

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Wyatt, Lance" <lance.wyatt@mail.va.gov> ("Wyatt, Lance" <lance.wyatt@mail.va.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 10:50:14.00

SUBJECT: RE: what would Chilcoat say?

TO: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

also in the Wash. Post today is an article describing Richard Holebrook's Africa trip and the need for attention to the AIDS Epidemic; January is the Month of Africa in the U.S...

-----Original Message-----

From: John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov [mailto:John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 9:16 AM
To: 'Ariel Zwang'; 'Barry Price'; 'Chris Moore';
Daniel_F._Feldman@nsc.eop.gov; 'Esther Benjamin'; 'Gary Hall';
Jacqueline_F._Lain@who.eop.gov; John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov; 'Juan Garcia'; 'Khalid Azim'; Wyatt, Lance; 'Melissa Goldstein'; 'Peter Najera'; Reynaldo_Valencia@who.eop.gov; Sonny_Garg@omb.eop.gov; 'Tim Wu'
Subject: what would Chilcoat say?

You may have seen last night or in the NYT today:

Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military
Al Gore and Bill Bradley said that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.
<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 14:57:36.00

SUBJECT: debate and the military 2

TO: "Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> ("Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pete Najera <PNAJERA@ustr.gov> (Pete Najera <PNAJERA@ustr.gov> @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> ("Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

A little more context on the gays in the military comments from last night. Pete, I think you will appreciate Bradley's answer--at least part of it.

The two candidates agreed on the need for stricter gun control laws and on letting gays serve in the military.

But Gore went further, saying he would not appoint anyone to the Joint Chiefs of Staff who disagreed with his position on homosexuals in the armed forces.

any such Bradley suggested he would not need to resort to litmus test: ``When you're president, you are commander-in-chief and you issue orders. And soldiers are good soldiers. And they follow your orders ... whatever the policy is."

the policy would But President Clinton said today that changing not be that simple, noting that Congress had voted by a veto-proof majority not to allow homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

Clinton said ``The Congress would have to change the law," outside the new home his wife and he had bought in Chappaqua, N.Y. ``I don't think the military and

the president
have the authority to do it."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ingrid Duran <lduran@hq.chci.org> (Ingrid Duran <lduran@hq.chci.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 17:05:21.00

SUBJECT: FW: Millennium March on Washington Working To Increase The Power of the Gay Vote

TO: Juan Herrera <jherrera@hq.chci.org> (Juan Herrera <jherrera@hq.chci.org> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Susana Mercado (E-mail)" <susana1@worldnet.att.net> ("Susana Mercado (E-mail)"

<susana1@worldnet.att.net> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Richard Rugnao (E-mail)" <richard.rugnao@tricon-yum.com> ("Richard Rugnao (E-mail)"

<richard.rugnao@tricon-yum.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Marisa Demeo (E-mail)" <Mjdemeeo@aol.com> ("Marisa Demeo (E-mail)" <Mjdemeeo@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Margaret Oconnor (E-mail)" <Margaret.Oconnor@gs.com> ("Margaret Oconnor (E-mail)"

<Margaret.Oconnor@gs.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Julio Abreu (E-mail)" <JAbreu@AIDSAction.org> ("Julio Abreu (E-mail)" <JAbreu@AIDSAction.org> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Juan Lopez (E-mail)" <Juan.Lopez@ssa.gov> ("Juan Lopez (E-mail)" <Juan.Lopez@ssa.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Henry L. Fernandez (E-mail)" <Henry.L.Fernandez@pmusa.com> ("Henry L. Fernandez (E-mail)"

<Henry.L.Fernandez@pmusa.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Gina Mooers (E-mail)" <ginamooers@hotmail.com> ("Gina Mooers (E-mail)" <ginamooers@hotmail.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel C. Montoya (CN=Daniel C. Montoya/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Cindy Mendoza (E-mail)" <Cmendoza@Henninger.Com> ("Cindy Mendoza (E-mail)"

<Cmendoza@Henninger.Com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Virginia Paris (E-mail)" <Virginia.Paris@mci.com> ("Virginia Paris (E-mail)" <Virginia.Paris@mci.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Scott Foval (E-mail)" <sbfoval@yahoo.com> ("Scott Foval (E-mail)" <sbfoval@yahoo.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Orlando Reyes (E-mail)" <OReyes1@aol.com> ("Orlando Reyes (E-mail)" <OReyes1@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Mario Solis Marich (E-mail)" <SolisMaric@aol.com> ("Mario Solis Marich (E-mail)" <SolisMaric@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Kim Avila (E-mail)" <kima@jsanet.com> ("Kim Avila (E-mail)" <kima@jsanet.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Julia Cavazos (E-mail)" <Julia_Cavazos@McCain.senate.gov> ("Julia Cavazos (E-mail)" <Julia_Cavazos@McCain.senate.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Joy (E-mail)" <JOYLSL1@aol.com> ("Joy (E-mail)" <JOYLSL1@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Guillermo J. Serritiello [GUILLERMOJ@iadb.org] (E-mail)" <GUILLERMOJ@iadb.org> ("Guillermo J. Serritiello [GUILLERMOJ@iadb.org] (E-mail)" <GUILLERMOJ@iadb.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Deb Troell (E-mail)" <photokid@hotmail.com> ("Deb Troell (E-mail)" <photokid@hotmail.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Arturo Vargas (E-mail)" <avargas@naleo.org> ("Arturo Vargas (E-mail)" <avargas@naleo.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Happy New Year!

Hi all- just wanted to keep you abreast of the what the MMOW is doing...

I hope that each and everyone of you will be participating in the march in April.

Ingrid M. Duran

Executive Director

Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute

504 C Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

(202) 543-1771

(202) 546-2143 fax

mailto:Iduran@hq.chci.org]

www.chci.org

> -----Original Message-----

> From: MMOW2000@aol.com [SMTP:MMOW2000@aol.com]

> Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2000 5:31 PM

> To: corriplanck@hotmail.com

> Subject: Millennium March on Washington Working To Increase The
> Power of the Gay Vote

>
> *****
> **
> NEWS FROM THE MILLENNIUM MARCH ON WASHINGTON
> 1000 16th St., NW, Ste. 300
> Washington, DC 20036
> (202) 467-8100
> www.mmow.org
> *****
> ***
> Contact: Corri Planck, Communications Director
> (202) 467-8108 (office)
> (202) 257-2318 (cell)
>
>
>
> MILLENNIUM MARCH ON WASHINGTON WORKING TO INCREASE THE POWER OF THE
> GAY VOTE
>
> GLBT Vote 2000 Will Energize An Important Voting Bloc
>
> WASHINGTON, DC, Dec. 14, 1999 - A front page story in today's
> Washington
> Post regarding Vice-President Al Gore's stance on the "Don't Ask,
> Don't Tell"
> policy regarding gays in the military refers to "... the increasing
> importance
> of the gay vote ..."
> Recognizing this increasing importance, organizers of the
> Millennium
> March on Washington for Equality have created "GLBT Vote 2000," a
> campaign
> designed to increase voter registration, education and empowerment
> among the
> gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community.
> "Our community has an historic opportunity to march on Washington
> and
> send a powerful message to our nation, but that opportunity doesn't
> end in
> Washington, DC. We have a responsibility to register, become informed
> and
> turn out for the 2000 elections," said Dianne Hardy-Garcia,
> co-executive
> director of the Millennium March on Washington. "It's not just about a
>
> presidential race, but about electing a Congress that will protect us
> as full
> citizens. It's also vitally important for our community to be educated
> about
> the candidates for state and local offices that are so crucial to our
> everyday lives. One of the major goals of the Millennium March on
> Washington
> for Equality is to orchestrate the largest gay, lesbian, bisexual and
> transgender voter turnout in history."

> More than 100,000 pledge cards have been distributed across the
> country
> as part of the Millennium March's GLBT Vote 2000 efforts to motivate
> gay,
> lesbian, bisexual and transgender people to vote in the 2000
> elections. On
> the cards, GLBT voters sign a pledge that reads, "I will be part of
> the
> largest gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender voter turnout in
> history. I
> pledge to vote in the 2000 elections and to encourage my friends and
> family
> to join in that effort."
> "The African-American and Latino communities, labor and even the
> Christian Coalition, are making serious commitments toward voter
> registration
> and turnout. The gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community must
> also
> step up to the plate," said Nicole Murray-Ramirez, board co-chair of
> the
> Millennium March on Washington. "At all levels, these elections are
> important
> for our community -- from the next president of the United States, who
> will
> appoint more Supreme Court justices, to our local school boards, who
> will
> make decisions affecting our youth about curriculum and gay student
> groups.
> This is a non-partisan effort, and we envision and hope that the GLBT
> Vote
> will continue long after the March on Washington."
> For more information, or to obtain pledge cards, about GLBT Vote
> 2000,
> call the office of the Millennium March on Washington at (202)
> 467-8100.
> The Millennium March on Washington, scheduled for April 30, 2000,
> is the
> fourth national GLBT civil rights march and the first human rights
> march of
> the new millennium. For more information on the March on Washington
> for
> Equality, visit the official website at www.mmow.org or write to
> MMOW2000@aol.com.

