Congress to pass line-item veto legislation.

The Supreme Court has made clear how such legislation can pass constitutional muster. Congress cannot give the president a permanent line-item veto. But it can give the president authority to decline to spend wasteful appropriations. As president, I will seek that constitutional authority. And I will use it to prevent spending that fails to serve the

public interest. And I will use the unspent money to pay down the national debt.

These reforms can take some of the friction out of our national politics - and justify greater public confidence in Washington. But they are reforms of procedure only. In the end, only the spirit of the lawmakers themselves can bring real change to Washington. Above all else, we must call a truce to politics as combat - where differences of principle give rise to unprincipled attacks on character.

A good place to start is the nomination and confirmation process. The Constitution empowers the president to nominate officers of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is clear-cut, straightforward language. It does not empower anyone to turn the process into a protracted ordeal of unreasonable delay and unrelenting investigation.

Yet somewhere along the way, that is what Senate confirmations became - lengthy, partisan, and unpleasant. Often they are occasions for pushing larger agendas, having nothing to do with the merits of the nominee. At some memorable low points, hearings have become a gauntlet of accusation, interest-group warfare, and public humiliation. This has done enough harm to the process.

The president and the Senate have a joint responsibility here. The president must be prompt in submitting his nominations, and the Senate prompt in acting upon them. Starting next January, I will make the prompt submission of my presidential nominees a top priority. And I will ask the Senate to act on each nominee I submit within 60 days. I would ask Republicans and Democrats in the Senate to follow this standard regardless of who may be elected next November.

Public service is an honorable calling, and there are many now serving in Washington who view it just that way. But their voices are

easily drowned out in the din of battle. Instead, the agenda is determined - the tone set - by the loud, the aggressive, the contentious.

This should not be the spirit of Washington. This is no way to encourage good people to serve, and no way to build a legacy of accomplishment.

None of us can control how others will conduct themselves. But each of us can control our own actions and our own words. As president, I will set a new tone in Washington. I will do everything I can to restore civility to our national politics - a respect for honest differences, and a decent regard for one another.

**George W. Bush**

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

June 9, 2000

***Making the Government More Efficient***

...

My goals for America are clear. To make sure that every child is educated, by returning high standards and accountability to public schools.

To bring more economic growth and opportunity, by reducing the income tax burden on all Americans – especially those aspiring to the middle class.

To keep our commitment to elderly Americans, and generations to come, by saving and strengthening social security.

To keep the peace, by building a national missile defense, modernizing our military, and establishing clear principles for the use of our power in a changing world.

All of these reforms will require a departure from old ways of government. Each will depend on reforms in government itself. Yesterday, in Knoxville, I spoke about the way business is conducted in Washington – the tone of the nation’s capital and the spirit of our politics. I offered ideas that represent a new approach to the people’s business – ideas that will restore confidence in government, and return a measure of civility and decency to the national debate.

Today my subject is the everyday operations and attitudes of the federal government – how it goes about its business and how it treats the people it is obligated to serve.

The model here, of course, is the private sector. Never before have private businesses been so quick to change and adapt – so accountable

to the customer. Everywhere in the private sector we see innovation, competition, results. Ideas and information are proving as valuable as machinery and factories. Custom design is replacing mass production. Services once delivered in days now come in seconds. Technology and information have created a remarkable age where time and distance have shrunk to almost nothing.

The effect of all this is clear: more choices, more information, and more power for the citizens and local communities. And with that power, more responsibility.

This new culture has extended its reach into some levels of government, which are transforming the way they do business.

In Houston, the city's school system has partnered with a private education company to help the most troubled students. Under the agreement, if students' reading and math scores don't improve, the firm must continue to help these students at no cost to the city.

In Pennsylvania, Governor Ridge has reformed public contracting. The state now uses online auctions to buy bulk commodities like rock salt or coal, eliminating the shadow of favoritism and influence that has always haunted government contracting.

Indianapolis has put 80 municipal services – from trash collection to golf courses – up for competitive bidding. So far, taxpayers have saved hundreds of millions of dollars.

In Virginia and Arizona, instead of standing in line for hours, drivers can renew their licenses over the Internet.

Across America, people are learning about this trend of reform from first hand experience. Yet it appears largely to have escaped the notice of the federal government.

