

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

PORK FOR POLICY:  
EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE IN BRAZIL

Lee J. Alston  
Bernardo Mueller

Working Paper 11273  
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w11273>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH  
1050 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
April 2005

The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

©2005 by Lee J. Alston and Bernardo Mueller. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Pork for Policy: Executive and Legislative Exchange in Brazil  
Lee J. Alston and Bernardo Mueller  
NBER Working Paper No. 11273  
April 2005  
JEL No. D73, D72, D23

**ABSTRACT**

The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 gave relatively strong powers to the President. We model and test Executive-Legislative relations in Brazil and demonstrate that Presidents have used pork as a political currency to exchange for votes on policy reforms. In particular Presidents Cardoso and Lula have used pork to exchange for amendments to the Constitution. Without policy reforms Brazil would have had greater difficulty meeting their debt obligations. The logic for the exchange of pork for policy reform is that Presidents typically have greater electoral incentives than members of Congress to care about economic growth, economic opportunity, income equality and price stabilization. Members of Congress generally care more about redistributing gains to their constituents. Given the differences in preferences and the relative powers of each, the Legislative and Executive benefit by exploiting the gains from trade.

Lee J. Alston  
Institute of Behavioral Sciences  
University of Colorado Campus Box 483  
1416 Broadway Ave  
Boulder, CO 80309  
and NBER  
lee.alston@colorado.edu

Bernardo Mueller  
Institute of Behavioral Sciences  
University of Colorado Campus Box 483  
1416 Broadway Ave  
Boulder, CO 80309  
bmueller@unb.br

## Section 1 - Introduction

It is part of the folklore of the democratization process in many Latin American countries that the power of the executive should be limited. No doubt this emerged because of past abuses. Limiting executive power by giving power to a Congress is not costless. In a utopian world representatives should vote for the “good of the country,” but in the real world they vote for geographic redistribution, e.g., one member of Congress wants a road while another wants an irrigation project. The incentive of the executive differs from that of members of Congress; as head of the country the executive is in a position to internalize the costs and benefits from policies affecting national interests more so than regional interests. As a result of differing electoral connections between the President and members of Congress, the President should care more about economic growth and inequality than members of Congress. To better achieve these goals, it makes sense to give the executive relatively strong powers provided the power is checked, e.g., by a veto in Congress, and a free press. When Brazil returned to democracy in 1985 they structured their federal institutions of governance in a way that retained strong powers for the President. The transition from a military dictatorship to a civilian government in Brazil during the first half of the 1980s was gradual and peaceful rather than revolutionary. As a result many institutions continued from the military regime to democracy, most notably for our analysis was the retention of strong presidential powers. Had there been a clean break between regimes this might not have been the case. We argue that strong presidential powers are the key component in the relationship between the president and Congress. It should be made clear, however, that we are not claiming that strong presidential powers arose because they

facilitate gains to trade, rather they arose historically and have persisted and evolved because they benefited those who had the power to change them.

Within the governance system of Brazil, seven parties currently play a significant legislative role. With seven active parties and a weak committee structure one might imagine that policy is highly unstable in Brazil. Policy stability is important for economic development because it induces private investment, provided the policies are not punitive to investors. There may be a fine line between the ability to reform when needed, and policy stability. In short, policy stability should not be confused with policy gridlock. One of the fundamental dilemmas in all representative democracies is how to induce stability in governmental outcomes while maintaining the ability to reform. Governments need a certain amount of elasticity in the policy space to adapt to changing domestic or international conditions.

We propose to analyze the mechanism in Brazil for inducing policy reform, along with expectations of policy stability. In Brazil parties and committees are far too weak to induce stability. Our analysis rests on the existence of strong executive power that in turn enables the President to mold a stable coalition in Congress. The coalition then functions as a strong party, though with an important caveat: the President is necessarily the leader of the coalition. Without the President at the helm of the coalition, it would be inherently unstable. Like most cartels, some enforcement mechanism is necessary to ensure compliance and prevent defections. Having the President as head of the coalition enables him to capture a large part of the gains from trade between the executive and legislative branches. Importantly, the electoral connection for the President rests on a strong economy and one perceived as satisfying the goals of economic growth, economic opportunity, and greater income inequality,

As is the case of its American counterpart, the Brazilian Congress presents great potential for gains from trade, as well as similar kinds of problems concerning the enforcement and durability of such trades. Although there is a committee system in the Brazilian Congress it does not fulfill the same purpose as that suggested by Weingast and Marshall (1988) for the case of the US Congress. Pereira and Mueller (2000, 2004) show that party leaders routinely change deputies from one committee to another, even against their will, so that having a committee seat does not guarantee property rights over the agenda of the committee. Furthermore, bills can be (and are) routinely taken out of committee by the College of Leaders.<sup>1</sup> As a result committees are not in a position to coordinate legislative exchanges.

Similarly parties cannot play the coordination role because there are too many parties and no one party is large enough to ensure stability. Currently there are seven effective parties in Brazil. It is conceivable that a Congressional institution could arise that would enable a cartel arrangement (coalition) to act as a dominant party but so far this has not happened and we will argue that it is unlikely to happen given the powers of the executive.

For our purposes the most notable feature that emerged from the Constitution of 1988 was the extent of legislative powers conferred to the Executive.<sup>2</sup> The powers of most importance are: 1) the power to establish the status quo through provisional decrees; 2) the sole authority to initiate certain types of legislation, e.g. budgetary and administrative issues; 3) the execution of the budget; 4) the ability to appoint a cabinet (though like the U.S. this is subject to the approval of the Senate); and 5) immense discretion over patronage jobs. We will elaborate briefly on each of these powers.

### Provisional Decrees

The President has the power to change the status quo policy by issuing decrees that remain in force for 30 days unless overturned by a majority vote in a joint session of Congress. After 30 days the President can reissue the decree. Provisional decrees have been used extensively and increasingly since 1988. According to Figueiredo and Limongi (2000a: 155), from 1989 to 1997, Presidents issued 446 provisional decrees (without counting reissues) and Congress rejected only 3%.<sup>3</sup> Monteiro (2000b) computed the number of provisional decrees in effect every month (including reissues) for each bill enacted through regular legislative procedures. During President Cardoso's first and second term that number oscillated from 1.8 decrees per regular bill in April 1995 to 6.5 in July 1999, with a clear increase in the trend over time. The average life of a provisional decree over this period was approximately 20 months.<sup>4</sup>

### Exclusive Initiation Rights

The executive has exclusive constitutional rights to initiate budgetary and administrative legislation. Budgetary legislation involves the elaboration and subsequent changes to the budget. Administrative legislation includes: laws that create new ministries, agencies and even public corporations; new positions within the public sector; the mandates of the public entities; and the determination of wages within public entities excluding Congress and the Judiciary. Presidents use their exclusionary rights often and successfully: from 1989 to 1994 the President initiated almost 70% of the 1,259 laws approved by Congress from 1989 to 1994 - 41% were budgetary, 10% administrative and 18% provisional decrees (Figueiredo and Limongi, 1996: 69).<sup>5</sup> The President also initiated successfully an additional 10% of the laws passed in areas over which he does not have

exclusive rights. Cardoso continued the same pattern: he initiated 80.5% of all enacted legislation from 1995 to 1998 (Pereira and Mueller, 2000: 48).

#### Execution of the budget

The executive office not only initiates the budgetary process but also carries it out. After the executive submits a bill to Congress, the legislature may amend it. Many of these amendments entail pork barrel projects in a legislator's district. After Congress as a whole amends, the budget goes first through a Combined Budget Committee that prunes out some pork.<sup>6</sup> From Congress the bill goes back to the President who has line-item veto power. Once a bill is passed the President decides which amendments get executed, based on political and budgetary considerations. For example, the President can argue that he will not implement an amendment because of insufficient tax receipts to cover the expenditure. Discretion over execution gives the President enormous power to reward or punish legislative behavior. Ames (1995a) first related budget amendments to roll call votes. Pereira (1999) and Pereira and Mueller (2000) provide further evidence that the President uses his discretion strategically.

#### Cabinet Appointments

One mechanism by which the President rewards legislative behavior is through Cabinet appointments.<sup>7</sup> This power is used throughout a President's term to reward or punish voting behavior in favor of or contrary to the President's preferences. Cabinet appointments are usually distributed to parties, whose leaders then have more means to discipline their members. However, in some cases these appointments can go to particularly influential individuals who are able to deliver the support of several congressmen. Throughout his terms, Cardoso has been explicit about this mechanism in the media,

making it well known that the appointment remained contingent on continual support in Congress.

### Patronage

Patronage positions are numerous. Fleischer (1998) states that the executive controls over 40,000 jobs throughout Brazil. These positions range from cabinet positions to second and third rank jobs, which in most countries would be civil service appointments. Rather than simply rewarding friends who got out the vote, some of these positions go to standing members of Congress, suggesting that these positions can bring influence or wealth. Indeed in many instances, time spent in Congress is an investment made to secure an executive appointment.