>

> -30-

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 13:46:19.00

SUBJECT: Revised Pool Report #1, Morning in Chappaqua

TO: dirck.halstead@pressroom.com (dirck.halstead@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Winmc@aol.com (Winmc@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: irawyman@wn.net (irawyman@wn.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cromequeen@aol.com (cromequeen@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.pearson@afp.com@inet (bob.pearson@afp.com@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: luke.frazza@afp.com (luke.frazza@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry.Rubenstein@Reuters.com (Larry.Rubenstein@Reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joycenal@earthlink.net (joycenal@earthlink.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mfeinsilber@ap.org (Mfeinsilber@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ggibson@ap.org (ggibson@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wendy.wilkinson@nbc.com (wendy.wilkinson@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: claire.shipman@nbc.com (claire.shipman@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tim.russert@nbc.com (tim.russert@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: russ.moore@nbc.com (russ.moore@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mary.dorman@nbc.com (mary.dorman@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: creese@nbc.com (creese@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: david.bloom@nbc.com (david.bloom@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WALLACEJ@FOXNEWS.COM (WALLACEJ@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHELTON@FOXNEWS.COM (SHELTON@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SANTER@FOXNEWS.COM (SANTER@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LECROY@FOXNEWS.COM (LECROY@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JANKOWSK@FOXNEWS.COM (JANKOWSK@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COLE@FOXNEWS.COM (COLE@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOUGHTON@FOXNEWS.COM (BOUGHTON@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOSWELL@FOXNEWS.COM (BOSWELL@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah.Ruth@Turner.com (Sarah.Ruth@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol.Cratty@Turner.com (Carol.Cratty@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TT1@CBSNEWS.COM (TT1@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mcm@cbsnews.com (mcm@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ldx@cbsnews.com (ldx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HGX@CBSNEWS.COM (HGX@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bpc@cbsnews.com (bpc@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary.F.Walsh@ABC.com (Mary.F.Walsh@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie.Z.Smith@ABC.com (Stephanie.Z.Smith@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tom.A.Shine@ABC.com (Tom.A.Shine@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrea.A.McCarren@ABC.com (Andrea.A.McCarren@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Luis.E.Martinez@ABC.com (Luis.E.Martinez@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leo.J.Meidlinger@ABC.com (Leo.J.Meidlinger@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anita.J.Krichmar@ABC.com (Anita.J.Krichmar@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick.J.Cullen@ABC.com (Patrick.J.Cullen@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ann.w.compton@abc.com (ann.w.compton@abc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dee.W.Carden@ABC.com (Dee.W.Carden@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kent.D.Alley@ABC.com (Kent.D.Alley@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mkx@cbsnews.com (mkx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mliasson@npr.org (mliasson@npr.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sammon@twtdmail.com (sammon@twtdmail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: babingtonc@washpost.com (babingtonc@washpost.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jeanne.cummings@news.wsj.com (jeanne.cummings@news.wsj.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: spage@usatoday.com (spage@usatoday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mcfeattersd@shns.com (mcfeattersd@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hardgrovet@shns.com (hardgrovet@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: toedtman@newsday.com (toedtman@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fireman@newsday.com (fireman@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: deborah.howell@newhouse.com (deborah.howell@newhouse.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lacey@nytimes.com (lacey@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tdefrank@edit.nydailynews.com (tdefrank@edit.nydailynews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CCannon@njdc.com (CCannon@njdc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pramatowski@media-general.com (pramatowski@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mdobbin@mcclatchydc.com (mdobbin@mcclatchydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: doyle.mcmanus@latimes.com (doyle.mcmanus@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: edwin.chen@latimes.com (edwin.chen@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jenda@krwashington.com (jenda@krwashington.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bennett.roth@chron.com (bennett.roth@chron.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stewart@hearstdc.com (stewart@hearstdc.com [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sdimeglio@gns.gannett.com (Sdimeglio@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Klewis@dallasnews.com (Klewis@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sfeeney@dallasnews.com (sfeeney@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: andyg@coxnews.com (andyg@coxnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: george.condon@copleydc.com (george.condon@copleydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thurmans@csp.com (thurmans@csp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbendavid@tribune.com (nbendavid@tribune.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: s_milligan@globe.com (s_milligan@globe.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkeil@bloomberg.net (dkeil@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan.weisman@baltsun.com (jonathan.weisman@baltsun.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul@basken.com (paul@basken.com [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hthomas@upi.com (hthomas@upi.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tim.ryan@reuters.com (tim.ryan@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: randall.mikkelsen@reuters.com (randall.mikkelsen@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: deborah.charles@reuters.com (deborah.charles@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gretchen.cook@afp.com (gretchen.cook@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thunt@ap.org (thunt@ap.org [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agearan@ap.org (agearan@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: charrrity@usnews.com (charrrity@usnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rg@newspictures.com (rg@newspictures.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ChrisUsher@aol.com (ChrisUsher@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: garyhershorn@ibm.net (garyhershorn@ibm.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: smikla@nwnet.newsweek.com (smikla@nwnet.newsweek.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul.Richards@pressroom.com (Paul.Richards@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stephen.jaffe@pressroom.com (stephen.jaffe@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim.Aubry@Reuters.com (Tim.Aubry@Reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim.Sloan@afp.com (Tim.Sloan@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmills@ap.org (dmills@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sapplewhite@ap.org (sapplewhite@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ken.strickland@nbc.com (ken.strickland@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: antoine.sanfuentes@nbc.com (antoine.sanfuentes@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.palmer@nbc.com (john.palmer@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: betty.francis@nbc.com (betty.francis@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brady.daniels@nbc.com (brady.daniels@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tony.capra@nbc.com (tony.capra@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WELLSC@FOXNEWS.COM (WELLSC@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHOTT@FOXNEWS.COM (SHOTT@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SAVAGE@FOXNEWS.COM (SAVAGE@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson@foxnews.com (Nelson@foxnews.com [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KAHN@FOXNEWS.COM (KAHN@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAGAN@FOXNEWS.COM (HAGAN@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CHUNG@FOXNEWS.COM (CHUNG@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOYD@FOXNEWS.COM (BOYD@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marc.Sklar@Turner.com (Marc.Sklar@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.Gilmore@Turner.com (John.Gilmore@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: eschweiger@c-span.org (eschweiger@c-span.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tsx@cbsnews.com (tsx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LSE@CBSNEWS.COM (LSE@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jrc@cbsnews.com (jrc@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ESX@CBSNEWS.COM (ESX@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: add@cbsnews.com (add@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vija.Udenans@ABC.com (Vija.Udenans@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew.Speiser@ABC.com (Matthew.Speiser@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judy.M.Penniman@ABC.com (Judy.M.Penniman@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry.Moran@ABC.com (Terry.Moran@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dean.G.Hovell@ABC.com (Dean.G.Hovell@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rusty.M.Lutz@ABC.com (Rusty.M.Lutz@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: josh.gerstein@abc.com (josh.gerstein@abc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bob.Crawford@ABC.com (Bob.Crawford@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.J.Cochran@ABC.com (John.J.Cochran@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane.T.Boozer@ABC.com (Diane.T.Boozer@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gclugsto@capaccess.org (gclugsto@capaccess.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pma@cbsnews.com (pma@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: msmith@ap.org (msmith@ap.org [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harrisj@washpost.com (harrisj@washpost.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.davis@news.wsj.com (bob.davis@news.wsj.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lmcquillan@usatoday.com (lmcquillan@usatoday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hargrovet@shns.com (hargrovet@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hoffmanl@shns.com (hoffmanl@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: copelandp@shns.com (copelandp@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bill.douglas@newsday.com (bill.douglas@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: miles.benson@newhouse.com (miles.benson@newhouse.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dasang@nytimes.com (dasang@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: broder@nytimes.com (broder@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ken.bazinet@pressroom.com (ken.bazinet@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mgwash@media-general.com (mgwash@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jhall@media-general.com (jhall@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dwestphal@mcclatchydc.com (dwestphal@mcclatchydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: james.gerstenzang@latimes.com (james.gerstenzang@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sthomma@krwashington.com (sthomma@krwashington.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.henry@chron.com (john.henry@chron.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmathis@gns.gannett.com (dmathis@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: candrews@gns.gannett.com (candrews@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cleubsdorf@dallasnews.com (cleubsdorf@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: grhillman@aol.com (grhillman@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bobdeans@coxnews.com (bobdeans@coxnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: amy.bayer@copleydc.com (amy.bayer@copleydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kieferf@csps.com (kieferf@csps.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scales@nws.globe.com (scales@nws.globe.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stage@bloomberg.net (stage@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bsmall@bloomberg.net (bsmall@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jane_fullerton@adg.ardemgaz.com (jane_fullerton@adg.ardemgaz.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: whitehouse@upi.com (whitehouse@upi.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lorisantos@netscape.net (lorisantos@netscape.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: arshad.mohammed@reuters.com (arshad.mohammed@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: steve.holland@reuters.com (steve.holland@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philippe.debeusscher@afp.com (philippe.debeusscher@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sross@ap.org (sross@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kgalvin@ap.org (kgalvin@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ricardo.alonso-zaldivar@latimes.com (ricardo.alonso-zaldivar@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James R. Fallin (CN=James R. Fallin/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Pool Report #1
Morning in Chappaqua
January 6, 2000

Your pool staked out Old House Road for much of the morning. At 10:30 am a potted plant from Loving Moments florists in Hawthorne, NY arrived at the house. At 11:25 am, the first couple emerged from the columned porch on the left rear of the white shingled colonial -- stepping slowly down

the steps toward the pool cameras. After exchanging a few pleasantries, they turned walk hand in hand down the pebbled drive way toward a gaggle of about 30 reporters, camera men, and crew members. POTUS wore a dark brown leather jacket, a black open necked polo shirt and gray tee-shirt. FLOTUS wore a yellow nylon jacket (pool apologizes profusely for thinking it was suede last night), yellow scarf, and tan leather gloves.

As FLOTUS spoke, POTUS placed his arm around her shoulder and gazed lovingly though he later removed it. POTUS acknowledged that he would register to vote in New York in time for FLOTUS, senate bid "I want to make sure my vote counts." They said they spent the night unpacking boxes, deciding where to place the furniture, where to hang paintings, and listening to a hand cranked, solar powered South African Radio. They told us they had no television, they did not watch the democratic debate (although POTUS said he had asked for the debate to taped and would play it back later), though they said they were awake past 1 AM.

Both ducked a question about the use of soft money in the New York Senate campaign, with FLOTUS saying they were there to talk about the house. But POTUS did speak at length about Don't ask Don't tell policy of gays in the military.

POTUS denied having entertained a job offer from Lazard-Freres -- saying he was amazed by such a suggestion. At 11:35 am after 10 minutes of question, they returned to the house. (transcript should be coming later.)

The motorcade to Westchester County airport made one unannounced stop at the Chappaqua fire department on the edge of town creating quite a stir among volunteer fire fighters and a throng of well-wishers and new neighbors. POTUS and FLOTUS shook hands with neighbors who welcomed them to Chappaqua. "Thank you for coming, you're so beautiful," gushed Grace Bucolo of Ovington, a book keeper at the Chappaqua Grand Union. Susan Solomon of York Town NY crowded FLOTUS holding a sign that said "Hillary is a cutie, Rudie is a doody."

POTUS greeted George Anderson, asking him "what are you hunting" and Anderson replied "deer." After some minutes POTUS shouted, "Come on Hillary, we're late." But FLOTUS proceeded across the street to a mobile station where a sign read welcome Bill and Hillary. After chatting for some time with a road crew at the gas station, POTUS and FLOTUS rejoined the motorcade for an uneventful ride back to the airport.

Jonathan Weissman
Baltimore Sun

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> ("Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 10:24:18.00

SUBJECT: RE: what would Chilcoat say?

TO: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As Samuel Huntington describes in Soldier and the State, Chilcoat would salute and execute the orders of his civil master. Of note, I am certain that the political utterances of the "candidates" would not be so absolute once the next president is elected. The experiment continues.

BLP

-----Original Message-----

From: John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov [mailto:John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov]

Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 9:16 AM

To: 'Ariel Zwang'; 'Barry Price'; 'Chris Moore';

Daniel_F._Feldman@nsc.eop.gov; 'Esther Benjamin'; 'Gary Hall';

Jacqueline_F._Lain@who.eop.gov; John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov; 'Juan

Garcia'; 'Khalid Azim'; 'Lance Wyatt'; 'Melissa Goldstein'; 'Peter

Najera'; Reynaldo_Valencia@who.eop.gov; Sonny_Garg@omb.eop.gov; 'Tim Wu'

Subject: what would Chilcoat say?

You may have seen last night or in the NYT today:

Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military

Al Gore and Bill Bradley said that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html>

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> ("Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 15:48:28.00

SUBJECT: RE: debate and the military 2

TO: "Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> ("Price, Barrye" <blprice@opm.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pete Najera <PNAJERA@ustr.gov> (Pete Najera <PNAJERA@ustr.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> ("Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

J.B.,

Well spoken by my Commander in Chief (CINC).

BLP

-----Original Message-----

From: John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov [mailto:John_B._Buxton@opd.eop.gov]

Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 2:58 PM

To: Garcia, Juan; Price, Barrye; Pete Najera

Subject: debate and the military 2

A little more context on the gays in the military comments from last night.

Pete, I think you
will appreciate Bradley's answer--at least part of it.

The two candidates agreed on the need for stricter gun control
laws and on letting gays serve in the military.

But Gore went
further, saying he would not appoint anyone to
the Joint Chiefs
of Staff who disagreed with his position on
homosexuals in the
armed forces.

any such
Bradley suggested he would not need to resort to
litmus test: ``When you're president, you are
commander-in-chief and you issue orders. And
soldiers are
good soldiers. And they follow your orders ...

whatever the
policy is."

But President Clinton said today that changing
the policy would
not be that simple, noting that Congress had
voted by a
veto-proof majority not to allow homosexuals to
serve openly
in the military.

"The Congress would have to change the law,"
Clinton said
outside the new home his wife and he had bought
in
Chappaqua, N.Y. "I don't think the military and
the president
have the authority to do it."

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 09:16:22.00

SUBJECT: what would Chilcoat say?

TO: Sonny Garg (CN=Sonny Garg/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Reynaldo Valencia (CN=Reynaldo Valencia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Peter Najera" <pnajera@ustr.gov> ("Peter Najera" <pnajera@ustr.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Lance Wyatt" <Lance.Wyatt@mail.va.gov> ("Lance Wyatt" <Lance.Wyatt@mail.va.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Juan Garcia" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> ("Juan Garcia" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jacqueline F. Lain (CN=Jacqueline F. Lain/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Gary Hall" <Gary.Hall@do.treas.gov> ("Gary Hall" <Gary.Hall@do.treas.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel F. Feldman (CN=Daniel F. Feldman/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Barry Price" <blprice@opm.gov> ("Barry Price" <blprice@opm.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Tim Wu" <TWU@os.dhhs.gov> ("Tim Wu" <TWU@os.dhhs.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Melissa Goldstein" <Melissa_Goldstein@ovp.eop.gov> ("Melissa Goldstein"
<Melissa_Goldstein@ovp.eop.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Khalid Azim" <khalid.azim@exim.gov> ("Khalid Azim" <khalid.azim@exim.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John B. Buxton (CN=John B. Buxton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Esther Benjamin" <benjamin-esther@dol.gov> ("Esther Benjamin" <benjamin-esther@dol.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Chris Moore" <Christopher.M.Moore@usdoj.gov> ("Chris Moore" <Christopher.M.Moore@usdoj.gov> [

UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Ariel Zwang" <ariel_m._zwang@hud.gov> ("Ariel Zwang" <ariel_m._zwang@hud.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
You may have seen last night or in the NYT today:

Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military

Al Gore and Bill Bradley said that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.
<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (CN=Margaret M. Suntum/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 14:57:27.00

SUBJECT: remarks of the President and Mrs. Clinton from their residence in Chappaqua, NY