Today, when Americans look to Washington, they see a government slow to respond. Slow to reform. And ignoring all the changes going on

around it. At times the government is simply irrational, running things without any standard of what is necessary, or even what was intended.

When an elderly patient is denied Medicare reimbursement for a simple procedure, it takes almost two years to process an appeal. Part of the reason may be that there are 132,000 pages of Medicare regulations.

Federal education policy can be even more bewildering. It is so complicated that there are 788 programs to carry it out. And there's actually a federal committee trying to figure out who's doing what in these 788 programs. The committee's been at work for 17 years now. Maybe it's become an example of the problem it set out to solve.

The federal government is also responsible for the safety of our nation's food supply. The way things work now, there's one agency that inspects cheese pizza. There's another to inspect pepperoni pizza. There is one agency that inspects food grown outside the United States. Another that inspects food grown here. Apparently, the revolutionary idea that maybe these functions could be combined hasn't dawned on anyone yet.

Americans hear examples like this and conclude, quite reasonably, that government is too big and it spends too much. That is true. But size and inefficiency are not the only problems our federal government faces. Our government in Washington acts in a way that squanders the people's confidence – the confidence that John F. Kennedy called the basis of effective government.

You may recall that the present Administration came to Washington promising to change all this, to clear away the clutter of bureaucracy and streamline the system. They called their idea a National Performance Review to “reinvent government.”

At last report, they were, in the vice president's words, “making progress” in cutting government spending. But that doesn't square with

the numbers. The General Accounting Office looked into some of these claims of big savings. Of those reviewed by the GAO, two-thirds had no evidence to back them up.

The Administration claims to have reduced the number of low- and mid-level workers in the federal government. As it turns out, many positions have been eliminated – but the layers of middle and senior managers have multiplied. We now have Washington offices crowded with people bearing titles like “associate principal deputy assistant secretary” or “assistant chief of staff to the administrator.”

My point here is that for all the Administration’s rhetoric about reinvention, they never ask fundamental questions about the purpose of government – what it is doing, or whether it should be doing it at all. At a time when private businesses are turning to leaner management teams, Washington keeps adding new managers. They haven’t re-invented government bureaucracy – they’ve just reshuffled it.

Throughout this campaign, I have set forth policies that capture my vision of government reform. They are guided by three principles: government should be citizen-centered, results-oriented, and, wherever possible, market-based.

In my administration, government will be an ally of the new economy. Government will rely more on the good judgment and common sense of the people themselves. Government will give citizens more options, and fewer orders. Government will respect the people, and answer to them, in every department and bureau and agency. This is, after all, what the term public service is supposed to mean.

My education reforms would empower parents, school districts, and states. I would require school-by-school report cards, published on the Internet so that parents can hold schools responsible. The Administration claims to want the same thing. Yet unlike them, I will

insist on regular tests – selected by the states – so that we can measure results, and demand accountability.

I believe faith-based programs should play a greater part in the after-school activities the federal government supports for at-risk children. While the administration would place strict limits on these kinds of programs, I will open the door wide and let private and religious charities compete for every contract they can.

Here's a third example of how my approach differs from the Administration. I believe seniors on Medicare should have more choices among private health care plans, including prescription drugs, just as every federal worker has. The failure to provide such choice is another example of government overlooking the millions of Americans it is supposed to serve.

In size and scale, modern government will never resemble what the Framers envisioned. In spirit, however, it should always be a citizen-centered government – listening and answering directly to the people.

That is why I will reduce the number of mid- and senior-level managers in the federal government. More than 80,000 federal employees in managerial positions are scheduled to retire over the next eight years. I propose that half of them not be replaced.

The idea here is to clear away the layers between the citizen and the decision-maker – between the person with the problem and the person with the answer. Every extra layer of management makes it harder to get things decided. There's always another form to be filled out, another sign-off from the next level up. Quality of service becomes an afterthought, and it's never clear who's really accountable.

Credit must go to this Administration for applying Internet technology to government departments and agencies. But even on this front, they lag far behind their counterparts at the state and local level.