As a result of these five powers the President has dominated the legislative agenda both in timing and content. The legislature rarely defeats the proposals of the President.<sup>8</sup> The preponderance of the Executive in legislative procedures accounts for the claim by some scholars that the Brazilian Congress has abdicated its main constitutional authority to the Executive.<sup>9</sup> We will argue that this notion goes too far because Congress as a whole has the power of veto to resist the Executive's advances, or even to change the rules that are the underpinning of the Executive's powers. The fact that it has not done so suggests that a majority of members of Congress benefit from the status quo as compared to a counterfactual world of multiple parties facing a severe collection action problem in the legislative arena. The College of Leaders has the potential to organize legislative exchanges but it currently lacks any enforcement mechanisms for legislative exchanges. In short, outside of the powers of Presidency, there is no apparent extant institution within Congress that could improve on the status quo. The powers of the executive fill this void, enabling



members of and parties within the coalition to achieve many of the gains from trade that arise through other mechanisms (e.g. committees) in other countries.

Our paper contributes to the literature that analyzes the effect of political institutions on public policy and policy outcomes (North and Weingast 1989, North 1981 and 1990, Levy and Spiller 1996, Haggard and McCubbins 2001, Dixit 1996, Moe 1990, Spiller and Tommasi 2002). More specifically it is concerned with how countries' political institutions affect the trade-off between gridlock and instability that permeates all policy-making (Shepsle and Weingast, 1981; Weingast and Marshall, 1988). The way in which the political structure maps into the ability to reform and to commit has been a subject of growing interest in the literature. Our paper relates closely to several recent strands in this literature, particularly those concerned with institutions that determine legislative-executive relations. Our focus on the strong powers of the Brazilian president and his ability to bargain with a coalition with different preferences is directly related to the notion of separation of power and separation of propose in Cox and McCubbins' (2001) and Shugart and Haggard (2001). In this regard we argue that Brazil is an example of political system that provides both high levels of governability and responsiveness to the median voter preferences. Our analysis can also be seen as a veto player model where the coalition must agree with the President's proposals for them to be realized, much in the spirit of the models in Tsebelis (2002). Persson and Tabellini (2000; 239-246) and Persson, Roland and Tabellini (1997) provide models that show conditions under which the separation of powers between Congress and the president benefits voters by leading to policies that promote general welfare rather than private benefits to individuals or groups. Our paper is also related to the analysis in Epstein and O'Halloran (1999) regarding how the institutional characteristics of legislative-executive relations, such as divided government and party

conflict affect the decision by Congress whether to delegate policymaking. Finally, our analysis is perhaps most relevant to the comparative literature on the variation among presidential systems (Haggard and McCubbins, 2001, Shugart and Carey 1992). We present a case study of a coalition-based presidential system with strong presidential powers in a context of multiple parties. Although this basic configuration may occur frequently in developing countries, the specific details of the Brazilian case lead to a much less common result; a divided government that can act decisively and where “pork” does not necessarily have significant negative consequences. Understanding the conditions under which this occurs is a contribution towards a better understanding of the relation between political institutions and policy.

Our paper also contributes to the specific literature on Brazilian executive-legislative relations. For the particular case of Brazil there is considerable debate regarding how the political institutions affect the costs of governability and consequently outcomes. The traditional argument has been that electoral rules based on an open list system lead to multiple, fragmented and undisciplined parties, where party leaders are unable to control their members’ votes and presidents consequently face high costs in getting their proposals approved (Ames; 1995a,b, 2001; Carey and Shugart, 1995; Shugart and Carey, 1992; Lamounier 1994a,b; Mainwaring 1993, 1999; Mainwaring and Shugart, 1997). This view has recently been disputed by scholars who argue that Brazilian Presidents since the 1988 Constitution have had remarkable success in enacting their legislative agendas, and that parties are disciplined and able to control their members (Figueiredo and Limongi, 2000a, 2000b; Pereira 1999, Pereira and Mueller 2002; Santos 1997). According to this revisionist view, incentives from the electoral arena that push towards individualistic behavior are countered by the incentives within Congress that derive from the legislative powers of the

President. We argue that not only have Presidents achieved high levels of success in the legislative arena but they have done so at relatively low cost. One of the contributions of this paper is an explicit model of the micro-foundations of legislative-executive relations that are consistent with the revisionist view.

In the following section we present a model in which a President uses his control over the agenda and patronage to pursue his preferred policy. We stress the trade-off between policy outcomes and patronage. In Section 3 derive several results about the gains from trade and who receives the gains. In Section 4 we analyze pension reform from 1995 to 2004 and data from budget execution as a test of our model. In Section 5 we offer some concluding remarks.

## **Section 2 – A Model of the Brazilian Congress**

In this section we present a model that captures the main elements of the executive-legislative relationship in Brazil. The important feature of the relationship is the agenda power held by the President. This does not mean, however, that the President can unilaterally impose his preferences on Congress: a majority coalition can restrict the policy preferences of the President. To the extent that the President has a greater electoral connection associated with economic growth, stability and national public goods than members of Congress it is desirable to give the President relatively strong legislative powers. However, to the extent that the President has other goals in his objective function or is incompetent, it is important that Congress be able to check the actions of the President.

Our model is largely driven by the trade-off between policy outcomes and patronage, where the outcomes depend on both preferences and on the value of patronage to both members of Congress and the President, that is, on the existence of gains to trade.

In our model we have five political parties, each of which negotiates directly with the President. Although this is often a good representation of reality, as party leaders have several instruments to reward and punish their members, in some cases the transactions are with individual legislators. The model can be easily adapted to having each of the five coalition parties being a legislator in a five member legislature. All legislators belong to a political party and parties either belong to the government's coalition or are part of the opposition. Both of these groups interact in congressional proceedings, constrained by the legislative institutions, and subject to the powers of the executive. We assume that the parties are able to discipline their members.<sup>10</sup> The coalition and the opposition, on the other hand, face the usual coordination problems, however the coalition is able to overcome this by having the executive at the lead.<sup>11</sup>

Figure 1 shows the preferences of the President ( $P$ ) and five parties ( $K_i$   $i=1...5$ ) in a two-dimensional space composed of a policy issue on the horizontal dimension and patronage on the vertical dimension.<sup>12</sup> The policy can be, for example, the minimum retirement age, with the president preferring a higher age than that preferred by each of the parties.<sup>13</sup> The patronage dimension measures the value of patronage in the form of such benefits as individual budget amendments, cabinet posts, jobs or cash provided by the Executive to each party. Suppose that the number of legislators in each party are such that the President needs support of any three parties to have a majority (and a 3/5 majority in the case of constitutional amendments.) Thus in this example  $K_3$ ,  $K_4$  and  $K_5$  will form the President's coalition and  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are in the opposition.

<<Place Figure 1 about here>>

The horizontal line shown in Figure 1 is the zero-patronage line. The points with asterisks are the parties' preferred policy points along the zero-patronage line. Whereas the president's bliss point is on the zero-patronage line, as he would rather not concede any patronage, the parties prefer infinite amounts of patronage so their bliss points do not appear in the figure. The points shown with asterisks are thus the projection of their bliss points on the zero-patronage line. The ellipses show the indifference curves of each legislator to the status quo point  $SQ$ . These are labeled as  $K_i^{SQ^{(i)}}$ ,  $i=1\dots5$ , where the superscript indicates that the curve represents all the points for which the party is indifferent to  $SQ$ . All points within the ellipse are preferred by the party to those on or outside the ellipse. Thus if the president used his agenda power to propose a policy at his preferred point  $P^*$ , all parties would vote against the proposal.

The president anticipates this outcome and thus acts strategically proposing some point more palatable to a majority of parties. In order to show which point exactly the president would propose so as to improve on the status quo with the least cost in terms of patronage, Figure 2 shows a close-up of the previous figure with the point where each legislators' indifference curve through  $SQ$  crosses the zero-patronage line labeled as  $K_i^{SQ^{(0)}}$ .<sup>14</sup> Without the use of patronage, the best the President could do would be to propose a policy at point  $K_3^{SQ^{(0)}}$ , as this would be preferred to the status quo by both  $K_5$  and  $K_4$  and would be indifferent to  $K_3$  (so we assume she would vote in favor). Note, however, that the President can do better than this by using patronage. By proposing a policy at point  $B$  and offering a value in patronage to  $K_3$  valued at  $AB$ , the president gets favorable votes from a majority composed of  $K_3$ ,  $K_4$  and  $K_5$ , and reaches a higher indifference curve than would be achieved without the use of patronage ( $U^P(K_3^{SQ^{(0)}}) > U^P(A)$ ). Point  $A$  is the best

the President can do with this configuration of preferences. Note that although the President incurs a higher cost in terms of patronage by proposing  $A$  rather than  $K_3^{SQ(0)}$ , he is better off doing so as are  $K_4$  and  $K_5$ . At the same time  $K_3$  is indifferent to both situations. Thus the President and some parties realize gains from trade by having a policy-patronage point at  $A$ .