TO: Jennifer I. Hoelzer (CN=Jennifer I. Hoelzer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kamena@washpost.com (kamena@washpost.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eileen P. McCaughey (CN=Eileen P. McCaughey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pamela P. Carpenter (CN=Pamela P. Carpenter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather F. Hurlburt (CN=Heather F. Hurlburt/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin G. Cooper (CN=Justin G. Cooper/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lauren M. Supina (CN=Lauren M. Supina/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Magana (CN=Mark D. Magana/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sonya N. Hebert (CN=Sonya N. Hebert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordanindc@aol.com (Jordanindc@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kit.judge@mail.house.gov (kit.judge@mail.house.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com (jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adrienne K. Elrod (CN=Adrienne K. Elrod/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason E. Hartke (CN=Jason E. Hartke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean.carr@cnn.com (sean.carr@cnn.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kymberly M. Escobar (CN=Kymberly M. Escobar/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Samir Afridi (CN=Samir Afridi/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Abigail L. McDermott (CN=Abigail L. McDermott/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric P. Liu (CN=Eric P. Liu/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Fern Mechlowitz (CN=Fern Mechlowitz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie A. Cutter (CN=Stephanie A. Cutter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us (MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn T. Wu (CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub_Arch@EOP (Pub_Arch@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pub_Arch (Pub_Arch @ oa.eop.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alberto O. Feraren (CN=Alberto O. Feraren/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com (62955104@eln.attmail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri@dol.gov (tingen-terri@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john_see@ed.gov (john_see@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: carolmast@aol.com (carolmast@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra S. Wood (CN=Debra S. Wood/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janice H. Vranich (CN=Janice H. Vranich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy F. Sisser (CN=Tracy F. Sisser/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Sullivan (CN=Michael J. Sullivan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark C. Sheppard (CN=Mark C. Sheppard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders (CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evan Ryan (CN=Evan Ryan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TDIXON@smtpgate.mac.whca.mil (TDIXON@smtpgate.mac.whca.mil [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Denver R. Peacock (CN=Denver R. Peacock/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nathan B. Naylor (CN=Nathan B. Naylor/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. Maloney (CN=Sean P. Maloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger (CN=Jim Kohlenberger/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen (CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Kalbaugh (CN=David E. Kalbaugh/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani (CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marty J. Hoffmann (CN=Marty J. Hoffmann/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William Hadley (CN=William Hadley/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy E. Gray (CN=Wendy E. Gray/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachel E. Forde (CN=Rachel E. Forde/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (CN=Debra D. Bird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel W. Burkhardt (CN=Daniel W. Burkhardt/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn G. Cutler (CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George G. Caudill (CN=George G. Caudill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Cahill (CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen (CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen K. Ahn (CN=Kathleen K. Ahn/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu (backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooke B. Livingston (CN=Brooke B. Livingston/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mara A. Silver (CN=Mara A. Silver/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RSocarides@rlmnet.com (RSocarides@rlmnet.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angela Blake (CN=Angela Blake/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean R. Dobson (CN=Sean R. Dobson/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Renee Sagiv (CN=Renee Sagiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adrian E. Miller (CN=Adrian E. Miller/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erica_Lepping@ed.gov (Erica_Lepping@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsay R. Drewel (CN=Lindsay R. Drewel/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maureen A. Hudson (CN=Maureen A. Hudson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deanne E. Benos (CN=Deanne E. Benos/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Abigail C. Smith (CN=Abigail C. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisel Loy (CN=Lisel Loy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Alexander (CN=Debra D. Alexander/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: masonjulie@aol.com (masonjulie@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia G. Bataille (CN=Julia G. Bataille/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry Edmonds (CN=Terry Edmonds/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laurie P. Kelleher (CN=Laurie P. Kelleher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bridget T. Leininger (CN=Bridget T. Leininger/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francisco J. Sanchez (CN=Francisco J. Sanchez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles J. Payson (CN=Charles J. Payson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon H. Yuan (CN=Sharon H. Yuan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachel A. Redington (CN=Rachel A. Redington/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick M. Dorton (CN=Patrick M. Dorton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John H. Corcoran III (CN=John H. Corcoran III/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases (Releases @ pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Hildy Kuryk (CN=Hildy Kuryk/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gina N. Dennis (CN=Gina N. Dennis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com (newsdesk@usnewswire.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usia01@access.digex.com (usia01@access.digex.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd@umich.edu (skgmd@umich.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank@tnr.com (dmilbank@tnr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Woyneab M. Wondwossen (CN=Woyneab M. Wondwossen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Weiner (CN=Robert S. Weiner/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Setti D. Warren (CN=Setti D. Warren/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli (CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dana C. Strand (CN=Dana C. Strand/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brooks E. Scoville (CN=Brooks E. Scoville/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Johnson (CN=Robert B. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet (CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ellen E. Olcott (CN=Ellen E. Olcott/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore (CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KTORPEY@AOL.COM (KTORPEY@AOL.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John_See@ed.gov (John_See@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson (CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dario J. Gomez (CN=Dario J. Gomez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen B. Fowler (CN=Carmen B. Fowler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha Foley (CN=Martha Foley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sharon Farmer (CN=Sharon Farmer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jackson T. Dunn (CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lana Dickey (CN=Lana Dickey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pcaplan@fbr.com (pcaplan@fbr.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick E. Briggs (CN=Patrick E. Briggs/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd A. Bledsoe (CN=Todd A. Bledsoe/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak (CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ralph Alswang (CN=Ralph Alswang/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah Akel (CN=Deborah Akel/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov (wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (CN=Margaret M. Suntum/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian S. Mason (CN=Brian S. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Chappaqua, New York)

For Immediate Release

January 6, 2000

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND THE FIRST LADY
TO THE WHITE HOUSE TRAVELING PRESS

Outside Chappaqua Residence
Chappaqua, New York

11:28 A.M. EST

MRS. CLINTON: Good morning!

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody.

Q So are you now officially New Yorkers?

THE PRESIDENT: We're here. Let me say to start that we're delighted to be here. We like this house very much and we, at least, have put up all the boxes we brought up here so far. This is the first home we have had since January of 1983, 17 years ago, when we moved back into the Governor's Mansion in Little Rock. So it's exciting. We're seeing some things we haven't seen since we moved to the White House and some things we haven't seen in 17 years.

We've got a table in there that we bought shortly after we got married, in 1975, that we haven't used in a long time. So we've had a lot of fun and I've enjoyed it very much.

MRS. CLINTON: We're glad to have you here this morning because this is a lot of excitement and hard work for us, but we're so pleased that we are finally here and moved in and looking forward to many, many happy days here in the days and months ahead.

THE PRESIDENT: We also want to thank our neighbors who have been long-suffering with all the attention --

MRS. CLINTON: Right.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that the house has received.

MRS. CLINTON: And all of the officials here in Chappaqua and New

Castle and Westchester County, who have been so helpful and cooperative with the Secret Service and the other people who are a part of the President's official duties.

Q Mr. President, will you be shifting your voter registration to New York, so you can vote for a certain Senate candidate?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I've got a particular interest in the election up here next year, so I want to make sure my vote counts. I expect to vote in the election in New York.

Q What did you do last night? What did you do for dinner? Did you have friends in?

MRS. CLINTON: We had friends -- we've had a lot of friends helping us and one of my good friends here who lives nearby came over with her son and brought dinner for us, and then her son helped Bill move some things that needed to be moved. And we had other friends come over who have been helping us. But mostly what we did was unpack boxes, put things up, try to make decisions about where to hang paintings or move furniture and make a long list of all the things we have to do that aren't done yet that are going to have to be tended to.

Q Are you going back to Washington today to do that?

MRS. CLINTON: Yes, we're going back today and we'll be packing up more things and moving more things in the next couple of weeks. So it will be a process. We're not going to be totally moved in and everything in place for a while. But it's a lot of fun for us to be able to do this again, for the first time in such a long time -- because we, of course, worked very hard in the White House and spent an enormous amount of time and effort trying to keep the White House in good shape and do some additional work that needed to be done there, but it's different when you're doing it in your own home.

Q Have you thought any more about a schedule for how often you will both be here?

Q Mrs. Clinton and also Mr. President, the Mayor, as you may have heard a couple of days ago, said that both of you, the Clintons, he said, have been egregious violators of soft money, both in how it's collected and how it's distributed. Your reaction, both of you?

MRS. CLINTON: We're going to talk about our house this morning, which we are very happy about being in, and being New Yorkers. And we'll leave that to another time.

Q Mr. President, are you going to -- we haven't heard from you. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: No. (Laughter.) No, I keep reading all these things. I've not given very much thought to this. I'm going to work very hard on finishing my library and center. And I'm going to devote all my attention to being President. I've got a big agenda this year. We're

going back now, and I have to go back to Shepherdstown this afternoon. But I've had no discussions with anybody about that kind of move. And I was amazed to see that in the paper. No one's even suggested that.

Q Mr. President, last night the Vice President in the debates said that he'll ask military commanders about their feelings on gays serving in the military before appointing people to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is this litmus test the way it should work?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think the real problem is -- let me go back to what happened, because, as you know, my view was -- and I will restate my view. The Uniform Code of Military Justice prohibits homosexual contacts. So my view was, if someone was willing to take the pledge to observe the Uniform Code of Military Justice, they shouldn't have to lie about being gay and being in the military. Then, let me remind you what happened. The Congress voted, by a veto-proof majority, against that position. So that's how we got to "don't ask, don't tell."

My focus has been on trying to make the policy work the way the military commanders said it would work back in 1993, which it has not been doing. No one disputes that. To Secretary Cohen's credit, back in August we announced some new guidelines, which have now been implemented, for training and for implementation, which I think will significantly improve the present situation over the next few months.

Now, the Vice President and Senator Bradley say they want to go back to the position that I advocated in '92 and '93. In order to do that, the Congress will have to change the law, I believe. I don't think that the military and the President have the authority to do it. Now, you could go back and look at the constitutional arguments and do some research, but I think a lot of this debate, I think a lot of people have actually forgotten that Congress put into the law the present policy.

And so what I'm going to do is spend the next year trying to make sure that we do what was intended and what I announced would be done, after extensive consultation with our commanders back in 1993. I believe that the next President, if he wants to change the policy, will have to get the Congress to change the law.

Q A quick follow-up on that. Wouldn't litmus tests like that have disqualified somebody like Colin Powell from serving as Joint Chiefs?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that I'm going to leave the appointment process to the next President. I'm not going to get involved in this election right now. I think that there have been, we know, going back all the way to the first world war, we have clear evidence that there have been gays in the military who have served with great distinction. I think it's quite interesting that most of the Vietnam veterans, combat veterans, in the United States Congress, including Senator Robb and Senator Kerry, just to mention two, have felt that -- both Senator Kerry and Kerrey, and Senator Robb -- have felt that the policy ought to be changed and supported my original position.

So I would like to find some way for people to be honest, to obey the law, and to serve with distinction in the military. So I think that is where our focus ought to be, and the next President will have to figure out how to do that. But I think there will have to be a change in the law.

Q Mr. President, the polls show that your wife is trailing right now. Do you have any advice for her?

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you so much.

Q What was the first night like?

THE PRESIDENT: We had a wonderful time. We don't have a television yet. (Laughter.)

Q So how did you watch the debate?

THE PRESIDENT: We didn't. They have a tape for me. I'm going to watch it tonight when I get home. So I had a tape. So we brought up our CD player, and I gave Hillary one of those South African radios that you crank -- have you seen them?

MRS. CLINTON: Solar-powered radios.

THE PRESIDENT: We bought them -- and I got it in Washington at that Discovery store. You crank it up and it's run either by solar power or by hand crank, but you never need a plug or anything. So we listened to the radio last night. It was quite wonderful.

Q -- what it was like being in the house for the first time in 17 years, your own house?

- 5 -

MORE

- 5 -

MRS. CLINTON: We loved it. Well, it was a little overwhelming because there is so much to be done, and we stayed up very late, working on getting things organized and put away. And then we're going to be back together next week and we'll keep the process going until we finally get things moved in.

But it was wonderful having a chance to be here. My mother is with us. We just had a great time.

Q How late were you up?

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, gosh.

THE PRESIDENT: Past 1:00 a.m.

MRS. CLINTON: Past 1:00 a.m. (Laughter.) Thanks.