I will expand the use of the Internet to empower citizens, allowing them to request customized information from Washington when they need it, not just when Washington wants to give it to them. In many areas, even this is not enough. True reform involves not just giving people information, but giving them the freedom to act on it.

Second, government should be results-oriented – guided not by process but by performance. There comes a time when every program must be judged either a success or a failure. Where we find success, we should reward it, repeat it, make it the standard. And where we find failure, we must call it by its name. Government action that fails in its purpose must be reformed or be ended.

In government, sometimes just observing the process –going through the motions – counts as a success. Here’s an example. Under a law signed by President Clinton, every federal department and agency faces an annual audit to improve accountability. The government, through many of its departments and agencies, has failed all three audits since the law took effect in 1997. And what happened as a result? Nothing.

Without accountability, how can we ever expect results? Under my administration, we will bring this cycle of funding failure to an abrupt end. As president, I will hold all affected agencies accountable for passing their audits by no later than 2002.

I will also enforce the Government Performance and Results Act. This is a powerful tool that asks agencies to report what they are actually accomplishing. This law has not been taken seriously enough. For example, as the Department of Commerce has defined it, a goal is “substantially met” if performance is at just two-thirds of the target level.

In my administration, standards will be higher, and results will matter. We must have a government that thinks differently, so we need to recruit talented and imaginative people to public service. We can do

this by reforming the civil service with a few simple measures. We'll establish a meaningful system to measure performance. Create awards for employees who surpass expectations. Tie pay increases to performance. We'll attract people who value achievement. With a system of rewards and accountability, we'll promote this culture throughout the federal government.

In keeping with the principle of results-oriented government, we will eliminate duplicative and overlapping programs and agencies. Consider the federal government's efforts to help at-risk youth. We can all agree on this worthy objective. But with 117 federal programs – divided among 15 federal agencies – all aimed at this goal, who can tell whether or not we're succeeding at all?

Then there is economic development – a mission claimed by no fewer than 342 separate programs. Here again, it is impossible to judge whether we're meeting our goal when the efforts are so fragmented and scattershot. For that matter, how can any one of these programs possibly know what the other 341 are doing?

The state of Texas once had a similar problem. But under a law passed some years ago, we have a Sunset Advisory Commission to clear away government activities that have outlived their purpose. The Commission has closed or consolidated 43 programs. The Commission also recommends ways to support agencies that are performing well, and to reform those that are not.

As president, I will ask Congress to establish a Sunset Review Board at the federal level. It will have a specific charge: To review every agency and every program at least once every decade.

Finally, government should be market-based – encouraging competition, innovation, and choice. When government dominates any field, there is little reward for innovation, and little regard for customers.

Government often treats private contractors as if they were another government agency. That is, contracts are awarded based on compliance with bureaucratic rules. Results are secondary.

Under my proposal, over the next five years, a majority of the service contracts offered throughout the federal government will be performance-based. In other words, rather than micromanaging the details of how contractors operate, the government will simply demand a result, and give the contractor the freedom to achieve it in the best way.

I will also open government to the discipline of competition. We've seen how the private sector can achieve significant savings by using the Internet for purchases, through online auctions and business-to-business, or "B2B" transactions. We should work to use the same methods in federal procurement.

In addition, we should no longer allow agencies to exempt themselves from competitive pressures. At least 900,000 full-time federal employees are performing tasks that could be done by companies in the private sector. I will put as many of these tasks as possible up for competitive bidding. If the private sector can do a better job, the private sector should get the contract.

Any governor knows how complicated the work of reform can be. It is only more so at the federal level, with a two-trillion-dollar-a-year government grown set in its ways and comfortable in its distance from the people.

Government likes to begin things – to declare grand new programs and causes and national objectives. But good beginnings are not the measure of success, in government or in any other pursuit. What matters in the end is completion. Performance. Results. Not just making promises, but making good on promises.

In my Administration, that will be the standard from the farthest

regional office of government to the highest office in the land. We will do our duty – day in and day out – never forgetting why we are there, and whom we must serve. Only in this way is public confidence restored. Only in this way do we earn the right to lead.

...

**George W. Bush**

California Republican Party Convention via Satellite

Austin, Texas

September 16, 2000

***View on the Role of Government: Gore Plan vs. Mine***

...