<<Place Figure 2 about here>>

In the example portrayed in Figure 2, the president only provided patronage to one of the parties. This was a result of the specific preferences portrayed by the indifference curves. In Figure 3 we slightly alter those preferences by moving  $K_4^{SQ(0)}$  closer to  $K_3^{SQ(0)}$  to show a situation where more than one party receives patronage. In this case, the previous solution, policy at  $B$  and  $AB$  patronage to  $K_3$ , would no longer defeat the status quo. This is because  $K_4$  prefers  $SQ$  to policy at  $B$ . Without giving patronage to  $K_4$  the best that the President can do is to propose policy at  $K_4^{SQ(0)}$  and give patronage to  $K_3$  worth the distance from  $K_4^{SQ(0)}$  to  $C$ . However, he can do better than this by giving patronage as well to  $K_4$ . The dark line labeled  $K_3^{SQ(\cdot)} + K_4^{SQ(\cdot)}$  is the vertical summation of the indifference curves of both  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  and thus shows the amount of patronage that the President would have to concede in total to compensate both  $K_3$  and  $K_4$ . The most favorable indifference curve of the President is tangent to this curve at point  $D$ . The equilibrium in this case would thus be for the President to propose policy at point  $E$  and to give patronage worth  $DE$  in total to both  $K_3$  and  $K_4$ . The amount given to each is the vertical distance from  $E$  to their indifference curve  $K_i^{SQ(\cdot)}$ , the sum of which equals  $DE$ . In this situation  $K_3$ ,  $K_4$  and  $K_5$  would vote for the policy and the President's utility would be  $U^P(D)$ . Note that if  $K_5$ 's policy preference moved sufficiently to the left, that party too could receive patronage.

<<Place Figure 3 about here>>

The model presented above stylizes the main forces that we believe mold the relationship between the executive and its coalition in Congress. There are several characteristics of that relationship that are not explicitly addressed in the model that should also be considered. The first is that the analysis so far has been made in the context of a one-off negotiation over a single bill; however the relationship is a recurring one involving a series of bills and other procedures besides plenary voting. Therefore the exchange of support for patronage may not be tallied on a bill-by-bill basis, but rather as the cumulative support provided by the party during the legislative year. Only exceptionally is there specific negotiation over individual bills that are particularly controversial and high profile (some examples involving pension reform are given in section 4). The fact that the executive and the coalition play a repeated game helps ensure cooperation, as a party will be willing to forgo a chance to cheat on any given bill so as not to upset the relationship. Repeated play also limits strategic behavior.

Another characteristic of the relationship between the executive and the coalition during the two terms of President Cardoso is that the coalition held a supermajority of seats, approximately 66% in 1994 and 74% in 1998. This means that it was often the case that the executive would be able to pass several bills even without the support of some of the parties in the coalition. This fact also mitigates the weight of our assumption that party leaders are able to perfectly control their members. Even if some members of each party vote against or abstain on any given proposal, the coalition will still be able to approve the bill. This allows some parties or individuals to oppose, with the executive's concurrence, some bills that are particularly harmful to their constituencies, thus avoiding the electoral cost of supporting the bill. Of course the leeway is less in the case of constitutional

amendments, which require a three-fifths majority (60%) and usually involve the more important issues.

### **Section 3 – Gains from Trade in the Brazilian Congress**

The gains from trade are most easily illustrated in Figure 2. If the legislative institutions were such that the President still retained agenda power but did not have the ability to offer patronage, then the best he could do would be to propose  $K_3^{SQ(0)}$ . This represents an improvement for all coalition members considered together (President plus the coalition parties) compared to the status quo where utilities were the same for  $K_3$  but lower for  $K_4$ ,  $K_5$  and the President. But it is an inferior situation compared to that of the President offering patronage, because with patronage the President can improve his position and the party are no worse of compared to the status quo.

The gains from trade, as always, arise from one actor having property rights to a good that is more highly valued by another. That is, they arise when the President gains more utility by giving patronage than the utility cost he incurs in doing so, and the parties gain more utility from the patronage than they lose by having policy move away from their preferred points. Clearly, some issues are sufficiently dear to the parties that it would require more patronage than the President would be willing to offer. In such cases the President would not even bring the proposal to a vote, which explains why some crucial issues, such as political system reform and tax reform, are consistently being postponed. Occasionally the President may miscalculate and propose a bill that will be rejected, however such cases should be relatively rare.

Our model implies that all of the gains from trade go to the President, while the coalition parties that receive patronage remain just as well off as they did at the status quo.



Coalition parties that do not receive patronage, such as  $K_5$  in the example in Figure 3, are better off because the final policy improves their utility compared to the status quo. This result derives from the agenda power held by the President.<sup>15</sup> If the legislative rules were such that the President could not influence the agenda, and assuming that the same coalition were able to remain united, then the coalition could propose a bill at its median point and have it approved, because it has a majority of the votes to pass the bill and override any vetoes. If the legislative rules allowed the President to offer patronage, then he could still pull policy towards  $P$ , but the final outcome would be further from his preferred point than in the case where he had agenda power, as the reversal point would then be the coalition's median preference rather than  $SQ$ . It is the agenda power of the President that provides a structure-induced equilibrium that prevents cycling problems and provides stability to the coalition and policy decisions. If the President did not have agenda power and there were no other institution that had this effect, such as a strong committee system, we expect that the coalition would break and outcomes would become unpredictable. In short there is currently no legislative institution that can solve the collective action problem within Congress of monitoring and enforcing legislative exchanges.

In our model the President receives all the gains from trade but we stress that this does not imply that he is unconstrained by the coalition. The further apart are the President's and the coalition members' preferences, the less the President will be able to accomplish of his reform agenda. Our analysis also demonstrates that if an incompetent or ill intentioned President proposes extreme policies, Congress would check the policies.

The major conclusions from the discussion above are summarized in the following results:

*Result 1 – The Brazilian legislative rules are such that there are significant gains from trade for the members of the coalition and the executive from the exchange of support for patronage. The President’s agenda powers guarantee the stability of the relationship and allow him to appropriate most of the gains.*

The model can also be used to determine the effect of parametric changes in the cost of patronage to the President. Providing patronage involves a series of costs that are reflected in the inclination of the President’s indifference curves. These costs arise for two reasons. The first is the opportunity cost to the President of depleting his capital, since the patronage used to purchase support for a given set of causes cannot be used for other ends. The second is the efficiency cost that arises from the fact that patronage, by transferring the right over specific decisions to members of party  $K_i$ , implies that policies and resource use in those areas may be distant from those that the President would prefer.<sup>16</sup> The slope of the President’s indifference curves measures the cost of providing patronage because by definition those curves show how much patronage the President is willing to give in exchange for having policy move one unit closer to his preferred point along the no-patronage line. The greater the slope of the President’s indifference curves at each point (that is, the more vertically elongated his preference ellipses) the more he cares about policy relative to patronage. Thus, the lower the cost of providing patronage, the greater the slope (in absolute value) of the President’s indifference curves and consequently the closer will be the equilibrium outcome to the President’s preferred point. In Figure 3 an increase in the slope of  $U^P(D)$  would imply a tangency point to  $K_3^{SQ(\cdot)} + K_4^{SQ(\cdot)}$  that would yield a policy closer to  $P$  than  $E$ , with more patronage being given to  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  than  $DE$ .

The shape of the President’s utility curves are primarily determined by his preferences for policy versus patronage. However, they are also determined by the

institutions in Congress and the Executive, which influence the level of costs that determine the amount and quality of patronage a President has to offer, as well as the level of transaction costs involved in doing so. In Section 1 we showed that in Brazil political institutions endow the President with several means of providing patronage at low cost, such as the control of the execution of individual budget amendments by the President. If any of these institutions were altered, affecting the costs of providing patronage, the President's indifference curves would change which in turn would lead to a different outcome. The effect of a parametric reduction in the cost of patronage to the President is to move the policy outcome closer to the President's preferred point. This happens because greater gains from trade can then be realized from the exchange of each unit of patronage.

*Result 2 – Changes that reduce the cost of patronage to the President and the cost of transacting with the coalition parties, lead to greater gains from trade, and policy outcomes more favorable to the President.*

Policy outcomes can also be affected by parametric changes in the indifference curves of the coalition parties. These curves measure how much patronage a party must receive in order to vote for a policy further away from their preferred point and remain just as well off. The steeper these curves, the lower the value of patronage to the party relative to the value of the policy. Thus the less vertically elongated their preference ellipses, the more the parties value patronage. In addition to the parties' innate preferences for policy and patronage, political institutions also influence the shapes of their indifference curves. Changes in legislative or electoral rules, or changes in the voters' preferences or behavior, may alter those curves. In Figure 3, a parametric increase in the value of patronage to the parties implies flatter indifference curves and consequently more favorable policy outcomes to the President. For example, if the President is undergoing a period of intense popularity

it will be more valuable for a party or individual to hold or control a governmental post, as this popularity may rub off onto those seen by the electorate as participating in the government. As another example, the easier it is for the legislators to use patronage so as to benefit themselves, the more highly it will be valued. If the country's institutions make it more acceptable for a legislator to derive rents from a pork barrel project taken home, then the execution of a personal amendment to the budget is more valuable to a legislator.