END 11:38 A.N. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 13:01:08.00

SUBJECT: Pool Report #1, Morning in Chappaqua

TO: dirck.halstead@pressroom.com (dirck.halstead@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Winmc@aol.com (Winmc@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: irawyman@wn.net (irawyman@wn.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cromequeen@aol.com (cromequeen@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.pearson@afp.com@inet (bob.pearson@afp.com@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: luke.frazza@afp.com (luke.frazza@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry.Rubenstein@Reuters.com (Larry.Rubenstein@Reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: joycenal@earthlink.net (joycenal@earthlink.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mfeinsilber@ap.org (Mfeinsilber@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ggibson@ap.org (ggibson@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wendy.wilkinson@nbc.com (wendy.wilkinson@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: claire.shipman@nbc.com (claire.shipman@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tim.russert@nbc.com (tim.russert@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: russ.moore@nbc.com (russ.moore@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mary.dorman@nbc.com (mary.dorman@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: creese@nbc.com (creese@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: david.bloom@nbc.com (david.bloom@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WALLACEJ@FOXNEWS.COM (WALLACEJ@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHELTON@FOXNEWS.COM (SHELTON@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SANTER@FOXNEWS.COM (SANTER@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LECROY@FOXNEWS.COM (LECROY@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JANKOWSK@FOXNEWS.COM (JANKOWSK@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COLE@FOXNEWS.COM (COLE@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOUGHTON@FOXNEWS.COM (BOUGHTON@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOSWELL@FOXNEWS.COM (BOSWELL@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah.Ruth@Turner.com (Sarah.Ruth@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carol.Cratty@Turner.com (Carol.Cratty@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: TT1@CBSNEWS.COM (TT1@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mcm@cbsnews.com (mcm@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ldx@cbsnews.com (ldx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HGX@CBSNEWS.COM (HGX@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bpc@cbsnews.com (bpc@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary.F.Walsh@ABC.com (Mary.F.Walsh@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie.Z.Smith@ABC.com (Stephanie.Z.Smith@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tom.A.Shine@ABC.com (Tom.A.Shine@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrea.A.McCarren@ABC.com (Andrea.A.McCarren@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Luis.E.Martinez@ABC.com (Luis.E.Martinez@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leo.J.Meidlinger@ABC.com (Leo.J.Meidlinger@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anita.J.Krichmar@ABC.com (Anita.J.Krichmar@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick.J.Cullen@ABC.com (Patrick.J.Cullen@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ann.w.compton@abc.com (ann.w.compton@abc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dee.W.Carden@ABC.com (Dee.W.Carden@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kent.D.Alley@ABC.com (Kent.D.Alley@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mkx@cbsnews.com (mkx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mliasson@npr.org (mliasson@npr.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sammon@twtdmail.com (sammon@twtdmail.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: babingtonc@washpost.com (babingtonc@washpost.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jeanne.cummings@news.wsj.com (jeanne.cummings@news.wsj.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: spage@usatoday.com (spage@usatoday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mcfeattersd@shns.com (mcfeattersd@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hardgrovet@shns.com (hardgrovet@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: toedtman@newsday.com (toedtman@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fireman@newsday.com (fireman@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: deborah.howell@newhouse.com (deborah.howell@newhouse.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lacey@nytimes.com (lacey@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tdefrank@edit.nydailynews.com (tdefrank@edit.nydailynews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CCannon@njdc.com (CCannon@njdc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pramatowski@media-general.com (pramatowski@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mdobbin@mcclatchydc.com (mdobbin@mcclatchydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: doyle.mcmanus@latimes.com (doyle.mcmanus@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: edwin.chen@latimes.com (edwin.chen@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jenda@krwashington.com (jenda@krwashington.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bennett.roth@chron.com (bennett.roth@chron.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stewart@hearstdc.com (stewart@hearstdc.com [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sdimeglio@gns.gannett.com (Sdimeglio@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Klewis@dallasnews.com (Klewis@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sfeeney@dallasnews.com (sfeeney@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: andyg@coxnews.com (andyg@coxnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: george.condon@copleydc.com (george.condon@copleydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thurmans@csp.com (thurmans@csp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nbendavid@tribune.com (nbendavid@tribune.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: s_milligan@globe.com (s_milligan@globe.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dkeil@bloomberg.net (dkeil@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan.weisman@baltsun.com (jonathan.weisman@baltsun.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: paul@basken.com (paul@basken.com [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hthomas@upi.com (hthomas@upi.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tim.ryan@reuters.com (tim.ryan@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: randall.mikkelsen@reuters.com (randall.mikkelsen@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: deborah.charles@reuters.com (deborah.charles@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gretchen.cook@afp.com (gretchen.cook@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: thunt@ap.org (thunt@ap.org [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agearan@ap.org (agearan@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: charrity@usnews.com (charrity@usnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rg@newspictures.com (rg@newspictures.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ChrisUsher@aol.com (ChrisUsher@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: garyhershorn@ibm.net (garyhershorn@ibm.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: smikla@nwnet.newsweek.com (smikla@nwnet.newsweek.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul.Richards@pressroom.com (Paul.Richards@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stephen.jaffe@pressroom.com (stephen.jaffe@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim.Aubry@Reuters.com (Tim.Aubry@Reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim.Sloan@afp.com (Tim.Sloan@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmills@ap.org (dmills@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sapplewhite@ap.org (sapplewhite@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ken.strickland@nbc.com (ken.strickland@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: antoine.sanfuentes@nbc.com (antoine.sanfuentes@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.palmer@nbc.com (john.palmer@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: betty.francis@nbc.com (betty.francis@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brady.daniels@nbc.com (brady.daniels@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tony.capra@nbc.com (tony.capra@nbc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WELLSC@FOXNEWS.COM (WELLSC@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHOTT@FOXNEWS.COM (SHOTT@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SAVAGE@FOXNEWS.COM (SAVAGE@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson@foxnews.com (Nelson@foxnews.com [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KAHN@FOXNEWS.COM (KAHN@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAGAN@FOXNEWS.COM (HAGAN@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CHUNG@FOXNEWS.COM (CHUNG@FOXNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BOYD@FOXNEWS.COM (BOYD@FOXNEWS.COM [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marc.Sklar@Turner.com (Marc.Sklar@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.Gilmore@Turner.com (John.Gilmore@Turner.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: eschweiger@c-span.org (eschweiger@c-span.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tsx@cbsnews.com (tsx@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LSE@CBSNEWS.COM (LSE@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jrc@cbsnews.com (jrc@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ESX@CBSNEWS.COM (ESX@CBSNEWS.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: add@cbsnews.com (add@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vija.Udenans@ABC.com (Vija.Udenans@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew.Speiser@ABC.com (Matthew.Speiser@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judy.M.Penniman@ABC.com (Judy.M.Penniman@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry.Moran@ABC.com (Terry.Moran@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dean.G.Hovell@ABC.com (Dean.G.Hovell@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rusty.M.Lutz@ABC.com (Rusty.M.Lutz@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: josh.gerstein@abc.com (josh.gerstein@abc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bob.Crawford@ABC.com (Bob.Crawford@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.J.Cochran@ABC.com (John.J.Cochran@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane.T.Boozer@ABC.com (Diane.T.Boozer@ABC.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gclugsto@capaccess.org (gclugsto@capaccess.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: pma@cbsnews.com (pma@cbsnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: msmith@ap.org (msmith@ap.org [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: harrisj@washpost.com (harrisj@washpost.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.davis@news.wsj.com (bob.davis@news.wsj.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lmcquillan@usatoday.com (lmcquillan@usatoday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hargrovet@shns.com (hargrovet@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hoffmanl@shns.com (hoffmanl@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: copelandp@shns.com (copelandp@shns.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bill.douglas@newsday.com (bill.douglas@newsday.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: miles.benson@newhouse.com (miles.benson@newhouse.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dasang@nytimes.com (dasang@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: broder@nytimes.com (broder@nytimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ken.bazinet@pressroom.com (ken.bazinet@pressroom.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mgwash@media-general.com (mgwash@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jhall@media-general.com (jhall@media-general.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dwestphal@mcclatchydc.com (dwestphal@mcclatchydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: james.gerstenzang@latimes.com (james.gerstenzang@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sthomma@krwashington.com (sthomma@krwashington.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: john.henry@chron.com (john.henry@chron.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmathis@gns.gannett.com (dmathis@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: candrews@gns.gannett.com (candrews@gns.gannett.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cleubsdorf@dallasnews.com (cleubsdorf@dallasnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: grhillman@aol.com (grhillman@aol.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bobdeans@coxnews.com (bobdeans@coxnews.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: amy.bayer@copleydc.com (amy.bayer@copleydc.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kieferf@csps.com (kieferf@csps.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: scales@nws.globe.com (scales@nws.globe.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: stage@bloomberg.net (stage@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bsmall@bloomberg.net (bsmall@bloomberg.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jane_fullerton@adg.ardemgaz.com (jane_fullerton@adg.ardemgaz.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: whitehouse@upi.com (whitehouse@upi.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lorisantos@netscape.net (lorisantos@netscape.net [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: arshad.mohammed@reuters.com (arshad.mohammed@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: steve.holland@reuters.com (steve.holland@reuters.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: philippe.debeusscher@afp.com (philippe.debeusscher@afp.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sross@ap.org (sross@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kgalvin@ap.org (kgalvin@ap.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ricardo.alonso-zaldivar@latimes.com (ricardo.alonso-zaldivar@latimes.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James R. Fallin (CN=James R. Fallin/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Pool Report #1
Morning in Chappaqua
January 6, 2000

Your pool staked out Old House Road for much of the morning. At 10:30 am a potted plant from Loving Moments florists in Hawthorne, NY arrived at the house. At 11:25 am, the first couple emerged from the columned porch on the left rear of the white shingled colonial -- stepping slowly down

the steps toward the pool cameras. After exchanging a few pleasantries, they turned walk hand in hand down the pebbled drive way toward a gaggle of about 30 reporters, camera men, and crew members. POTUS wore a dark brown leather jacket, a black open necked polo shirt and gray tee-shirt. FLOTUS wore a yellow nylon jacket (pool apologizes profusely for thinking it was suede last night), yellow scarf, and tan leather gloves.

As FLOTUS spoke, POTUS placed his arm around her shoulder and gazed lovingly though he later removed it. POTUS acknowledged that he would register to vote in New York in time for FLOTUS , senate bid "I want to make sure my vote count." They said they spent the night unpacking boxes, deciding where to place the furniture, where to hang paintings, and listening to a hand cranked, solar powered South African Radio. They told us they had no television, they did not watch the democratic debate (although POTUS said he had asked for the debate to taped and would play it back later), though they said they were awake past 1 AM.

Both ducked a question about the use of soft money in the New York Senate campaign, with FLOTUS saying they were there to talk about the house. But POTUS did speak at length about Don ,t ask Don ,t tell policy of

POTUS denied having entertained a job offer from Lazared-Freres -- saying he was amazed by such a suggestion. At 11:35 am after 10 minutes of question, they returned to the house. (transcript should be coming later.)

The motorcade to Westchester County airport made one unannounced stop at the Chappaqua fire department on the edge of town creating quite a stir among volunteer fire fighters and a throng of well-wishers and new neighbors. POTUS and FLOTUS shook hands with neighbors who welcomed them to Chappaqua. "Thank you for coming, you ,re so beautiful," gushed Grace Bucolo of Ovington, a book keeper at the Chappaqua Grand Union. Susan Solomon of York Town, NY crowded FLOTUS holding a sign that said "Hillary is a cutie, Rudie is a doody."

POTUS greeted George Anderson, asking him "what are you hunting" and Anderson replied "deer." After some minutes POTUS shouted, "Come on Hillary, we ,re late." But FLOTUS proceeded across the street to a mobile station where a sign read welcome Bill and Hillary. After chatting for some time with a road crew at the gas station, POTUS and FLOTUS rejoined the motorcade for an uneventful ride back to the airport.

Jonathan Weissman
Baltimore Sun

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:04:08.00

SUBJECT: PBS NewsHour, January 6, 2000

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maura M. Pally (CN=Maura M. Pally/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Hynes (CN=Scott Hynes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PBS NewsHour
January 6, 2000

GAYS IN THE MILITARY

Margaret Warner discusses with four military officers whether "Don't ask, don't tell" is a good policy for the military, after a background report.

Then, participate in an Online Forum on the topic.

TOM BEARDEN: The Pentagon's policy on gay service is commonly called

"don't ask, don't tell," and has been in effect since 1993. It was the result of a hard-fought compromise between President Clinton, who had advocated allowing homosexuals to serve openly, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Congress, who opposed it. Congress passed a law rendering such service illegal.

The "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy says: "The Department of Defense will not ask, nor will members be required to reveal their sexual preference. Homosexual orientation is a personal and private matter and will not

be questioned during service. However, homosexual conduct is not compatible with military service and will subject a member to discharge from the armed forces."

Provoking the latest round of political debate was the killing of Army Private Barry Winchell at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, last year, and the murder conviction and sentencing of 18-year old Private Calvin Glover last month. Soon after, in New York, Senate candidate and First Lady Hillary Clinton, speaking at a gay rights fund-raiser, said the policy had not worked. A week later, her husband agreed. In a radio interview, Mr. Clinton said the policy was out of whack and, as implemented, does not work. The issue was again raised at last night's presidential campaign forum in New Hampshire.

PANELIST: If you become President will you nominate members of the Joint Chiefs who only support your gay policy? In other words, will it be a litmus test?

AL GORE: I would try to bring about the kind of change in policy on the "don't ask, don't tell" policy that President Harry Truman brought about after World War II in integrating the military. And I think that would require those who wanted to serve on the position of... on the Joint Chiefs, to be

in agreement with that policy, so yes.

BILL BRADLEY: My sense is that when you're President of the United States, military people are loyal to their commander-in-chief, whatever the policy is that the

commander-in-chief calls for for the country, and that's what I expect them to do if I'm President of the United States and we move toward gays in the military, which I intend to do.

The President Comments

TOM BEARDEN: The President weighed in again today, standing in front of the Clintons' new home in New York.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I think a lot of people have actually forgotten that Congress put into the law the present policy. And so what I'm going to do is spend the next year trying to make sure that we do what was intended and what I

announced would be done after extensive consultation with our commanders back in 1993. I believe that the next president, if he wants to change the policy, will have to

get

the Congress to change the law.