I do not believe government is the enemy – but I do not believe it is always the answer. At its best, it can help people find the tools they need to build for themselves. At its best, it gives options, not orders. At its best, government can help us live our lives – but it must never run our lives.

My opponent’s ideas are shaped by a quarter century in Washington – and they were tired even when his career began. Every big idea means bigger government. Rules replace choices.

Regulations replace responsibility. It is an old temptation: You start off trying to help people, and end up telling them what to do.

The Vice President talks about “the people versus the powerful.” But, in all his plans, who ends up with the power? Who always ends up making the choices? Not taxpayers, but tax collectors. Not senior citizens, but HMO overseers. Not parents, or even teachers, but some distant central office.

He says he wants to help “the people.” If only he would trust them.

He is trying to have it both ways. But, as Ronald Reagan said, “You can’t be for big government, big bureaucracy, and still be for the little guy.”

I have found that to win the trust of the people, you have to trust them in return. Our agenda trusts people with responsibility, and opens wide the door of opportunity. To every man and woman, a chance to

succeed. To every child, a chance to learn. To every family, a chance to live with dignity and hope.

This message has united our party. It is inspiring our country. It will win the support of Democrats and independents. And it will win, for our cause, the state of California.

**George W. Bush**

October 5, 2000

***TV Ad: "Trust"***



*[Bush]:*

I believe we need to encourage personal responsibility so people are accountable for their actions. And I believe in government that is responsible to the people. That's the difference in philosophy between my opponent and me. He trusts government. I trust you. I trust you to invest some of your own Social Security money for higher returns. I trust local people to run their own schools. In return for federal money, I will insist on performance.

And if schools continue to fail, we'll give parents different options. I trust you with some of the budget surplus. I believe one fourth of the surplus should go back to the people who pay the bills. My opponent proposes targeted tax cuts only for those he calls the right people. And that means half of all income tax payers get nothing at all. We should help people live their lives but not run them.

Because when we trust individuals, when we respect local control of schools, when we empower communities, together we can ignite America's spirit and renew our purpose.

*(On screen: Paid for by Bush-Cheney 2000, Inc. and the Republican*

*National Committee)*

## **George W. Bush**

Republican National Convention 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

### ***Party Platform: Judicial Reform***

Americans have the right to a judicial system they can trust. There is no question that the need for reform extends to the judicial branch of government. Many judges disregard the safety, values, and freedom of law-abiding citizens. At the expense of our children and families, they make up laws, invent new rights, free vicious criminals, and pamper felons in prison. They have arbitrarily overturned state laws enacted by citizen referenda, utterly disregarding the right of the people and the democratic process.

The sound principle of judicial review has turned into an intolerable presumption of judicial supremacy. A Republican Congress, working with a Republican president, will restore the separation of powers and reestablish a government of law. There are different ways to achieve that goal — setting terms for federal judges, for example, or using Article III of the Constitution to limit their appellate jurisdiction — but the most important factor is the appointing power of the presidency. We applaud Governor Bush's pledge to name only judges who have demonstrated that they share his conservative beliefs and respect the Constitution.

Reform of the legal profession is an essential part of court reform. Today's litigation practices make a mockery of justice, hinder our country's competitiveness in the world market and, far worse, erode the public's trust in the entire judicial process.

Avarice among many plaintiffs' lawyers has clogged our civil courts, drastically changed the practice of medicine, and costs American companies and consumers more than \$150 billion a year. Who profits?

On average, more than fifty cents of every dollar paid out in tort cases goes to lawyers' fees, not to an injured party. This amounts to a tax on consumers to fatten the wallets of trial lawyers.

Let's be blunt about the effects of all that cash: Our civil justice reforms have been blocked in the Capitol and vetoed in the Oval Office. It's why federal agencies have colluded with the trial lawyer lobby in sweetheart litigation, to advance through the courts what they could not accomplish through the political process. We fully support the role of the courts in vindicating the rights of individuals and organizations, but we want to require higher standards for trial lawyers within federal jurisdiction, much as Governor Bush has already done in Texas — and as we encourage other States to do within their own legal codes. To achieve that goal, we will strengthen the federal rules of civil procedure to increase penalties for frivolous suits and impose a "Three Strikes, You're Out" rule on attorneys who repeatedly file such suits. We will limit "fishing expeditions" by amending federal discovery rules, curb the use of junk science in testimony, and end the abusive use of the RICO statute. We encourage all states to consider placing caps on non-economic and punitive damages in civil cases. We also support such caps in federal causes of action. We also encourage states to examine the effects on the democratic process of advancing policies through litigation that could not be accomplished through the political process.