*Result 3 – The larger the benefit that the members of the coalition are able to derive from a given amount of patronage, the greater the gains from trade and the more favorable will be policy outcomes to the Executive.*

Finally, a perhaps counterintuitive implication of our model is that the President will have to offer more compensation to those coalition parties that are further from his preferences. In Figure 3, for example,  $K_3$  is the furthest from  $P$  and received the majority of patronage,  $DE$ , the total amount of patronage that was given.  $K_4$  was more aligned with the President than  $K_3$  but nevertheless received less patronage. And  $K_5$ , who was even closer to  $P$  received no patronage at all.<sup>17</sup>  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  who are not part of the coalition also received no patronage. In this regard our model has a similar implication to the model in Snyder Jr. (1991): “in order to obtain favorable legislation the president should allocate the distributive benefits he has at his disposal to the congressmen who are slightly opposed to his proposal.”<sup>18</sup> In the following section we will test this implication with data on patronage distribution.

*Result 4 – The further the preference of a coalition party from that of the President, the greater the patronage that party will receive. Therefore coalition parties that have more divergent preferences from those of the President will receive, ceteris*

*paribus, more compensation than those parties closer to the President up to the point where the President has the number of votes that he needs.*

#### **Section 4 – Evidence from Pension Reform**

The success rate of the Brazilian Executive in getting its projects approved in Congress has been impressive. Of the 1,881 bills presented by the various Presidents from 1989 to 1997, 77% were approved and only 1.3% were rejected, the remaining having been withdrawn or still in progress (Figueiredo and Limongi 2000a; 155). The performance of the Cardoso Presidency has been even stronger with an approval of 95.3% of its proposals in the House during his second term (*Jornal do Brasil*, 2001). At first sight this record may lead one to believe that the Executive is able to pursue its agenda with practically no interference from Congress. However, the same outcome can also be explained by a relationship between the Executive and the Legislature as modeled in the previous section. The Executive achieves a high rate of success in getting its proposals approved through its power to set the agenda together with the strategic use of patronage. Providing evidence to support this model is not easy, because a high rate of approval is predicted by both hypotheses.<sup>19</sup>

The percentage of Presidential bills approved per se does not provide much information on the prior explicit and implicit bargaining between the Executive and Congress in order to assure approval. For many proposals the preferences of the coalition are close to the preference of the President and approval follows without bargaining. In other cases preferences are further apart but the combination of patronage and compromise in changing the policy leads to approval. In still other cases the preferences are so divergent

that no such compromise is feasible. When the President perceives preferences as widely divergent, he most likely will withhold the proposal rather than face defeat.

According to our first result, there are significant gains from trade from the exchange of support for patronage. Evidence of patronage should be particularly visible in those instances where preferences diverged but not so much as to rule out exchanges. We should expect to find that the voting behavior of members of the coalition are rewarded and punished by the Executive in the following ways: (i) granting or removing the right to make appointments to patronage positions and (ii) executing or failing to execute the amendments in the budget related to specific legislators. Although there is systematic data available on individual amendments (which we describe below), there is no systematic data on posts in the federal government that have been assigned to deputies. It is usually quite clear which political party, and sometimes even which individual within a party, has been given property rights to appoint cabinet members and several other high-ranking positions. Even with lower positions, such as the head and directors of local branches of many federal companies, pundits and the press will often comment on which congressman choose the appointee. However, given the huge number of posts available for negotiation (Fleischer 1998, estimates this number at 40,000), the unofficial nature of the link between patron and appointee and transitory nature of appointments, it is very difficult to collect systematic information.

To test the hypotheses from the previous section we will look at pension reform during both Cardoso terms, 1995-2002. Our strategy is to associate the use of patronage with specific instances when Congress voted on divisive issues. This will be done in two ways; the first using evidence from the press and the second econometrically testing the determinants of the execution by the President of the amendments to the budget proposed

by Congressmen. We choose pension reform because it is a key element in any plan for economic growth and stabilization, and it has been by far the most contentious issue discussed in Congress in the past ten years. Cardoso sent his first proposal on pension reform to Congress in March 1995, shortly after he took office, and in eight years achieved only limited reform. President Lula who took office in January 2003 chose pension reform as the first major reform to be tackled. (See Table 1 for a chronology of activity.)

At first sight, the choice of focusing on pension reform may seem odd, as this is the major reform where the President was able to approve less of his initial proposal. Resistance by Congress not only forced compromises in terms of policy proposal changes, but even those proposals that did get through did so with great difficulty. Given that we are arguing that the Brazilian system provides high levels of governability at relatively low cost, pension reform would seem to be proof of just the opposite. However, the advantage of focusing on pension reform is that this is perhaps the issue over which the preferences of President Cardoso and his coalition most differed, but where nevertheless the President insisted in pushing forward. Whereas most other issues appeared to be routinely approved without much scrutiny from Congress, resulting in the high success rates for the President described above, in this issue conflicts are more visible and it becomes easier to analyze how these are dealt with. Given the critical state of the Brazilian pension system, any reform would necessarily involve diminishing benefits considered as an acquired right by most of society. The upshot was that practically all voters, and especially several well-organized groups such as civil servants, military and judges, strongly opposed. Therefore congressmen were very reluctant to be seen as supporting the reform, and what ensued was the negotiation between the President and Congress that is described below. That Cardoso insisted in the reforms, and that President Lula has done the same, despite its electoral

unpopularity, is testimony to the internalization by the president of broader issues such as monetary and fiscal stability.<sup>20</sup>

The Cardoso administration viewed pension reform as urgent because since 1997 contributions of workers no longer covered the expenditures on pensions. The fiscal demand of funding pensions is in part reflected in the borrowing costs of the government and has perverse consequences for price stability and continued economic growth. Outside observers (economists in academia, the World Bank and IMF and the press) have noted the lavish and unsustainable nature of Brazil's pension system.

The Brazilian pension system has broken just about every rule known to actuaries. It fixes no minimum retirement age, and allows a host of exceptions and special cases. It allows retired people (called, wonderfully inaccurately, "inactive workers") not only to draw more than one pension but also to go on getting a wage as well. Perhaps uniquely, Brazil not only allows some pensioners to retire on a higher income than they had when working, but also increases their pension every time their working colleagues get a wage rise. (*The Economist*, June 7, 1997).

Although the need for change is not controversial, the devil is in the details. Those who are already retired and those who are currently in the workforce have come to see the benefits promised by the current rules as a property right. The courts have tended to agree. Any solution necessarily implies redistribution and generates opposition, which is reflected in Congress. In addition, many Congressmen have a direct stake in pension reform; 120 members of the 518-seat house collect pensions.<sup>21</sup>

**<<Place Table 1 about here>>**

The first defeat to the Executive's pension reform occurred in March 1996. The proposed bill addressed some of the more blatant distortions of the pension system. It required 35 years of contributions for men and 30 years for women, rather than simply



years of service. In the private sector there was no age requirement for retirement but in the public sector the bill imposed a minimum retirement age of 55 for men and 50 for women, which would be increased to 60 and 55 in 2001. The bill would have capped pensions for the private sector at 10 times the minimum wage (approximately US\$1000). Civil servants would continue to receive the same as their pre-retirement wage but the current 20% bonus on retirement would be deleted. The bill also eliminated the accumulation of multiple pensions. Elected politicians who retired from another job were allowed to continue to receive a salary in addition to their pension.

Many issues in pension reform require a Constitutional amendment, which entails a three-fifths majority of the House (308 of the 513 deputies) and the bill must be approved in two separate votes in both the House and the Senate. After the first vote in the House the government came up fourteen votes short. President Cardoso responded quickly and sent a new bill to Congress in two weeks. This time Cardoso was very careful about his strategy. He attenuated some of the more controversial parts of the reform and made intense use of patronage, leading to passage in the House:

For the next two weeks, the President went to work. He held a meeting with 64 PPB congressmen, hosted a gala luncheon with one leading critic in the PMDB, and made telephone calls to state governors. Just what went on behind closed doors is anyone's guess, though the evidence is mounting that it was plenty. By March 21st, order was restored. The lower house backed the welfare reform.

So all's well? Not quite. The welfare reform has been weakened, to tinker with encrusted privileges not dismantle them... Still, "we made the only advance that was possible," said a relieved Mr Cardoso, thanking the legislators who supported him. And he paid for it. ...