TOM BEARDEN: Among Republicans, George W. Bush, John McCain and Steve Forbes back the current policy. Their more conservative opponents, Gary Bauer and Alan Keyes, have urged a return to the pre-1993 policy barring gays from serving. Last month, after the Clintons first spoke, Defense Secretary William Cohen announced a three-month review of the policy, especially into allegations that gays were being singled

out

for investigation and harassment. But former Marine Commandant General Carl Mundy and other retired officers have urged caution, warning that politically

inspired

changes could provoke a backlash in the all-volunteer military. A recent study of professional officers

indicated as

many as 27 percent would leave the service if gays were allowed to serve openly.

Four views on "don't ask, don't tell"

JIM LEHRER: Margaret Warner takes it from there.

MARGARET WARNER:
Now, four views on "don't ask, don't tell," and whether the policy needs to be changed. Michelle Benecke is co-executive director of the

Servicemembers Legal Defense
Network. She served in the
Army as a Captain. Robert Maginnis is senior director of
national security and foreign affairs at the Family

Research

Council. He is a retired Army lieutenant colonel and was
part of the Pentagon's study group that came up with the
"don't ask, don't tell" policy. Lieutenant General Paul
Cerjan is president of Regent University. He retired after
34 years in the Army, where his last post was as president
of the National Defense University. And Major General
Vance Coleman retired from the Army reserves in 1989;
he served as an artillery officer in the Korean War, and
he's now director of a community education foundation.
Welcome all.

Michelle Benecke, President Clinton, the man who helped
certainly spearheaded this policy to start with, now says

it

doesn't work. Is he right?

MICHELLE BENECKE,
Servicemembers Legal Defense
Network: This policy doesn't
work. He is right. Military
leaders continue to ask people
about their orientation, to pursue
suspected gay members, and to
tolerate anti-gay harassment. In
the last six years, my organization, Servicemembers Legal
Defense Network, has assisted 2,000 military members
who are hurt by this law. Harassment increased 120%
alone last year in our cases. Discharges have increased
86% under this law.

MARGARET WARNER: This is just for being
homosexual.

MICHELLE BENECKE: Right. And the reason
discharges have increased is because people facing
harassment in the military have no recourse but to leave.
And finally, service members are being required to lie,

even

to their parents, their doctors and their best friends, as

a

condition of serving our military. No, this policy doesn't
work.

MARGARET WARNER: General Cerjan, do you think
the policy works?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN
(Ret.), U.S. Army: I think it
absolutely works. It's got a few

things around the edges that have to be cleaned up to enforce the policy. But let's remember, this is a law. It's not a policy. It was enacted by a Democratic Congress in 1993, and if anybody believes that commanders on the ground spend all their time trying to ferret out people who may be of homosexual orientation, they don't understand what it is to serve in the military today.

MARGARET WARNER: Well, when you say you think it works, what's your evidence? What do you mean it works?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, if you take a look at the comment that Michelle just made about people leaving the service, 86% last year left the service voluntarily by identifying themselves as homosexual. Now, we don't know whether or not they left because they wanted to get out of the service or if they were in fact homosexuals. So, I think there's a little bit of questioning about these statistics.

MICHELLE BENECKE: I want to address that, Margaret, because we do know why they left. Our organization is the only entity that documents what is occurring under this law. And the fact is that our military leaders support those people who harass their fellow soldiers rather than supporting well-meaning officers and NCO's in the field who would rather treat their people fairly. That must end.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Colonel Maginnis....

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): I think that is a totally incorrect allegation.

MARGARET WARNER: Let me get - all right - there are two guests that haven't spoken yet. Colonel Maginnis, Bob Maginnis, do you think it's working?

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.), The Family Research Council: I've consistently said "don't ask, don't tell" since July of 1993 when President Clinton announced that this was the policy, having been

inside I said it's not going to work, one day we'll be here declaring that. It causes homosexuals to pretend they

aren't

homosexuals. It causes the military to pretend it doesn't care about homosexuals serving and it gives the Congressmen a free ride. They don't have to deal with this tough issue. It's time that we return to the question.

It's time

that we make "don't ask, don't tell" consistent with what the law says that General Cerjan just pointed out.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Let me ask General Coleman, do you think it works?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE
COLEMAN (Ret.), U.S. Army
Reserve: No. It absolutely does
not work. I disagree with
General Cerjan. You know, it's
obvious it isn't working. What
just happened at Fort

Campbell.... the leadership -

MARGARET WARNER: Excuse me. You're talking about the beating death of a....

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): Absolutely. But the leadership was supporting the policy we wouldn't have things like that occurring. We wouldn't have this many people leaving the service as leave now. My guess is that they're leaving out of fear. When you cannot be yourself and you don't know if you're going to be physically damaged or killed, for that matter, because the commanders do not support the policy, it seems to me the thing to do is to run for safety and that is to leave the service. And that's sad when my country comes to that point.

LT. COL. ROBERT
MAGINNIS (Ret.): Margaret
we need to be careful about
painting the entire military on
the terrible problem in one
unit. That was a heinous crime

committed down there and Glover is going to hopefully spend the rest of his life in jail for that murder. But at

the

same time we need to recognize nobody denies that homosexuals have served for the last 221 years in the military. It's: under what conditions may they serve? It's been declared because they are cohort that brings in some problems, the military says they're not going to contribute to cohesion and quality force that it demands, Congress agreed, they passed a very compelling law and therefore,

just like we discriminate against a whole host of other people, we say that they should not serve openly.

What should be changed?

MARGARET WARNER: Okay. Three out of the four of you don't think it works. Is there something to make the current policy more workable? Michelle Benecke.

MICHELLE BENECKE: This law is a double standard and it's wrong. And ultimately Congress needs to replace it with a rule whereby everybody is simply treated the same, but in the meantime the least that the military leaders can do for the safety of our soldiers is to fulfill their promises to stop asking, to stop pursuits and to stop harassment. And to date they have not done so.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Cerjan, do you think it needs to be enforced in that way in a better way?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN

(Ret.): I think that it's a leadership issue and you will find that commanders, generally speaking, will protect any soldier in the force who is harassed. Now, if you think you're going to continually try to ferret out those who have a homosexual orientation, I think that's exactly wrong. You cannot make a blanket statement that all commanders in the military,

the

complete cohort of officers and noncommissioned officers spend all their time trying to ferret out homosexuals;

that's

an incorrect statement.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Let me just get Bob Maginnis and then I'll come to you, General. What do you think, Bob Maginnis, is the way to make this policy work? You've alluded to it, but explain it a little more.

LT. COL. ROBERT

MAGINNIS (Ret.): Well, you know, Mr. Cohen is trying to do an inspection. They've already declared the policy works back in August. And, now they're adding don't harass. I'm afraid--

and I agree, we don't want to harass anyone. Nobody should be harassed. However that's going to chill the whole

process. I think we're going to make commanders out there far more timid about initiating investigations. Therefore we have a protected class in the military. And that's not what the law says.

MARGARET WARNER: But what needs to be done?

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): What we need to do is return to the law. Congress has yet to have a

single

hearing on this issue since 1993. They need to hold the military accountable for what the law says and they need to reimpose the question which they can do based on that law.

MARGARET WARNER: You mean when you're recruited ask if they're gay. If they say they're gay,

they're

not recruited.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): We're hypocritical. We're saying anybody can come in that we haven't already asked a question on, please come in and you can serve. That includes homosexuals. We ought to stop being hypocritical about this.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. But, just so I understand, because I want to go to General Coleman, you're saying essentially gays should be allowed to serve

in

the military but only if they're in the closet.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): That's right. That's the condition under which even George Washington adhered to and for the last 220 years.

MARGARET WARNER: Okay. General Coleman, take it away. You think this can be fixed?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE

COLEMAN (Ret.): No, I don't think. I think the law, as the General said, should not be there, period. We should go back to what the Army was as an individual, whether black, white, blonde, blue eyed, gray haired, whatever, if I want to serve, I should be able to serve. And providing that service, I'll have to be able to be what I am. I should not have to pretend that I'm something that I'm not. It seems

to

me that the Army is to fight and to win. I remember that from day one -- to fight and to win -- nothing about sexual orientation. So, we can train people to fight and win, no

matter what their sexual preference might be, it seems to me that's the bottom line.

MARGARET WARNER: So you agree with both Democratic candidates who would like to see homosexuals able to serve openly?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): Absolutely.

MARGARET WARNER: All right.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): I served openly. I don't know why they shouldn't be able to.

MARGARET WARNER: You mean you as a black man?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): That's right.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Cerjan, what about that?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN
(Ret.): First of all I think race is not a choice. Homosexuality is. Having said that, let me talk about the comments made in that last night on the debates. It seems to me that there's a problem here since we're not talking policy, we're talking laws. So the law has to be changed in order for any President to appoint an individual who supports an openly homosexual policy. I think that's something for the lawyers to attend to in terms of whether or not it's legal to get a chairman of the Joint Chiefs or a person to serve who is in direct contradiction to the law. Basically, let me make one more comment.

MARGARET WARNER: Please do.

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): It really bothers me that we would spend 30-some odd years educating and training the leadership of this country to move into

positions

of vast responsibility as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs and chiefs of services to give that military advice to the President when we're about to put our sons and daughters in harm's way and we would eliminate the best and brightest because of a policy that says unless you support an openly gay policy in the military that only addressed

1.5

to 2% of the population does not play to what we're about and that's to win the nation's wars.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): One more

comment if I may.

MARGARET WARNER: Yes.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): You know, it could be, General, that maybe the best and the brightest to lead this country to victory just might be gay.

For gays in the military

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Michelle Benecke, make the case for letting gays serve openly.

MICHELLE BENECKE: Gays do serve openly in some units and gays have served openly in the past. Colonel Kim Meyer is one example; Marine Sergeant Justin Elzin. Through experience we have learned that when people know other gay people, they lose their stereotypes. And by the way, prejudice shouldn't be a reason to exclude people in the first place. The real issue is who do we want in the military? Do we want Barry Winchells, someone who all of the testimony shows was a dedicated soldier; his unit members took the stand and testified they would go to combat with him without hesitation. That example, of any, should show that what breaks down unit morale is prejudice and hatred. We shouldn't want to recruit people like the man who killed PFC Barry Winchell. We should want to recruit fair-minded Americans.

MARGARET WARNER: Bob Maginnis.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): We should not make decisions based on hatred or discrimination, but we should make decisions on what is the best interest of the military and the armed forces of this country. You know, right now we recruit people with an eye on building cohesive teams. The cohesion is the glue that holds the units together. It overcomes terror and fear on the battlefield. Very few Americans understand that firsthand. And the reality is if that if you can't overcome that by camaraderie and cohesiveness, the trust and confidence that is built over a lot of time and a lot of activity,

then

you're going to have an ineffective unit. The thing that we have discovered destroys that the most comes down to, you know, favoritism, sexual relationships, favoring one over another. We already have problems where we mix young men and young women, and when we put young homosexuals together, you won't be able to distinguish one from the other. And then you end up with sort of a problem the Australians and the Brits are

about to have and they try to prosecute all indications of sexual relationships like holding hands between a boy and girl. You know, we have to focus once again on the importance of military readiness. What is our military all about? It's about preserving peace and fighting wars when it's required.

MICHELLE BENECKE: And Margaret, I would say "don't ask, don't tell" don't pursue hurts military

readiness.

It hurts military readiness, because it's harassment and investigations that break down unit morale.

Against gays in the military

MARGARET WARNER: General Cerjan, what's your view on the military cohesion argument and whether letting homosexuals serve openly will affect that?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, I think that across the board, as Colonel Maginnis said, you have a cohesion issue in terms of whether or not soldiers,

sailors,

airmen, believe in their leaders and whether or not they're willing to go forward when the test comes to walk into the crucible. So I think the homosexuality issue affects that because, as we found out in so many instances that Michelle brought up, there is harassment out there and that needs to be stopped. We need to apply an evenhanded policy as the policy was written. But the thing that

bothers

me is that when we start taking look at the readiness of

the

service and as General Coleman said to fight and defend and win the nation's wars, that means that we have to take every measure we can to insure that we have a combat-ready force.

MARGARET WARNER: But what are you saying exactly?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, we're becoming a social engineering agency and that's not what the

military

was intended to do.

MARGARET WARNER: I'm sorry, but we're almost out of time. I want to make sure I understand your point, General. Are you saying because there are straight members of the military who don't like homosexuals or find them distasteful or anathema, or whatever that affects unit cohesion or not?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): I think it does. I

absolutely believe it does because you have to believe in your leaders and, you know, this whole idea that you die for your country has been proven to be incorrect. You die for the soldier that sits next to you in the foxhole. And

you

have to believe in, and there's a whole bunch of love-trust and understanding about what you're doing in terms of what you're doing in the unit. And so, consequently, I

think

it affects unit cohesion.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Coleman, address that point.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): I suspect that any differences between individuals could affect unit cohesiveness. Let's not just look at homosexuality. That happens and I saw that when I was a younger officer, it happens with people that just don't like each other. It happens for various reasons, not because of homosexuality. So you can't just use that to say that affects... you can't have it because it affects unit

cohesion.