We will enact a Teacher Protection Act to protect educators from meritless federal lawsuits against their efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom. We will extend similar protections to non-profit organizations — churches, civic and community groups, and the volunteers who sustain them.

To reduce health care costs and keep doctors practicing in critical areas like obstetrics, we will reform medical malpractice law on the

federal level and urge decisive action on the state level as well.

To encourage settlements and to discourage prolonged litigation, a Fair Settlements Rule should be enacted requiring either party in federal court who rejects a timely, reasonable, and good faith pre-trial settlement offer, and who ultimately loses their case, to pay the other party's costs, including legal fees. We also encourage states to consider enacting such rules. To improve access to justice, we will make it easier for cases of national import to be heard in federal courts.

To protect clients against unscrupulous lawyers, we will enact a Clients' Bill of Rights for all federal courts, requiring attorneys to disclose both the range of their fees and their ethical obligation to charge reasonable fees and allowing those fees to be challenged in federal courts. Because private lawyers should not unreasonably profit at public expense, we will prohibit federal agencies from paying contingency fees and encourage states to do so as well. Even more important, we will require attorneys to return to the people any excessive fees they gain under contract to States or municipalities.

An integral part of legal reform is a federal product liability law. Without it, consumers face higher costs, needed products don't make it to the market, and American jobs are lost to foreign competitors. That, too, will change when the American people break the grip of the trial lawyers on our legal system.

## **George W. Bush**

Republican National Convention 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

### ***Party Platform: State and Local Governments***

Trust, pride, and respect: we pledge to restore these qualities to the way Americans view their government. It is the most important of tasks and reflects the overwhelming desire of our citizens for fundamental change in official Washington.

The templates to make this happen are readily available in the 30 states led by Republican governors. These visionary leaders have opened a new era of creative federalism, making government citizen-centered, results-oriented, and, where possible, market-based. Their sound management of public dollars has led to unprecedented surpluses. Services have improved. Waste has been reduced. Taxes have been cut.

State and local governments are also far ahead of official Washington in the creation of e-government: providing information and services to the public via the Internet. Citizens can conduct business with government by going on-line instead of wasting hours in-line. We will e-power citizens at all levels of government. And we will require federal agencies to use savvy, on-line practices to buy smart — and save enormous amounts of money in procurement.

The leadership our governors have shown in these matters only strengthens our commitment to restore the force of the Tenth Amendment, the best protection the American people have against federal intrusion and bullying. We have limited the ability of Congress to impose unfunded mandates on states and on local and tribal governments. The next logical step is to address the unfunded mandates of the past in areas like education and social services. The dramatic

success of welfare reform — once the States were allowed to manage their programs — is a stellar example of what happens when we give power back to the people.

Therefore, in our effort to shift power from Washington back to the states, we must acknowledge as a general matter of course that the federal government's role should be to set high standards and expectations in policies, then get out of the way and let the states implement and operate those policies as they best know how. Washington must respect that one size does not fit all states and must not overburden states with unnecessary strings and red tape attached to its policies.

In the Congress, a Republican majority has modernized our national legislature. They have set term limits for committee chairs and leadership positions, and they have, by law, required Congress to live by the same rules it imposes on others. And, at a time when the nation felt betrayed by misconduct in high office, the Republican Congress responded with gravity and high purpose. We applaud those Members who did their duty to conscience and the Constitution.

There is much to be done, but it can be done only when a Republican president works in tandem with a Republican Congress. We will work to pass legislation to make it clear that public officials who commit crimes will subsequently forfeit their pension rights. We will ensure that IRS audits are never used as a political weapon, so innocent Americans will never again fear the snooping, harassment, and intimidation of recent years. And because an accurate census is essential for representative government, we will respect the Supreme Court's judgment that an actual headcount of persons is the proper way to determine the apportionment of congressional districts.