Pork was on the menu in several states. The first time round, all seven congressmen from Rondonia, a small state in the Amazon, voted against the government's welfare reform. After a cordial chat at the Planalto, all seven changed their minds. Soon \$16m in federal cash will go to improve an important road in Rondonia, and one of the state's favourite sons will be heading the local arm of the federal telephone company. Pure coincidence, say officials in Brasilia. The drought-parched north-eastern state of Paraiba won money for an irrigation canal and reservoirs. A power plant was promised for Rio Grande do Sul. The government was no less open-handed with jobs and promotions. (*The Economist*, March 30, 1996)

The difficulties encountered in approving pension reform signaled to the government that the successful completion of more of its reforms would be a more demanding task than had been anticipated. In the following month Cardoso reshuffled the cabinet so as to strengthen the government's base of support in Congress. In addition Cardoso created a Special Ministry for Political Coordination whose purpose was to intermediate and facilitate the channeling of the demands of coalition members to the Executive, and the distribution of patronage in return for political support (Fleischer, 1998, pg. 91). Keeping track of each legislator's demands and voting performance is a formidable task so it is natural that means to do this more effectively would be sought. To better monitor legislative behavior over time the Ministry of Political Coordination created the System of Legislative Performance (SIAL) that centralized all requests by legislators to any governmental agency or Ministry, thus preventing any double granting of patronage or any omission (Pereira, 1999, pg. 107-108). In announcing the creation of the ministry President Cardoso justified that "... when Congress wants to say yes and can't manage to do so it is necessary that we get together to create conditions to make the dialogue flow better" (*O Estado de São Paulo*, April 30 1996).<sup>22</sup>

The second defeat to pension reform came in May 1998 when a proposal instituting a minimum retirement age of 60 for men and 55 for women lost by one vote. The proposed legislation would have significantly reduced the government's pension bill. The bill was defeated despite the Executive's usual appeals and negotiation with its coalition in Congress, a sign of how divisive this issue was, particularly in an election year. After the upset the Executive announced that those deputies that had had their requests granted before the vote and didn't keep their part of the bargain risked having their individual

amendments to the budget shelved and their appointments to positions in the federal government reexamined (*Gazeta Mercantil*, May 8 1998).

Two weeks later the President sent another bill to Congress.<sup>23</sup> This time Cardoso changed the minimum age for retirement to 53 for men and 48 for women, valid only for those already in the social security system. In terms of our model this change can be seen as a compromise in the policy proposed by the government. The defeat in the House showed that the coalition's preferences, which are for a much lower age, were more intense than expected. Even the negotiation of patronage did not guarantee the approval of the bill. Rather than simply offer more patronage to assure the next vote, the Executive opted to mitigate the age requirements. The new bill was approved and finally sealed in a second vote in November 1998. For this final vote the Executive took no risks:

President Cardoso dispensed with his trademark aloofness of his first term and openly pushed for his program, meeting with party leaders and sending telegrams summoning coalition members to vote. A bloc of 37 legislators representing agricultural businesses was promised by the Government that it would delay repayment of more than \$1 billion in farmers' debt in return for their votes, said Hugo Biehl, leader of the farmers' bloc in Congress. The Government also granted farm businesses \$280 million in concessions in exchange for their support. (*The New York Times*, November 6 1998.)

Having exhausted his options regarding age requirements, the President turned to addressing two different margins of pension reform: the size of the tax on income for pensions and the number of taxpayers. This was especially important to the President because it would provide some immediate financial relief at a time of imminent monetary crisis.<sup>24</sup> In December 1998 the House voted to increase pension contributions of civil servants from 11% to 20% of their wages, and also to start taxing the pensions of retired civil servants. This measure would provide an added U\$2.2 billion dollars to the government's coffers over the next year. This measure was bitterly opposed by civil servants who already saw their contributions as too high, and by the retired who saw their pensions as too low. The measure was defeated in the House:

As the vote on the pension approached, some coalition allies jostled for Cabinet posts. Others fielded calls from opponents of the bill. One hundred legislators just stayed away. ... Political analysts say the pension bill failed because the Government, overly confident, neglected the legwork to rally support. The administration also packed too much into one measure, focusing on active and retired government workers along with other groups because of time pressure. (*The New York Times*, December 12 1998.)

In the following month Congress called off its summer recess in an effort to vote a series of backlogged bills. At the same time Cardoso changed several ministerial appointments in order to adapt his Cabinet to changes in the newly elected Congress that would commence in two months. In part, due to the failed pension reform the pressure on the *Real* became overwhelming and Brazil set the *Real* afloat, resulting in a large devaluation.

Under this scenario Cardoso sent to the House a new measure to increase the pension contributions of active and retired civil servants. This time the Executive argued that pension reform was necessary to pull the country out of the economic crisis arising from the devaluation of the *Real*. In addition the heightened need for the measure made Cardoso more willing to exchange pork for support. Congress approved the bill by a safe margin and instituted the new contributions immediately. But, a few months later (October 1999) the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional, forcing the government to revert to previous levels of contributions and return the additional revenue that it had obtained. Cardoso threatened to change the Constitution so as to allow higher levels of contributions but sensing the difficulty of getting these changes through Congress attempted only minor changes to the pension system during the remainder of his term

In January 2003 the new Lula government stepped into office and immediately announced that pensions would be the first major reform it would address. Lula hoped to make the most of his high level of popularity and the momentum from his electoral victory to tackle pension reform, taking advantage of the sense that a left wing government would

have greater legitimacy to impose the kinds of fiscal changes that are necessary (Abranches, 2003:62). Interest groups immediately mobilized to pressure against losing their so-called “acquired rights.” Federal judges, civil servants and the military were quick to express their opposition to losing their privileges. By the end of 2003 the government had succeeded in passing pension reform through Congress.<sup>25</sup>

#### *Evidence on the Strategic use of Individual Budget Amendments*

In this section we analyze the relationship between the voting behavior of the Deputies and the execution of their budget amendments by the President. In Brazil the Executive first proposes the yearly budget and then it passes through Congress where it can be amended by legislators. The amendments generally consist of expenditures in the Congressmen’s district, with the hope of yielding both votes and rents from constituents.<sup>26</sup> Following passage of the budget in Congress, the bill goes back to the President who has discretion over implementation. The process gives the President enormous leverage for rewards and punishments. The President frequently shelves some amendments on the grounds that tax receipts are insufficient to cover all expenditures, though in many instances there appears to be little fiscal merit to his veto.

One of the implications of our model is that there should be a direct link between the voting behavior of the members of Congress and the execution of their individual budget amendments. In order to test this implication we focus on one particular instance when the President had a proposal rejected and a couple of weeks later submitted a new attenuated proposal that Congress approved. The specific case, already described above, involved a second round defeat in the House of establishing a minimum age for retirement of 60 for men and 55 for women (May 6, 1998), and the subsequent approval of a minimum

age of 53 for men and 48 for women (May 23, 1998). Our strategy is to regress the percentage of the total value of each deputy's amendments that were executed in 1998 on a series of variables that should affect the President's decision whether to execute those amendments. The key explanatory variables will be two dummies: 1) those deputies who switched their vote from *no*, against the President's proposal to *yes* in favor of the President's proposal; and 2) those deputies who switched their vote from *yes* in favor of the President's proposal to *no*, against the President's proposal. For pension reform a supermajority is needed. The first vote tallied 307 in favor, 148 against and 11 abstentions, missing the 308 approval mark by 1 vote. The second vote tallied 333 – 149 – 3, with 15 switching from *no* to *yes* and 9 from *yes* to *no*, the balance being explained by abstentions and absences.<sup>27</sup>

The other explanatory variables are: (i) *Votes* - the percentage of times the deputy voted favorable to the President's position in the 1995-1998 period; (ii) *Exec. Amend. 1997* - the percentage of the total value of individual budget amendments that were executed in the previous year, 1997; (iii) *Position* - a dummy that equals 1 if the deputy held a powerful position within Congress during that year, such as speaker, party leader, committee president or *rapporteur*; (iv) *N<sup>0</sup> Amendments* - the number of amendments submitted by the deputy that year; and (v) *Seniority* – the number of terms served by the deputy.

*Votes* should capture the degree to which the President uses the execution of the budget amendments to reward and punish those who vote for or against his proposals. To control for the endogeneity of voting behavior we estimated *Votes* simultaneously using instruments, including dummies identifying whether the deputy was a member of a party in the core coalition, on the fringe of the coalition or in the opposition.<sup>28</sup>

*Exec. Amend. 1997* should capture any persistent capacity to get amendments executed. For example, a given deputy might have a more capable staff than others, which can affect her chances of execution. The *Position* and *Seniority* variables should capture the effect of influence and experience, and the  $N^0$  *Amendments* is primarily a control variable and should measure whether those who propose more amendments have a greater or lesser likelihood of having amendments executed.

<<Place Table 2 about here>>

<<Place Table 3 about here>>

We present descriptive statistics and results in Tables 1 and 2. Deputies who voted in accord with the President received more *pork* in terms of budgetary amendments. A 10 percentage point increase in *Votes* (.4 of the standard deviation) increased the proportion of the value of a deputy's amendments that were executed by almost 3%. Not surprisingly there appears to be considerable stasis in the reception of *pork* as indicated by the coefficient on *Exec. Amend. 1997*. This may partially explain why the coefficients on *Position* and *Seniority* are not reliably different from zero. Of course this does not rule out that *Position* and *Seniority* have pay-offs other than budget amendment execution. The coefficient on  $N^0$  *Amendments* is small; an additional amendment leads to an increase of only 0.42% in the value of total amendments that are executed.<sup>29</sup>

The results of most importance for our model of exchange of pork for policy are the coefficients *No to Yes* and *Yes to No*. Switching votes from opposition to the President's proposal for establishing a minimum age for retirement to support for a minimum age increases the value of amendments by 11%. Changing votes from *yes* to *no* had less of an impact but was still reasonably large: a 5% decrease in *pork*. Overall the results are

consistent with our expectations and when combined with the qualitative evidence indicate a strong case in favor of our model of gains from trade between legislators and the President.