If that were true, then I think a lot of other things that

must

be eliminated. I didn't like you again because you had red hair, I didn't know you because you were six feet tall or I didn't like you because you were heavy. I didn't like you

because you were different than I am. That was the thing that the integration between blacks and whites back in the 1950s with President Truman. People had the same arguments then. We overcame that because we

learned to trust and to respect each other. And I would say to you that prior to the leadership of the Army making homosexuality an issue, it was not an issue. Homosexuals fought side by side with straights. And there was no problem. It became a problem when the leadership made it a problem. General, I agree with you. It's a leadership problem, not a soldier problem.

MARGARET WARNER: All right, gentlemen and Michelle Benecke, we're going to have to leave it there. Thank you all four very much.

MIRANDA RIGHTS

Gwen Ifill leads a discussion with two lawyers on each side of the

Miranda rights case, which the Supreme Court is scheduled to rule on later this year.

JIM LEHRER: Now, Gwen Ifill has the Miranda rights story.

GWEN IFILL: Four sentences repeated so often on cop shows and in movies that Americans assume they are an essential protection. "You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you. You have the right to talk with a lawyer before being questioned and to have the lawyer present during the questioning. If you cannot afford a lawyer, one will be provided for you before questioning begins." This is the Miranda warning dating from the 1966 Supreme Court decision in *Miranda versus Arizona*.

To supporters, Miranda is a safeguard against police abuse; to opponents, a spoiler in hundreds of thousands of criminal cases every year because if the warning is not given or given improperly, a defendant's confession can be thrown out. The Supreme Court agreed earlier this month to take up a challenge to Miranda from Maryland. In it, an accused bank robber's confession was excluded in his trial because police gave him the Miranda warning after they questioned him, not before.

Each side of Miranda
Two perspectives now. Paul Cassell, a University of Utah law professor, has been a long time advocate to loosen the Miranda requirement. He will argue the case before the Supreme Court. Steven Shapiro is a legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union, and favors keeping Miranda protections in place. Mr. Cassell, what is wrong or right with the Miranda protections as they now stand?

PAUL CASSELL: Well, there are some things that are right. Giving Miranda warnings has not proven to be a problem. What has proven to be a problem is the exclusionary rule feature of Miranda. That is the feature that throws out perfectly voluntary confession. For example, in this case, all the courts have agreed that Mr. Dickerson's confession is voluntary, and yet now for two and a half years there's been litigation over "what time did he give

his

perfectly

Miranda warning?" Congress has said, "let's let in voluntary confessions." And that's what I'm optimistic the Supreme Court will uphold.

GWEN IFILL: When we speak about Mr. Dickerson, we're talking about the Maryland case.

PAUL CASSELL: That's exactly right, yes.

GWEN IFILL: Mr. Shapiro, what about you? What do you think is wrong or right? What should be upheld in the Miranda warning?

STEVEN SHAPIRO: Well, I think the Miranda decision itself ought to be upheld. And you know, Gwen, it's odd to me that this controversy has even arisen, because Miranda really is a win-win situation. It gives the police a clear set of rules to follow. If anything, it makes it easier to admit confessions at trial, as long as the police obey the rules. It is fair to defendants because it informs them of their rights. It protects the basic Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. And it promotes a sense of fairness, integrity in the criminal justice system. And so, unlike Paul, I'm actually quite optimistic that this Supreme Court will reaffirm the core of the Miranda holding.

GWEN IFILL: Mr. Cassell, your argument, as I understand it is that, at least in part, that there are so many technicalities that Miranda is used as a technicality to throw cases out. What evidence is there of that?

PAUL CASSELL: Well, there's substantial empirical evidence, that over the last 50 years, Miranda's had a devastating effect on law enforcement. If you look at crime clearance rates -- the rate at which police officers solve crimes -- from 1950 to 1965, it was about 60%, but then fell dramatically after Miranda. And if you work through the numbers, as I have with some econometricians, it turns out that about 70,000 violent criminal cases each year go unsolved because of Miranda. And so it's not a win-win situation, at least if you're willing to go beyond the

groups that the ACLU looks at, and look, for example, at victims of crime who are typically poor or racial minorities, residents of inner cities. They're the ones who lose because of Miranda. Criminals are set free and set free to commit their crimes again. That's the problem with

Miranda, and that's why I think the Supreme Court will take a hard look at correcting some of the excesses of the decision.

GWEN IFILL: Mr. Shapiro, your chance to pony up a little evidence, exactly what evidence is there that defendants' rights would be compromised without Miranda?

STEVEN SHAPIRO: Well, let me just respond to something that Paul has just said because he has spent a lot of time promoting this statistic that he just described, and the fact is that there is considerable dispute within the academic community about the validity of those statistics. And rather than get into a fight here or an argument between academics or between lawyers, I think the most powerful fact in this case is that the Justice Department -- on behalf of the FBI and behalf of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, behalf of IRS, on behalf of the entire federal law enforcement structure

--
has filed a brief in this case asking the court to uphold Miranda. And it just defies imagination to think that the federal government and the federal law enforcement would be filing that brief if it thought it had... Miranda had

the
consequences for law enforcement that Paul just described. In fact, the overwhelming proof is that Miranda has not resulted in guilty criminals... significant

numbers of
guilty criminals going free. And what it does do is protect against the abuses that the Supreme Court saw for decades in coerced confession cases before it announced the Miranda rule in 1966.

Are Constitutional rights enough?

GWEN IFILL: What about the constitutional underpinnings of this case, Mr. Cassell? You'll be arguing this in front of the court. They argue... the Constitution does guarantee a right to remain silent. Is that enough?

PAUL CASSELL: Well, as the court has repeatedly said about Miranda rights is that they're not constitutional rights. They're simply safeguards that the Court has created. And one of the little-known facts about Miranda is that Chief Justice Warren, himself, in the Miranda opinion, invited Congress to come in and adopt alternative approaches for dealing with this problem. So the law that

we're talking about here -- the voluntary confessions law -- was enacted at the express invitation of Congress. And I think also, we're going to see considerable support for the law throughout the law enforcement community. It's true that the politically driven brief filed by the Justice Department supports Miranda, but the career people in the Justice Department -- the criminal division, U.S. attorneys around the country-- support the position I'm arguing. The National District Attorneys Association supports it. Many of the nation's largest law enforcement groups support it as well. So, when you talk about where rank and file law enforcement officers are, what they say is, "look, we'll continue to give Miranda warning, but

don't

throw out a perfectly voluntary confession because there's some technicality involved or technical question about how it was obtained."

GWEN IFILL: Well. That leads exactly to the next question here, Mr. Shapiro: If someone confesses to a crime, actually says, "yes, I did it," and it's someone who

you have every reason to believe did do the crime, why should that be thrown out?

STEVEN SHAPIRO: Well, in many circumstances, it is not going to be thrown out. It will not be thrown out if somebody confesses before the police interrogate them; it will not be thrown out if the police give the Miranda warnings before interrogating them. But as you said before, quite properly, Gwen, we do have a constitutional principle that says people have the right to remain silent. And in our system, the government cannot force you to give evidence against yourself. And if that is the constitutional rule, I don't see any basis for objecting

to a

principle that says people have a right to be informed of their rights. Do we really want to live in a system and

live

in a society in which the law enforcement depends upon keeping people ignorant of their rights?

And let me just say, I don't think you can dismiss the Justice Department brief in this case as politically

driven.

The fact of the matter is, the law that is now before the Supreme Court was enacted in 1968; it has not been relied on by a single administration, Democrat or Republican, in the intervening 30 years. This is not an

issue

of politics; this is an issue of constitutional law. And if Miranda were not, in fact, a constitutional ruling, the

Supreme Court could not have applied it against the states, as it did in Miranda and as it has done in many cases subsequently. And while it is true that Chief Justice

Warren

said in Miranda that there's nothing magical about the words and that Congress and the state legislatures could adopt equally effective safeguards to protect the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, that is not

what

Congress did in the statute. Congress did not adopt any safeguard at all. Instead, it went back to a general test

of

voluntariness, which was precisely the test that the Supreme Court had rejected in Miranda.

So what you have here now is a situation where Congress has purported to overrule the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution, and that is something

that

Congress does not have the authority to do in our system.

GWEN IFILL: Mr. Cassell, Mr. Shapiro just referred to Earl Warren's reference to there not being any magic in the words, but certainly Americans have gotten used to the idea that these words represent some sort of protection of their basic rights. How do you argue that that's not true?

PAUL CASSELL: Well, I argue, in fact, it is true. And you'll actually see many of those same words in the law that I'm defending. Congress passed a law that included many of the same rights that are included in

the Miranda opinion. And so what you find in the law itself, voluntary confessions law, is that the evidence can be used if police officers give warnings, and to look at

all

of the factors. So police officers are going to continue to give warnings if this law is upheld. That's not an issue today. What is an issue is whether a perfectly voluntary confession from indisputably guilty criminals can be thrown out because of some technical issue.

It's simply not the case to say, as Steven has, that no administration has ever relied on this law. In fact, if

you go

back as far as 1969, you'll find that the Nixon administration litigated this law all over the country. In 1975, the Tenth Circuit out here in Denver, upheld the law. So, it has been used actually for about 25 or 30 years. It was even used during the start of the Clinton administration. They've just made the political decision

not

law. to enforce this act of Congress. I'm confident that the Supreme Court will agree that this is a constitutional

Voluntary versus coerced confessions

GWEN IFILL: It seems that we keep coming back to the question of voluntary versus coerced confessions. Mr. Shapiro, how exactly and who gets to decide what a voluntary confession is -- something someone says of their own free will -- and what a coerced confession is, that presumably law enforcement officials forced out of someone?

STEVEN SHAPIRO: Well, ultimately it's the courts that decide. And one of the things that produced the Miranda rule was, in fact, the difficulty of determining whether a confession is voluntary or a confession is coerced, given what the Supreme Court described as the inherently coercive atmosphere of custodial interrogations -- station house interrogations.

So what you have pre-Miranda, is you have litigation in case after case after case, where courts were required to look at whole range of factors to decide whether or not the confession was voluntary. You had more litigation, you had less certainty, you had more confusion, not only on the part of the police, but on the part of judges and criminal defendants. Miranda really simplified and rationalized the system which is why many, many law enforcement professionals -- Paul's comment notwithstanding -- support Miranda, believe it is professionalized law enforcement, and believe it has in

fact

made it easier for them to operate and have valid confessions admitted into evidence. Nobody's against the use of uncoerced, voluntary confessions. Miranda is designed to ensure that the confessions that get into trial are in fact voluntary and uncoerced.

GWEN IFILL: Mr. Cassell, if you make your case before the Supreme Court, you argue that people will still continue to give the Miranda warning. If you don't make your case against the Supreme Court, the chance is that the Supreme Court will uphold the law as it currently stands. So, why is this at the Supreme Court? Why does this have to be argued?

PAUL CASSELL: Well, I think the key issue is exactly what Steven just said -- should a perfectly voluntary confession be thrown out. He said that no one would argue against that. In fact, in this case, Mr. Dickerson's

lawyer -- the case out of Maryland -- Mr. Dickerson's lawyer is arguing to throw out this confession that all the courts have found to be voluntary. And that raises fundamental questions about our criminal justice system: Are we going to make the search for truth the overriding and central focus of criminal justice? For too long, we've diverted our attention. We've looked at some of these side issues, these side issues and ancillary questions. This

case

presents an opportunity for the Supreme Court to clearly say, "We're going to make the search for truth the key issue, and we're going to give juries all reliable

evidence to

make that decision."

GWEN IFILL: Steven Shapiro, Paul Cassell, thank you both very much.

PAUL CASSELL: Thank you.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:03:51.00

SUBJECT: FOX The Edge, January 6, 2000

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maura M. Pally (CN=Maura M. Pally/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Hynes (CN=Scott Hynes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FOX THE EDGE WITH PAULA ZAHN

January 6, 2000

PAULA ZAHN, HOST: Tonight in THE EDGE: It's a jungle out there. Just look at tonight's debate in New Hampshire. The GOP candidates took the stage for some sparring. A few of the candidates will join me, and I'll ask them who won the war of words.

Stay tuned. Get THE EDGE.

(NEWS BREAK)

ZAHN: Hi, everyone. Welcome to THE EDGE. Thank you very much for joining us tonight.

A little bit later on, we will hear from candidates Steve Forbes and Orrin Hatch.

But leading THE EDGE tonight: Things are getting hot in chilly New Hampshire. The big primary is less than a month away, and tonight the GOP candidates took the stage yet again, hoping that their take on the issues will give them the edge with the voters.

Let's first turn to three of my favorite political know-it-alls, and I mean this, guys, in the best possible way. In Washington, FOX NEWS political analyst Juan Williams, and here in New York, former senator Al D'Amato, who is also a FOX NEWS political analyst, and John Fund, editorial page writer for "The Wall Street Journal." He's not a FOX political analyst, but we won't hold that against you, anyway.