A Republican president will take the lead in proposing, and fighting

for, the structural changes that are long overdue in the federal government. For starters, the twenty-five year old congressional budget process, though it has helped to make possible today's budget surpluses, has become almost unintelligible to legislators, let alone the average citizen. It has been inadequate to enforce legislated spending caps and cannot stop the phony "emergency" bills that cause the spending caps to be exceeded. It cannot control runaway spending on entitlements and "mandatory" spending; it does not even prevent our government spending \$120 billion on programs whose statutory authority has expired.

Our goal is to replace the status quo with clarity, simplicity, and accountability to the budget process. We will have a biennial budget that has the force of law. To end pork barrel abuses on Capitol Hill, we will:

Eliminate the "baseline budgeting" that artificially boosts spending.

Create a constitutionally sound line item veto for the president, and direct the savings from items vetoed to paying down the national debt.

Prevent government shutdowns by enacting a "Permanent Continuing Resolution" so the spending lobbies can never again extort billions from the taxpayers by blocking the regular order of appropriation bills.

Define legislatively the conditions for "emergency" spending.

Like Congress, the Executive Branch must adapt to the challenges of the new century. There are too many departments and agencies with competing programs that waste resources and fail to deliver the goods: 342 economic development programs, 788 education programs in 40 different agencies at a cost of over \$100 billion a year, 163 job training programs in 15 different agencies. Twelve agencies administer over 35 food safety laws. One agency regulates pizzas with meat; another regulates vegetarian pizzas. (Still another regulates the people who deliver them. Enough said.)

We intend to downsize this mess and make government actually do what it is supposed to, simply by ensuring that all agencies adhere to the Government Performance and Results Act, which has been neglected or ignored by the current administration. By applying its procedures to all federal programs, we can stop the loss of millions of Medicare dollars for services rendered after patients have died. We can put the brakes on an Education Department that pays out \$3.3 billion on defaulted student loans, and an Energy Department that spends \$10 billion on projects that are never completed. Because of its history of needless partisan litigation, we call for the Legal Services Corporation to return to its original purpose of providing legal aid to the indigent, rather than pursuing political causes and agendas. We will, as an urgent priority, restore the integrity of the nation's space program by imposing sound management and strong oversight on NASA.

A Republican president will run the federal government much as the Republican governors run state agencies. Bureaucracy will be reduced and trimmed in size at its upper echelons. If public services can be delivered more efficiently and less expensively through the private sector, they will be privatized. A Republican president will establish accountability, reward performance, put civility back into the civil service, and restore dignity and ethics to the White House.

**George W. Bush**

Republican National Convention 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

***Party Platform: The Nation's Capital***

The District of Columbia is a special responsibility of the federal government and should be a model for urban areas throughout the country. Its downhill slide has at least been arrested, both through its internal efforts and the active intervention of congressional Republicans, who have taken unprecedented steps to help the city recover. Their D.C. homebuyers' tax credit is helping to revitalize marginal neighborhoods; their landmark tuition assistance act has opened the doors of the nation's colleges to D.C. students.

Now, to enhance the city's economic security, reverse the movement out of the city, and ensure a safe and healthy environment for families, we advocate deep reductions in the District's taxes, currently among the highest in the nation, and encourage user-friendly development policies.

We call once again for structural reform of the city's schools so that none of its children will be left behind. We strongly support both charter schools and the opportunity scholarships for poor kids that have been repeatedly blocked by the administration.

We respect the design of the Framers of the Constitution that our nation's capital has a unique status and should remain independent of any individual state.

## **George W. Bush**

Republican National Convention 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

### ***Party Platform: Americans in the Territories***

We welcome greater participation in all aspects of the political process by Americans residing in Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas, and Puerto Rico. Since no single approach can meet the needs of those diverse communities, we emphasize respect for their wishes regarding their relationship to the rest of the Union. We affirm their right to seek the full extension of the Constitution, with all the rights and responsibilities it entails.

We support the Native American Samoans' efforts to preserve their culture and land-tenure system, which fosters self-reliance and strong extended-family values.

We support increased local self-government for the United States citizens of the Virgin Islands, and closer cooperation between the local and federal governments to promote private sector-led development and self-sufficiency.