Finally we test result 4 of our model: the President will deliver more benefits to legislators who are in the coalition but further from his preferences than he will to those who are closer. To do this we use the index created by Leoni (2000, 2002) as a measure of the “ideological” position of each legislator and the President.<sup>30</sup> This index is the first dimension of a W-Nominate procedure (Poole and Rosenthal, 1985) which alone typically explains over 90% of the variation of deputies’ votes in Brazil (Leoni, 2002). It can be interpreted as the deputies’ position on a left-right spatial dimension. Our test consists of explaining the value of each deputy’s congressionally approved amendments that the President chose to execute in the 51<sup>nd</sup> legislature (1999-2002). For the test we fitted a polynomial equation using the absolute value of the distance of each deputy to the President.<sup>31</sup> This strategy allows for a non-linear relationship between the distance of each deputy to the President and the value of patronage received through amendments. Thus we can see whether the President distributes benefits based on the ideological distance of the deputy from the President. We are most interested in whether deputies who are slightly further away receive more than those that are very close and very far. For 1999 and 2000 (Cardoso years) the predicted relationship between executed amendments and distance to the President exhibited a pattern where the value of amendments first increased and then decreased as the deputies became more divergent from the President’s preferences, see figure 5.<sup>32</sup> For 2001 and 2002 we found the same relationship but the statistical reliability was weak.<sup>33</sup>

<<Place Figure 4 about here>>



Though this test is supportive of our model we stress that our statistical test only controls for the value of amendments as pork whereas the President has several other forms of patronage to trade, such as posts in government, as well as instruments to punish deviant behavior. Nevertheless the results suggest that the “prodigal son” effect may hold.

## **Section 5 – Conclusion**

The media in Brazil commonly laments the exchange of pork for policy. Such complaints ignore the counterfactual: in the absence of exchanging pork for policy the President would accomplish less of his policy agenda and policies would be either highly unstable or in gridlock. One could conceive of some other Congressional institution, such as strong committees, as stabilizing policy. But, because of a differing electoral connections between votes and policies, Presidential power as the stabilizing factor has the advantage that the President, more so than members of Congress, should place a higher weight in his utility function on the national interests of economic growth, income equality, economic opportunity and price stabilization. The concerns of Congressmen are more likely more parochial because Congressmen are in less of a position to internalize the gains from growth enhancing policies whereas they do internalize the benefits from pork. With the extant Congressional institutions in place, if Congress curtailed the power of the President we envision even more pork and less prudent developmental policies.

Prior to the new administration of Lula, the institutionally driven exchange model that we present could not be separated from the administration of Cardoso. Fortunately for us the new Lula government has behaved remarkably consistent with our model. After 8 years of fierce criticism and opposition to the policies of the Cardoso administration, Lula in his first year in office has proposed objectives very similar to Cardoso, e.g., pension reform and more independence for the Central Bank. Though the proposed policies have

surprised some analysts and irritated radicals within the Lula's party, Lula's agenda is consistent with the extant incentives derived from the existence of strong Presidential powers stipulated in the 1988 Constitution of Brazil.

## References

- Abranches, Sergio. 2003. "Lula e a Previdência." *Veja*, ed. 1785, ano 36 n<sup>o</sup> 2:62.
- Ames, Barry. 1995a. "Electoral Rules, Constituency Pressures, and Pork Barrel: Bases of Voting in the Brazilian Congress." *Journal of Politics* May(57:2): 324-343.
- Ames, Barry. 1995b. "Electoral strategy under open-list proportional representation," *American Journal of Political Science* 39(2): 406-433.
- Ames, Barry. 2001. *The Deadlock of Democracy in Brazil*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Amorim Neto, Otavio. 1994. "Formação de Gabinetes Presidenciais no Brasil: Coalizão versus Cooptação," *Nova Economia* 4(1): 9 - 34.
- Amorim Neto, Otavio. 2000. "Brazil: The Costs and Benefits of Coalition Governments," *Latin American Legislatures*. IAD-IDESP. Rio de Janeiro, Working Paper.
- Amorim Neto, O., G.W. Cox and M. D. McCubbins (2000), "The Cartel Model in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Brazil," APSA, Washington DC.
- Associated Press 1999 "Brazil's Congress to Vote on Key Economic Reform Measure." *Business News*, January 20.

Carey, John. and Matthew Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas" *Electoral Studies* 14: 417-439.

Cox, Gary. W. and Matthew D. McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins. 2001. "The Institutional Determinants of Economic Policy Outcomes" in Haggard and McCubbins *Presidents, Parliaments and Policy*, Cambridge University Press.

Dixit, Avinash. 1996 *The Making of Economic Policy. A Transaction-Cost Politics Perspective*. The MIT Press.

*The Economist* (1996) "Brazil. Physiology? Pork." March 30, Pg. 45.

*The Economist* (1997) "Inactive Workers, Inactive Congress." June 5, Pg. 37.

Epstein, David. and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1999. *Delegating Powers: A Transaction Cost Politics Approach to Policy Making Under Separate Powers*. Cambridge University Press.

*O Estado de S. Paulo*. 1996. "FH pede ao Congresso que Acelere Reformas." April 30.

Figueiredo, Argelina C. and Fernando Limongi. 1996. *Congresso Nacional: Organização, Processo Legislativo e Produção Legal*. São Paulo, CEBRAP.

Figueiredo, Argelina C. and Fernando Limongi. 2000a. "Presidential Power. Legislative Organization, and Party Behavior in Brazil." *Comparative Politics* January: 151 - 170.

Figueiredo, Argelina C. And Fernando Limongi. 2000b "Executivo e Legislativo na Formulação e Execução do Orçamento Federal," II Encontro da Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política.

Fleischer, David. 1998, "Brazilian Politics: Structures, Process, Elections, Parties and Political Groups (1985-1995)", Working paper, The Institute of Brazilian Issues, Washington, WP95-2.

*Gazeta Mercantil* 1998<sup>a</sup>. "FHC Ameaça Retaliar Infieis." May 8.

Haggard, Stephan. 1995. *The Reform of the State in Latin America*. Annual Bank Conference on Development in Latin America and Caribbean, Rio de Janeiro, World Bank.

Haggard, Stephan and Robert Kaufman. 1992. *The Politics of Economic Adjustment: International Shocks, Distributive Conflicts and the State*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Haggard, Stephan and Matthew McCubbins. 2001. *Presidents, Parliaments and Policy*.

New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, Jeffery A. 1998. "Property Rights and the Emergence of Standing Committee Dominance in the Nineteenth-Century House." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23:493-519.

*Jornal do Brasil*. 2001. "Governo Faz Mais Leis que Congresso." *Política*, April 7.

Lamounier, Bolivar. 1994a. "Brazil at Impasse." *Journal of Democracy* 5(July): 72-87.

Lamounier, Bolivar. 1994b. *A Democracia Brasileira de 1985 à Década de 90: A Síndrome da Paralisia Hiperativa. Governabilidade, Sistema Político e Violência Urbana*. J. P. R. Velloso. Rio de Janeiro, José Olympio Editora.

Leoni, Eduardo L. 2000. *Ideologia, Democracia e Comportamento Parlamentar: A Câmara dos Deputados No Brasil Pós-Constituinte*. Master Dissertation. Brasília, Universidade de Brasília: 91.

Leoni, Eduardo L. 2002. *Ideologia, Democracia e Comportamento Parlamentar: a Câmara dos Deputados (1991-1998)*. *Dados*, vol.45, no.3, p.361-386.

Levy, Brian and Pablo T. Spiller. 1994. *Regulations, Institutions and Commitment: Comparative Studies of Telecommunications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1993. "Brazilian Party Underdevelopment in Comparative Perspective."

*Political Science Quarterly* 107(4): 677-708.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1999. *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization:*

*The Case of Brazil*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott and Anibal P. Linan. 1997. "Party discipline in the Brazilian

Constitutional Congress" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 4: 453-483.

Mainwaring, Scott. and Timothy R. Scully. 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party*

*Systems in Latin America*. California, Stanford University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott and Matthew S. Shugart. 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin*

*America*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Moe, Terry. 1990b. "Political Institutions: The Neglected Side of the Story" *Journal of*

*Law, Economics and Organization* 6: 213-53

Monteiro, J.V. (1997). *Economia e Política: Instituições de Estabilização Econômica no*

*Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

Monteiro, Jorge.V. 2000a. *As Regras do Jogo: O Plano Real 1997-2000*. Rio de Janeiro,

Fundação Getulio Vargas.

Monteiro, Jorge V. 2000b. "Condicionamentos Institucionais das Medidas Provisórias."

*Revista de Administração Pública*. Mar./Abr. 34(2):25-44.