Welcome to all three of you.

Senator D'Amato, your take on tonight.

AL D'AMATO, FOX NEWS POLITICAL ANALYST: The edge went to George Bush. Clearly, he demonstrated composure. He did not go for the jugular when it was very tempting when the question was put out there about Senator McCain and the FCC. He handled it, I think, in a very diplomatic way, and then turned it around and said, "You know, John, this isn't personal. We disagree on philosophy as it relates to the campaign financing."

So he addressed what probably is one of McCain's greatest points. He took it on. You know, he's the--he's the fellow who's opposed to the present system. He gets great sympathy as it relates to that, a kind of non-politician, a politician who's a non-politician. So I think, clearly, George Bush acquitted himself better than he has heretofore. He not only survived tonight, he picked up.

ZAHN: Juan, don't you think, though, he might have missed an opportunity when it came to that issue of the FCC and John McCain?

JUAN WILLIAMS, FOX NEWS POLITICAL ANALYST: I think...

ZAHN: I mean, he was clearly given the opportunity to call him a hypocrite if he chose to do so.

WILLIAMS: Right. And I think...

ZAHN: He did not.

WILLIAMS: I think that's in the water. It's in the air. Now, the question, Paula, really is one of political strategy. Is it the case that if George W. Bush had attacked, he would be seen as going for the jugular, as Alfonse D'Amato just said, and maybe therefore seen as attacking a fellow Republican on a point of vulnerability and maybe therefore engender a backlash against him?

The problem that McCain has is less with George W. Bush and less with Republicans than with independents. Remember, McCain's best hope in New Hampshire is that independent voters will swing over to him and say that "We like John McCain, the reformer." And McCain's, you know, whole rap has been "I'm the guy that's for campaign finance. George W. Bush is not. And I'm the guy that's clean and pure as the driven snow up here in New Hampshire." His image is being terrifically damaged by this--by the idea that somehow he was paid off--his top contributors were paying him to lobby the FCC on their behalf.

JOHN FUND, "WALL STREET JOURNAL": Well, Juan, I actually think that's very unfair because if you actually look at the facts of this case, the question is not what John McCain did, but what has the FCC done. For almost four years, it's basically held a public television station, the station that Mr. Rogers and "Mr. Rogers's Neighborhood" belongs to, hostage. The station is \$14 million in the red and because the FCC won't make a decision, the station is in danger of going under! So the real question here is not what John McCain did, but what is the FCC doing? I think John McCain is getting a bum rap on this.

WILLIAMS: Well, John, I think that's...

ZAHN: And in the end, Al D'Amato...

WILLIAMS: ... a wonderful point...

ZAHN: But let's not get buried in all this minutiae right now. Do you think the voter gives a darn about this, Al?

D'AMATO: No. But both John and Juan are right.

McCain is being hurt by this, the fact that it's out there now and this is being used and can tarnish his image. But Juan was also right in saying that George Bush, if he had gone to the jugular, I think there would have been a backlash. Republicans would have said, "What are you doing?" John happens to be right. This is a non-issue, really, if you look at the facts. But you know what? The public doesn't give a darn. They're not going to get into the facts. The facts of the situation are that what McCain did was absolutely appropriate. Everyone elected should be there to say to the bureaucracy, "What are you doing? How come you're not acting?"

FUND: This is no Keating 5 case.

ZAHN: Did you do that when you were in the Senate?

D'AMATO: Absolutely. I prided myself...

FUND: Paula...

D'AMATO: ... in doing that.

FUND: The difference is this is no Keating 5 case.

There is no crook here.

ZAHN: All right, let...

FUND: And John McCain did get some legitimate criticism for that case...

D'AMATO: But John...

FUND: ... but not for this one.

D'AMATO: ... the problem is that the public is never going to know it. And there's where Juan's point is that McCain has been hurt. They'll never know that his inquiry was absolutely appropriate. It should have been done before. They should have said to the FCC, "How come you're not making a decision? Make it one way or the other."

ZAHN: Let's move on to an issue Juan also brought up, which is the issue of how McCain has to appeal to independents. Now, John McCain has not unveiled his tax plan, but I think it was quite clear to anybody listening to the debate tonight he's not going to offer as large of a tax cut as George Bush. Does that hurt him in New Hampshire, John?

FUND: Well, New Hampshire is the most anti-tax state in the country.

ZAHN: Right!

FUND: Republicans are the most anti-tax constituency in New Hampshire. I think George Bush, by drawing a contrast with John McCain's tax plan, which really hasn't been unveiled yet, scored points in New Hampshire. He was looking for--he's looking to come up from behind in New Hampshire. I think John McCain is going to be vulnerable on taxes in New Hampshire.

ZAHN: Juan, jump in there.

WILLIAMS: Well, you know, the key point of attack for John McCain on George W. Bush and the tax plan is that he says George W. Bush's plan would spend the entire surplus and not protect Social Security, to which--you saw that little bit of back-and-forth sniping--"Yes, it will," "No, it won't," "Yes, it will"--which was

cut. But I think that the point here is that George W. Bush has some vulnerability connected to his father. Remember George Bush saying ``Read my lips, no new taxes." Here is his son saying not only is he promising no new taxes, but promising a tax cut. So he's taking it to an extreme. And McCain is saying ``You're behaving in a reckless manner that endangers the American economy." I don't know if that's going to help, but I would say that George W. Bush's position is the one that's going to be in the headlines tomorrow morning.

ZAHN: All right, we're going to take a short break right now. More on all of this in just a moment or two.

And a little later on in the show: Hillary and Bill have their first sleepover in their new digs. And I'll be talking to couple of folks who would love to move into a big white house next January: Steve Forbes and Senator Orrin Hatch.

Keep it on THE EDGE.

(22:09)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GEORGE W. BUSH (R), TEXAS GOVERNOR, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Come on down and let me show you what I've done. You talk about same-sex marriage? I'm against same-sex marriage. I'm the only person on this stage that signed a parental notification law. I've got a good record, Gary. It's easy to talk. It's easy to talk. What Republicans need to do is elect somebody who has gotten results, tangible results that people can see, that people can put their arms around and say, ``This man's a leader." And that's been my record in the state of Texas, and that'll be my record as president of the United States, as well.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

ZAHN: Well, the gloves are starting to come off among Republicans. We're continuing with our lead story tonight, tonight's GOP debate in New Hampshire, and we're having our own very own debate right here. Our participants in Washington, FOX NEWS political analyst Juan Williams, here in New York, former senator Al D'Amato, who is also a FOX NEWS political analyst, and John Fund, editorial page writer for ``The Wall Street Journal."

Welcome back.

What Governor Bush went on to say was that he came very close to making a ``no new taxes" pledge. Was that irresponsible?

D'AMATO: No. The fact of the matter is that when his dad said to the convention ``No new taxes," you know, ``Read my lips," he went from a situation where he was trailing Dukakis substantially to pulling right ahead of him because the American people were really saying, ``Don't--don't keep," you know, ``solving our problem by raising taxes." What happened was he broke the pledge unnecessarily. He should have said to the Congress, ``Let me tell you, fellows. I'm going to veto those bills." But what happened, his inner council--John Sununu, who up to that point had been a tough guy, had done a good job--caved in. And President Bush made the mistake...

(CROSSTALK)

D'AMATO: ... governor understands that, and he's going to keep that...

(CROSSTALK)

ZAHN: But has he walked himself into some sort of cage here?

FUND: Well, there's another problem. Steve Forbes today brought out the fact that there's controversy in Texas whether he kept his anti-tax pledge in 1994, so...

ZAHN: Well, he accused him of raising the state tax and the business taxes.

FUND: Well, he proposed a tax shift, but there's some controversy about that. But I think Governor Bush has realized that his father made a mistake. He's also realized that his tax plan does work, and he's going to lock himself into that. Now, that's going to be controversial because John McCain is going to attack him on it. He's going to be called reckless. But Governor Bush has made an opinion that in the Republican primary, the anti-tax position is what binds Republicans of all stripes, social and economic, together.

ZAHN: Gays in the military was a huge issue in last night's debate, less of an issue tonight. Juan, did anybody score points on that?

WILLIAMS: Well, you know, it's very interesting. Here you get a divide that's not McCain versus Bush. Here you get a divide that's more like McCain and Bush versus Gary Bauer, Alan Keyes and some of the others, where McCain and Bush are both saying, you know, "Don't ask, don't tell" is fine. McCain says the policy's working. He won't bother to change it. Bush says he's a "Don't ask, don't tell" man. And the others are making the point that conservatives, moral conservatives, are saying "This is wrong, and you need to make a stand on this issue."

Now, since the two frontrunners aren't fighting over it, I don't think you're going to see a change. But there certainly is a clear divide within that Republican tent.

ZAHN: Al, you're shaking your head.

D'AMATO: No, I...

ZAHN: I couldn't tell whether it was in agreement or disagreement.

D'AMATO: I agree with Juan. I agree with his analysis. But I also make an observation. Do you know who has been doing absolutely fabulously? And he is not getting the kind of--Orrin Hatch. He--he brought down the house, I guess it was a couple of weeks ago, when he talked about Steve Forbes's wallet and not being able--you know, not...

ZAHN: Not being able to lift it.

D'AMATO: ... being strong enough to lift it. He's sensible. He makes a--he's accrediting himself well. I don't think it's going to show in the polls, but he's done a heck of a job.

ZAHN: Is he...

FUND: You know...

ZAHN: ... wasting his time, though? He keeps on citing a poll that 85 percent of Americans really haven't decided who they're going to vote for, but someone pointed out in the debate tonight he has 1 percent--almost a hash mark--in New Hampshire in the polls.

FUND: Pat Buchanan was in single digits at this point before the New Hampshire primary in 1996, and he ended up winning it. I wish the media went beyond its Noah's Ark theory of coverage, which is you have to have two candidates by two candidates, two in the Democrats and two on the Republicans, and you can't cover anyone else. The other four candidates are legitimate candidates. They made some good points tonight. I think it's a mistake to marginalize them all completely, and that's what some of the media's trying to do.

ZAHN: All right, Juan...

WILLIAMS: Well...

ZAHN: ... you get the closing thoughts tonight. Fire ahead.

WILLIAMS: Well, I just think it's money. Money is why those two are as far ahead. And clearly, with Bush, it's of historic proportions. The other thing is lots of people went after Bush today on the experience issue. Bush is clearly saying, "I've been a governor. I've got the experience. I've led." And when it comes to these morality issues that so many of you are concerned with, you can see the results of what I've done in Texas. Come on down and take a look."

John McCain's response was, "I was a leader, too, in the military. Don't forget I've got a story to tell." So that experience issue is also becoming one of the defining issues. I think you're going to see more of it tomorrow when the candidates, the Republicans, go down to South Carolina and as they continue these debates.

ZAHN: I lied. You got to give me a one-word answer. Did the moderator preside over a fair debate tonight? John?

FUND: He was a zookeeper.

ZAHN: Zookeeper?

D'AMATO: He did a good job in tough circumstances. They were wild.

ZAHN: It was pretty freewheeling! Thank you, gentlemen, all for joining us tonight, Senator D'Amato, John Fund and Juan Williams.

A bit later on: Hillary and Bill play house, spending the first night in their new pad. And coming up next: my conversation with a couple of the candidates, Mr. Forbes and Senator Hatch.

We'll be right back. Keep it on THE EDGE.

(22:16)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

STEVE FORBES (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I am independent. The special interests and lobbyists have no hooks into me. And that's why I think my campaign is catching on. I'm picking my pockets. I'm not picking the pockets of the taxpayers. And special interests have no interest in me because they know their gravy train is going to be derailed when I'm president of the United States.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

PAULA ZAHN, HOST: And welcome back.

That was Steve Forbes getting his two or three cents in during the debate.

I talked to him right after he stepped off the stage, and started by asking him about the latest controversy to dog Senator McCain. It appears the senator asked the FCC to act on a request on behalf of a TV station owner who also happens to be one of his supporters. I asked him if he was satisfied by Mr. McCain's defense of his actions.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

FORBES: Well, I think the whole issue underscores why we need a true outsider in Washington who is not beholden in any way to the special interests and who also recognizes the way to deal with that

cesspool in Washington, that swamp, and that is you can't reform it or legislate against it. You got to drain it. And that's why...

ZAHN: Do you think Mr. McCain--are you saying that Mr. McCain is a hypocrite?

FORBES: No, I'm just saying that the system that we have is one that only an outsider's going to truly be able to change, and that begins with getting rid of this tax code and giving people a genuine tax cut. Half of the...

ZAHN: But let's go back to...

FORBES: Half of the lobbying...

ZAHN: ... Mr. McCain's actions. Was what he did...

FORBES: Let me--let me just finish.

ZAHN: Was he appropriate in taking this action to push the FCC to make some kind of a decision?

FORBES: You ask John McCain on that. I just see it as part and parcel of why we need fundamental change in Washington. The point I was...

ZAHN: You brought up the issue of...