We recognize that Guam is a strategically vital U.S. territory in the far western Pacific, an American fortress in the Asian region. We affirm our support for the patriotic U.S. citizens of Guam to achieve greater local self-government, an improved federal-territorial relationship, new economic development strategies, and continued self-determination as desired with respect to political status.

We support the right of the United States citizens of Puerto Rico to be admitted to the Union as a fully sovereign state after they freely so determine. We recognize that Congress has the final authority to define the constitutionally valid options for Puerto Rico to achieve a permanent

status with government by consent and full enfranchisement. As long as Puerto Rico is not a State, however, the will of its people regarding their political status should be ascertained by means of a general right of referendum or specific referenda sponsored by the United States government.

## **Government Management - Gore**

### **Al Gore**

Democratic National Convention 2000

Los Angeles, California

#### ***Party Platform: Building a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Government***

Since he took office, Al Gore has led the way in reinventing government - making government more effective in its mission of service to the public. Under his leadership the federal workforce has been cut by 377,000, making it the smallest government since Dwight D. Eisenhower was president. This has been accomplished through cooperation and partnership. Sixteen thousand pages of regulations were scrapped. From tea testers to mohair subsidies to the Navy's own dairy farm, over 200 outdated and unnecessary government programs have been eliminated. As a percentage of the workforce, the federal government is the smallest it has been since the New Deal.

We have saved over \$135 billion - contributing to the surplus and our prosperity. But we have saved something much more precious as well. We have begun to earn back the faith and trust of the American people in their democratic institutions. Trust in government has almost doubled. The first customer survey ever taken of American's satisfaction with the services government delivers found that fully 60 percent felt service had improved in the last two years and rated government services at levels almost as high as services in the private sector.

Today, our government is focused on emphasizing results over red tape, offering Americans quality service, old-fashioned common sense, and working in partnership with the private sector to achieve common goals. Republicans attack public workers and tear down public services.

We have empowered government workers and improved public services.

Now we need to go much further. We have ended the era of big government; its time to end the era of old government. We need to create a government where Americans can easily find the services they need; one that is on-line all the time with no need to wait in line, an open

Government that's always open. On the Internet, citizens will be able to help cut crime in their neighborhood, notify government of potentially dangerous environmental hazards, or sign up for a clinical trial of the latest advances in medicine. And all of this will be done while protecting everyone's personal privacy and with the highest levels of universal access and security. This new e-government will break down barriers to service, reduce costs, and make government accessible for all.

We must forge partnerships between labor and management that recognize the interests of both sides while uniting both front-line government workers and managers in a common crusade to improve government performance.

We must ensure that government has the tools and expertise necessary to provide high-quality services. Democrats do not believe that privatization is a panacea. Some services are inherently public. Democrats also believe that, to ensure government works better and costs less, public employees must be allowed to compete both for their current work and for new work. When government work is contracted out to private companies, they should adhere to same level of accountability as public agencies and those arrangements must incorporate labor, safety, health, civil rights, and other important safeguards.

We must also continue to decentralize our government, to make it more flexible and responsive towards communities and individuals, and to turn its focus towards empowering Americans to take charge of their own lives.

Faith-based and community-based organizations have always been at the forefront in combating the hardships facing families and communities. Democrats believe it is time that government found ways to harness the power of faith-based organizations in tackling social ills such as drug addiction, juvenile violence, and homelessness. However, in contrast to the Republicans, Democrats believe that partnerships with faith-based organizations should augment - not replace - government programs, should respect First Amendment protections, and should never use taxpayer funds to proselytize or to support discrimination.

## **Al Gore**

Democratic National Convention 2000

Los Angeles, California

### ***Party Platform: Judges and the Supreme Court***

We will fight to fill the vacancies on the federal bench to make sure we have enough judges to promptly decide all cases and to end Republican delays in the Senate that have kept qualified nominees, especially women and minorities, waiting literally for years for a Senate vote. Democrats oppose efforts to strip the federal courts of jurisdiction to decide critical issues affecting workers, immigrants, veterans and others of access to justice. And, unlike Republicans, Al Gore will appoint justices to the Supreme Court who have a demonstrated concern for and commitment to the individual rights protected by our Constitution, including the right to privacy.