*The New York Times*. 1998. "Brazil's Austerity Plan Clears Important Hurdle on Pension Cost", Nov. 6, Section A; Page 11; Column 1.

*The New York Times*. 1999. "Pressure Builds on Brazil to Reassure Investors." Dec. 12, Section A; Page 16; Column 3.

North, Douglass C. 1981. *Structure and Change in Economic History*. New York, Norton.

North, Douglass .C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

North, Douglass C. and Barry R. Weingast. 1989. "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England." *The Journal of Economic History*, 49: 803-832.

Pereira, Carlos. 1999. "What are the Conditions for Presidential Success in the Legislative Arena: The Brazilian Electoral Connection?" Ph.D dissertation, The New School for Social Research.



Pereira Carlos and Bernardo Mueller. 2002. “Comportamento Estratégico em Coalizões Presidencialistas: as Relações entre Executivo e Legislativo na Elaboração do Orçamento Brasileiro”. *Dados*, Vol. 45, N<sup>o</sup> 2.

Pereira Carlos and Bernardo Mueller. 2004. “A Theory of Executive Dominance of Congressional Politics: The Committee System in the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies” *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, Vol.10, No.1, Spring 2004, pp.9–49.

Pereira, Carlos and Bernardo Mueller. 2000. “Uma Teoria da Preponderância do Executivo: O Sistema de Comissões no Legislativo Brasileiro.” *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais* 15: 45-67.

Persson, Torsten and Guido Tabellini. 2000. *Political Economics. Explaining Economic Policy*. MIT Press.

Persson, Torsten, Gerard Roland and Guido Tabellini. 1997. “Separation of Powers and Political Accountability” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November, 1163-1202.

Pesanha, Charles. 1997. “O Decreto-Lei sob o Regime Autoritário Brasileiro” *Anais do XXI Encontro Anual da ANPOCS*, Caxambu.

Pires Jr., Jose Antonio M. 2004. “Transferências Voluntárias na Caixa de Edgeworth – Sob a Égide da Lei de Responsabilidade Fiscal” *VIII Prêmio Tesouro Nacional* Brasília, ESAF.

Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1985. "A Spatial Model for Legislative Roll Call Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 357-384.

Samuels, David. 2002. "Pork Barreling is Not Credit-Claiming or Advertising: Campaign Finance and the Sources of the Personal Vote in Brazil." *The Journal of Politics* 64 (3): 845-863.

Santos, Fabiano. 1997. "Patronagem e Poder de Agenda na Política Brasileira." *Dados* 40(3): 465 - 491.

Shepsle, Kenneth A. and Barry R. Weingast. 1981. "Structure-induced Equilibrium and Legislative Choice." *Public Choice* 37: 503-519.

Shugart, Matthew and John Carey. 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shugart, Matthew and Stephan Haggard. 2001. "Institutions and Public Policy in Presidential Systems" in Haggard and McCubbins *Presidents, Parliaments and Policy*, Cambridge University Press.

Snyder Jr., James. 1991. "On Buying Legislatures." *Economics and Politics* Vol. 3, N<sup>o</sup> 2:93-109.

Spiller, Pablo T. and Mariano Tommasi. 2003. "The Institutional Foundations of Public Policy: A Transactions Approach with Application to Argentina" *Journal of Law Economics and Organization*, Oct., 19: 281 - 306.

Tsebelis, George. 2002. *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton University Press.

Weingast, Barry R. and William J. Marshall. 1988. "The Industrial Organization of Congress; or, Why Legislatures, like Firms, are not Organized as Markets" *Journal of Political Economy* 96(1): 163.

White, Halbert. 1980. "A heteroskedastic consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test of heteroskedasticity" *Econometrica* 48, 817-838.

**Figures**

Figure 1 – Preferences of the President and Parties in the Policy-Patronage Space.

Figure 2 – Gains to Trade in Executive-Legislative Relations

Figure 3 – Patronage for Multiple Parties

Figure 4 – Execution of Individual Budget Amendments

Figure 1 – Preferences of the President and Parties in the Policy-Patronage Space




Figure 2 – Gains to Trade in Executive-Legislative Relations




Figure 3 – Patronage for Multiple Parties





Figure 4 – Execution of Individual Budget Amendments





## Tables

**Table 1 – Chronology of Pension Reform**

Date	Event
1993	Congress initiates constitutional reforms.
1995 Mar.1	F.H. Cardoso took office on January 1 and sent the pension reform proposal to Congress three months later.
1995 Mar.16	Pension reform proposal <b>sent to Congress</b> .
1995 April	Committee of Constitution and Justice approves pension reform proposal.
1996 Mar.6	Pension reform proposal instituting minimum years of contribution to the pension system was <b>rejected</b> in the House. The vote was 294 in favor 190 against and 8 abstentions (approval of Constitutional amendments require 308 in favor.)
1996 Mar. 21	Pension reform proposal <b>approved</b> in the House after intense use of patronage. (351 – 139 – 2).
1996 April 12	Supreme Court judge accepts injunction by the opposition <b>suspending</b> the legislative procedures on pension reform.
1996 Apr.29	Cabinet reshuffled. Extraordinary Ministry for Political Coordination created.
1996 May 8	Supreme Court overrules injunction <b>suspending</b> pension reform deliberations.
1998 Feb.11	Constitutional amendment <b>approved</b> in the House setting minimum age to retire at 60 for men and 55 for women. (345 – 152 - 3) Previously there was no minimum age only the requirement of having worked for 35 years for men and 30 for women.
1998 May 6	Constitutional amendment establishing minimum age for retiring was <b>rejected</b> in its second voting in the House. (307 – 148 – 11).
1998 May 23	Minimum retirement age of 53 for men and 48 for women (for those already in the social security system) <b>approved</b> in the House.
1998 Nov.5	House <b>approves</b> minimum retirement ages of 53 for men and 48 for women in its second passage through the House. (346 – 131 – 3) A ceiling for public sector pensions was allowed. Intense negotiations with deputies preceded the vote.
1998 Dec.3	House <b>rejects</b> Constitutional amendment increasing contributions of active civil servants from 11% to 20%, and of retired civil servants who receive above R\$1,200 from 0% to 11%. (187 – 209 – 7; government need 200 votes to approve provisional decree.) Loss estimated at US\$2.2 billion per year.
1998 Dec.12	House <b>approves</b> a bill to increase pension contributions from charities, churches, hospitals, schools and small businesses.
1999 Jan. 4	Ministerial reform is undertaken to help approve fiscal adjustment plan.
1999 Jan. 14	Real is allowed to float suffers large devaluation.
1999 Jan. 20	House <b>approves</b> law that increases contributions by active and retired civil servants. (335 – 147 – 4). Once again patronage was intensely negotiated.
1999 Oct. 1	The Supreme Court <b>declares unconstitutional</b> the previous law raising the contributions of active and retired civil servants.
1999 Oct 6.	House <b>approves</b> a law that changes how private pensions are calculated. (301 – 157; simple majority required)
2000 March	Supreme Court ruled that law altering private pension calculations <b>is constitutional</b> .
2001 - 2002	Proposal to amend the Constitution so as to overcome the Supreme Court ruling against increasing contributions of active and retired civil servants is <b>stalled</b> in Congress.

---

2003      Lula government takes office places pension reform at the top of the agenda. The reform that is approved in this year is very similar to that which had been proposed by FHC

---

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Stand. Dev.</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
<b>Exec. Amend. 1998</b>	20.534	21.054	0.00	98.450
<i>Votes</i>	0.766	0.258	0.048	1.00
<b>Exec. Amend. 1997</b>	52.019	33.128	0.00	100.00
<i>Position</i>	0.310	0.463	0.00	1.00
<i>N<sup>o</sup> Amend.</i>	3.149	4.009	0.00	27.00
<i>Seniority</i>	1.936	1.289	0.00	8.00
<i>No to Yes</i>	0.248	0.155	0.00	1.00
<i>Yes to No</i>	0.015	0.121	0.00	1.00

**Table 3: The Determinants of Cardoso's Execution of Amendments of Deputies, 1998**

	<b>Dep. Var.: Executed Amendments 1998</b>
<b>Constant</b>	-4.822 (-1.17)
<b>Votes</b>	27.341 *** (5.54)
<b>Exec. Amen. 1997</b>	0.106 *** (3.15)
<b>Position</b>	-0.458 (-0.22)
<b>N<sup>o</sup> Amendments</b>	0.428 * (1.61)
<b>Seniority</b>	-0.189 (-0.22)
<b>No to Yes</b>	11.373 * (1.78)
<b>Yes to No</b>	-5.479 * (-1.63)
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.08
<b>N</b>	426

t-stat. in parenthesis. Significance: \*\*\*1%, \*\*5%, \*10%.  
Two-stage least squares estimation.  
Covariance matrix is White's robust, heteroscedasticity  
corrected matrix (White 1980).

## Endnotes

---

<sup>€</sup> For comments, we thank James Bang, William Bernhard, Aécio Cunha, David Fleischer, Mark Kohl, Fernando Limongi, Marcus Melo, Kara Norlin, Carlos Pereira, David Samuels, Emilson Silva, Douglass Stinnet, two anonymous reviewers the editor of the journal and participants at the following conferences and seminars: Tulane University, University of Paris X, “Neoliberalism and Its Consequences,” ANPEC 2001 and LACEA 2001. We thank the Hewlett Foundation and CNPq for financial support.

<sup>1</sup> The College of Leaders is composed of the President of the House, the leaders of all parties, and a non-voting deputy appointed by the President. It arose informally during the drafting of the 1988 Constitution in order to expedite deliberations. Party leaders met prior to the constitutional sessions to negotiate the proposals that would be taken to the floor. The College seemed to suit the preferences of the party leaders and it became institutionalized in the House’s legislative regiment in 1989 (Figueiredo and Limongi 1996: 31-36). The College of Leaders has close control of the legislative agenda deciding which bills are taken to the floor. One of its main instruments for this purpose is the use of urgency petitions (discharge petition), which take a bill from a committee and put it in the next day’s order of business to be voted on the floor. Decisions within the College of Leaders are taken by majority vote weighted by the proportion of deputies in each party, so that the majority coalition is able to control the decision making process.

<sup>2</sup> For descriptions and analysis of the organization of the Brazilian Congress see: Figueiredo and Limongi (1996, 2000a), Pereira and Mueller (2000), Pereira (1999).

<sup>3</sup> Issuing provisional decrees may be a low cost way of establishing policy and should not be interpreted as absolute power by the President. Given the veto power of Congress, the

---

President must be establishing decrees that make a majority of members of Congress better off.

<sup>4</sup> In 2002 Congress changed the rules governing the use of decree power were changed, diminishing the president's discretion. Nevertheless provisional decrees are still a key policy instrument for the executive.

<sup>5</sup> The provisional decrees are not necessarily in areas where the President has exclusive rights of initiation.

<sup>6</sup> Figueiredo and Limongi (2000b) argue that the members of the Combined Budget Committee are part of the coalition within Congress that aligns itself to the President.

<sup>7</sup> See Amorim Neto (1994 and 2000) for analysis of cabinet appointments in Brazil.

<sup>8</sup> See Figueiredo and Limongi (1996 and 2000a) for descriptive statistics. Some of the proposals may be strategically watered down or withheld by the president as suggested by Ames (2001). Nevertheless the record for the Brazilian presidents since 1988 and for Fernando Henrique Cardoso in particular are still impressive. The model presented in the next section explicitly shows how and when these trade-offs occur.

<sup>9</sup> This thesis is defended for example by Monteiro (1997) and Pessanha (1997), cited in Amorim Neto (2000: pg.8) and by Monteiro (2000a,b).

<sup>10</sup> This is a controversial issue among students of Brazilian politics. The existence of party discipline within Congress has been strongly argued by Figueiredo and Limongi (1996, 2000a, pg.162). Examining the data for the period of 1989-98 they show that when a party in the coalition supported the President, its individual members generally did too, and when the party did not support the President on an issue, most members followed the party. The lack of party discipline on the other hand has been argued by Ames (1995a,b, 2001), Mainwaring (1993, 1999), Mainwaring and Shugart (1997) and Lamounier (1994a,b).

---

<sup>11</sup> Leoni (2000 and 2002), applied the W-NOMINATE procedure (Poole and Rosenthal 1997) to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies using roll call data from 1988 to 1998. His results show that the first spatial dimension explains over 90% of the deputies' individual votes for the 50<sup>th</sup> legislature (F.H. Cardoso, 1995-98). This justifies the use of a single dimensional policy issue in the model presented here. Also, the results show a clear spatial divide between the government's coalition (PMDB, PSDB, PPB, PTB and PFL) and the opposition. Considering the first dimension the spatial location of the medians of the major parties in the 50<sup>th</sup> legislature are as follows (range from -1 to 1):

PT -0.826, PDT -0.514, PMDB 0.435, PSDB 0.457, PPB 0.518, PTB 0.546, PFL 0.682.

<sup>12</sup> We thank an anonymous referee for suggestions on modifications to our original model.

<sup>13</sup> The empirical section of this paper will use pension reform to test our model and retirement age was one of the major policy concerns of Cardoso and now Lula. Both Presidents preferred a higher minimum age than the median of each of the parties.

<sup>14</sup> Note that this is different from  $K_i^{SQ(\cdot)}$ .

<sup>15</sup> If there were a coordinating mechanism within the coalition that would enable them to credibly commit to a veto even when the President's offer was in the interest of some members then the coalition would be a position to extract the lion's share of the gains from trade.

<sup>16</sup> There may also be a public opinion component to this cost given that the media tends to denounce the use of patronage as if it were less than legitimate.

<sup>17</sup> Clearly this creates an incentive for coalition members to falsify their preferences so as to obtain more patronage and a disincentive for the like-minded parties to remain loyal.

Because our model is a one-shot game it cannot be used to address this issue, which is

---

inherently dynamic. However, we note once again that these perverse incentives are partly checked by the recurring nature of the relationship as well as (when this is the case) by the existence of a supramajority. Also, in a congressional setting it is not easy for a legislator to falsify his/her preferences as their history, past behavior, constituency links etc. are constantly scrutinized and are consequently well known by other players.

<sup>18</sup> We thank an anonymous referee for bringing Synder's article to our attention.

<sup>19</sup> Other authors that have stressed the importance of patronage in executive-legislative relations in Brazil include Ames (1995a,b), Amorim Neto (1994, 2000), Figueiredo and Limongi (1996), Pereira (1999), Santos (1997).

<sup>20</sup> Although the major objective of reforming the pension system should be to avoid the bankruptcy of the social security system and to establish a system that is fair and feasible, it is probable that the President may be primarily concerned with reducing the large deficits generated by the system, which have important short term consequences on the economy's performance for which the president is seen as directly responsible by voters.

<sup>21</sup> David Fleischer cited in Associated Press (1999).

<sup>22</sup> The creation of the Special Ministry for Political Coordination is consistent with Result 2 from our model: changes that reduce the cost of transacting between the Executive and the coalition, lead to greater gains from trade and policy outcomes more favorable to the Executive. The purpose of the new ministry was to facilitate transactions and thereby prevent future defeats in Congress.

<sup>23</sup> Below we examine the impact of the votes on pension reform May 6 and May 23 of 1998 on the President's approval of budgetary amendments.

<sup>24</sup> By this time there was a widespread belief that the Brazilian *Real* was substantially overvalued.



---

<sup>25</sup> It is noteworthy that a left-wing government that strongly opposed the reform proposed by its successor, adopted basically the same proposal and pursued it in Congress using the same methods based on distribution of patronage, which it customarily criticized as immoral and illegitimate. This behavior is consistent with our framework of executive-legislative relations in Brazil, as it postulates that the actors' behavior is determined by political institutions. Because these institutions did not change it is reassuring that political behavior also remained the same.

<sup>26</sup> Samuels (2002) argues that the relationship between pork and re-election is indirect. In return for pork, e.g. a construction contract, a construction company will give money for financing a campaign which in turn improves the probability of a Congressmen of being re-elected.

<sup>27</sup> Considering abstentions and absences as strategic did not significantly alter our results.

<sup>28</sup> Our determination of which instruments to use was based on the assumption that being a member of the coalition or not affects how a deputy votes, which in turn affects the execution of the deputy's amendments.

<sup>29</sup> It could be argued that the choice of how many amendments to submit is affected by the deputy's expectation of having them approved and executed, in which case this variable is endogenous. Treating  $N^0$  *Amendments* as endogenous reduced the size and significance of the coefficient by did not affect the other results.

<sup>30</sup> See footnote 12. We thank Eduardo Leoni for calculating the index for the 51<sup>st</sup> legislature for us.

<sup>31</sup> For this period we did not have the index for the President so we used instead the index of the government's leader in the House (Arnaldo Madeira), which was 0.74 on a scale

from -1 to 1. This would put the President in the 25<sup>th</sup> rightmost spot amongst approximately 600 deputies.

<sup>32</sup> The estimated relationships are:

$$1999 \text{ Value Executed} = 722,453.14 + 412,215.91 \text{ Distance} - 464,762.25 \text{ Distance}^2$$

(5.69)                      (2.44)                      (-4.64)

$$R^2 = 0.31$$

$$2000 \text{ Value Executed} = 854,654.89 + 566,766.21 \text{ Dist.} - 1,252,438.89 \text{ Dist.}^2 + 447,512.19 \text{ Dist.}^3$$

(8.14)                      (2.00)                      (-2.92)                      (2.52)

$$R^2=0.35$$

Ordinary least squares. t-stats in parenthesis. Includes regional dummies and controls for the number of amendments proposed by each deputy. Value is measured in 1,000 Reais, data from Pires Jr. (2004).

<sup>33</sup> This could be due to the use of other Presidential powers, e.g. the use of patronage. We did find very similar results for the earlier 50<sup>st</sup> legislature. We chose not to report those results because instead of value of amendments we only have data on the proportion of the value of approved amendments that were appropriated.