FORBES: ... going to make--the point I was going to make...

ZAHN: ... the tax cut...

FORBES: The point I was going to make is that half of the lobbying activity in Washington revolves around the tax code. You get rid of that, and half of the 67,000 lobbyists in Washington are going to have to find honest work. That is real reform.

ZAHN: The issue of tax cuts dominated part of the debate tonight, and Governor Bush came very close to making a "No new taxes" pledge. Were you reading his lips?

FORBES: Well, he made a pledge when he ran for governor in 1994 that he wouldn't raise the state sales tax, he wouldn't enact a statewide business tax. And yet a couple of years later, after he got in office, he violated both pledges. And his tax cut proposal is a lobbyist's dream. It keeps the IRS as we know it. It doesn't change any of the way taxes are done in Washington. It's very phased in over five to eight years. It doesn't do anything on capital gains. Why don't we get to the heart of it and get rid of it? And realists always say, "Well, it's unrealistic to do it." I think the American people ought to define what is realistic in Washington and not the other way around.

ZAHN: Are you surprised Senator McCain hasn't offered a tax cut proposal for everybody to chew on and analyze?

FORBES: Well, he's been showing, as they say, a little bit of leg on it. And apparently, it's going to be even smaller than what Governor Bush proposed. So I think it's--both proposals look like they're going to be typical Washington proposals, just trimming around the edges. That's not going to work. We need to do real, genuine reform, starting by getting rid of this horrible code. And neither one seems to have the stomach to make that fight. I'll make that fight, and I'll win it.

ZAHN: I know that your campaigning hard, but if you are not successful and you do not get the nomination, I am told that you would entertain a possible appointment in a George Bush nomination if he gets elected. Is that true or not?

FORBES: I think the question should be is George Bush going to be on my short list for vice president because I am going to

win this nomination, and I am going to win this election because I've got more bold, conservative ideas to help working Americans than all of the other campaigns put together.

ZAHN: OK, that issue came up during the debate tonight, and you were asked, if that is true, why are your ideas getting so little traction?

FORBES: Oh, I think they're getting real traction, if you come out and look at the crowds that I'm getting. People are very interested in learning more. And after the holidays, I think the American people, especially in New Hampshire and Iowa, are starting to really focus on this race. And that's why I'm optimistic.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ZAHN: Mr. Forbes, thanks for your time.

PAULA ZAHN, HOST: And Senator Orrin Hatch was also gracious enough to brave the cold and talk to us right after the debate. I asked him if he thought tonight's debate was fair.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

U.S. SENATOR ORRIN HATCH (R-UT), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Well, it was a little unruly. I thought it was all right, but you know, I wish we could get into a debate where you have two hours, where everybody can just take off the gloves and let it go. But personally, I want to always be fair to every other candidate, and I think I was tonight.

ZAHN: The criticism I've heard is of the moderator himself and that perhaps he gave more time to McCain and Bush, the two frontrunners in the New Hampshire polls. Is that true?

HATCH: Well, that--that's one reason why I grabbed the mike and said, "Hey, I'm going to say a few words here, whether you like it or not." And Tim's a good guy, and he's a very good moderator, and--but I do think that they kind of lost control of what was going on. And I have to say it was--it became kind of a dialogue between McCain and--and--McCain and Bush.

But look, I cited that Joan Shorenstein poll. That's the Kennedy School of Government. It's the Pew Foundation poll that is the most definitive poll there is. A month ago, two thirds of the American people hadn't even decided who they'd pick as president. Only 16 percent picked George Bush. Everybody else was in single digits.

Yesterday they announced their subsequent poll. Three quarters now of the American people--it's gone up--have not decided who they're going to pick for president. And George Bush has dropped from 16 percent down to 13 percent, and everybody else is still in single digits, Gore being at 6 percent, everybody else below that.

ZAHN: All right. But let's...

HATCH: Now, that's pathetic.

ZAHN: But let's say coming out of the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary, you still have single-digit support among voters. Will you drop out?

HATCH: Well, I don't intend to have that, so I'm going to give it everything I can. And frankly, we're getting some resonance in Iowa, and maybe a little bit here tonight in New Hampshire. So don't count me out. I think that--I think--look, I think McCain can only go so far. I think his campaign finance bill basically hurts Republicans badly. I would lots rather have had him shake hands with

Republicans rather than Bill Bradley on it. And you just have to wonder why all the Democrats favor his bill and hardly any Republican does.

ZAHN: Well, let's talk about...

HATCH: And then George Bush...

ZAHN: Can we talk about...

HATCH: George Bush...

ZAHN: ... the FCC squabble for a moment? Was that hypocritical, what he did?

HATCH: Well, let me just say this. I think that John McCain is finding out what a lot of other people know, that love affairs with the liberal press in this country are not any more stable than love affairs with Bill Clinton. And I've got to tell you that, you know, it's a tough thing. But I know John McCain...

ZAHN: But you're making it sound like the press is turning on him. Was what he did on his--with his position as the head of a committee the appropriate thing, to push action from the FCC? He tried to defend himself...

HATCH: Well, let me--let...

ZAHN: ... this evening.

HATCH: Let me put it to you this way. You know, in all honesty, I get a little tired of John complaining that--that everybody who takes money as a political candidate has to be doing it for a corrupt motive, and everybody who gives it has to be doing it for a corrupt motive. That's just not true.

But let's be fair to John. As a committee chairman, he's--he does have a right to prod the bureaucracy, which he did. I don't know how far he went. I read the articles. We'll just have to see. But people should, you know, give a little break here to John.

Look, John McCain is the same person this week that he was a week ago. And I personally believe he's a person of integrity, but I get a little tired of him saying that everybody else is in this business just because of money.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ZAHN: And Senator Hatch, thanks to you, and Steve Forbes, for standing up to the New England winter for us this evening.

Coming up next: The first couple spent their first night in their fancy New York pad, a rather large pad, not quite like the White House, but a different kind, in the 'burbs of New York.

Keep it on THE EDGE. We'll take you there when we come back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PAULA ZAHN, HOST: Well, the decision was made. But it doesn't seem like it has been accepted.

Thousands of protesters packed the streets of Miami furious because the INS said that 6-year-old Elian Gonzalez, who was rescued from the ocean trying to flee Cuba, must go back to his Communist homeland.

FOX's Jeff Goldblatt is in Miami.

What's been going on there tonight, Jeff?

JEFF GOLDBLATT, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CORRESPONDENT: ... adjective: wild, surreal, crazy, spectacular. You'll find it all here on the streets of Miami today, just one day after the INS ruled that Elian Gonzalez must be returned to his father in Cuba.

Demonstrators took to the streets en masse. They vowed yesterday to shut down the street. And that they certainly did bringing the downtown area to its knees.

About midday, a peaceful protest spilled out onto the streets as protesters snaked through the downtown. They arrived eventually at the port area, succeeded in blocking that for about a couple of hours. Police let protesters roam at will for about an hour before reclaiming the streets.

Hundred arrests in total we understand. Those arrests and the protests continuing throughout the streets of Miami--pardon me, Paula--throughout the night here. And this scene could be only a scene of things to come, the unrest here for the next couple of days.

The INS has said Elian Gonzalez must be returned to Cuba by next Friday. And so we still have a great deal of time left here and a lot of people taking to this cause.

ZAHN: So are people still expecting this thing to get really slowed down in the courts?

GOLDBLATT: The family of Elian, they sure hope so, the family with whom he's been living since he arrived here in the U.S. six weeks ago. They want to bog it down in courts. But it doesn't seem like government officials in Washington are buying into this.

Attorney General Janet Reno said today that essentially she will not overrule INS Commissioner Doris Meisner who yesterday said that Elian Gonzalez must be returned to Cuba.

ZAHN: All right. Thanks, Jeff, so much for that update tonight...

GOLDBLATT: Sure.

ZAHN: ... Appreciate your joining us.

And the plight of little Elian Gonzalez made a lot of you sound off last night. Here's a sample.

CALLER: George, Billerica, Massachusetts. They are risking their lives if this boy's mother died trying to do it. They are leaving there for a (EXPLETIVE DELETED) damn reason. What the hell are we sending the kid back there for now?

CALLER: Stacia. I live in New York City. I am a Miami native born and raised. I can see both sides of the story and understand where both sides of the family are coming from. Inevitably, I do believe the boy belongs with his father.

CALLER: Donna Goodhart (ph) from Atlanta, Georgia. I think that had this been a child who had escaped the Holocaust, we wouldn't have sent him back to Germany or Auschwitz. And I think that's exactly what we're doing.

CALLER: Ron Marquez, Sacramento, California. As unfortunate as it is, the boy should be with his father. And it never should have taken this long rather than being prodded with toys and Disneyland trips and such.

CALLER: Jose, New York City, New York. I just find it so interesting that Fidel Castro cares so much about children being that his own daughter had to escape Cuba.

ZAHN: As you can see, you've looked at Elian Gonzalez's story in a number of different ways. And as always, we appreciate all of your feedback. So please, keep it coming.

And coming up next, it's been market madness for

``Time" magazine's Man of the Year. Amazon.com CEO and billionaire Jeff Bezos stops by. Keep it on THE EDGE.
(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PAULA ZAHN, HOST: Jeff Bezos is ``Time" magazine's Person of the Year. I'm getting all choked up about it here, excuse me, and CEO of the Internet retailer Amazon.com. Their web site has become a household name. But not everyone had faith in the idea. Jeff Bezos once said, ``If I had a nickel for every time a potential investor told me this wouldn't work," well now he has more than 20 billion nickels. And Jeff Bezos joins us from Seattle.

Good to see you. Congratulations.

JEFF BEZOS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, AMAZON.COM,
``TIME" MAGAZINE'S PERSON OF THE YEAR: Thank you. It's great to be here.

ZAHN: Well, you're known as a pretty low-key guy.
How are people treating the person of the year?

(LAUGHTER)

BEZOS: Well, when we found out, I went out to dinner with my family to celebrate. And my mom cried. And it was very emotional for my family.

It's very nice. Obviously a big honor, and we're very grateful.

ZAHN: It was a wonderful thing to have happen to you, particularly at such a turbulent time for your company. So let's talk business for a moment.

Some analysts have suggested that your company has lost 40 percent of its value in the last month or so. What happened?

BEZOS: Well, actually, I think Amazon--it's always been a turbulent time for Amazon.com for the past four-and-a-half years. And what happened is--I mean, the market is a very volatile market, especially for Internet stocks, especially for Amazon.com. It always has been.

And we're a very long-term oriented company. We make all of our decisions for the long-term. We're focused on the customer. We're investing for the customer experience.

Over the last 12 months, we've spent \$300 million investing in new distribution centers so that we'd be ready for the holiday season. And we delivered well in excess of 99 percent of the orders in time for the holiday season. We're the only retailer to do that in any scale. And we're very proud of that performance.

ZAHN: So for people who don't...

BEZOS: So we're happy with the way it's going.

ZAHN: ... follow the Internet trading business all that closely, can you explain to them why these businesses are so hot when they're hemorrhaging so much cash?

BEZOS: Well, one of the things that's happening is that companies are investing for the future. So if you look at Amazon.com, for example, we think this is a critical category formation time. We're not--we're investing. New customers are coming online. We're investing in these new distribution centers I talked about, new customer service facilities, whole new categories.

Eighteen months ago, we were selling exclusively U.S. books. Now we also sell toys. We have a complete toy store. We have a complete tool store, a complete electronics store. And these stores have

been rated by various parties as the best place to buy these particular things online. Making that kind of best of breed customer experience is hard.

ZAHN: What do you say to your critics who say you simply are spreading yourself too thin?

BEZOS: Well, I think that the sales numbers that we turn in and the fact that we have well in excess of 15 million customers now who've shopped at Amazon.com demonstrate that that's wrong. But the thing that I would really say is go to www.amazon.com and check it out. You'll see for yourself that it's working and working well.

ZAHN: I checked it out all right. And I also was looking at Barnes and Noble's stock today. And I noticed it went up six percent with the announcement that it has gone into a deal with Microsoft to use their technology to create digital books. Isn't that a pretty good idea?

BEZOS: Oh, I think digital books is a fantastic idea and...

ZAHN: Do you wish you had done it first?

BEZOS: ... No, no, no. First of all, digital books is a wonderful idea whose time hasn't quite come yet. Digital books is going to be a very big deal though. You know, the computer displays are not quite as good as paper yet. Paper turns out to still be the best display advice. But Amazon.com will be heavily involved in digital books.

ZAHN: How far away are you from doing that?

BEZOS: Well, I think that what you'll see as with all these things is they're not light switches. They're not things that turn on and off with a single switch.

This will be something that will happen incrementally over five years. If you look out 10-plus years, I think the majority of books may even be electronic.

ZAHN: I've got to tell you, I'm one of those people that loves getting newsprint of my newspaper all over my face, all over my kids' faces. I can't believe that all of us are going to get used to the idea of reading books digitally.

BEZOS: Well, I'm sure you're...

ZAHN: Do you really think the books of yesterday are gone?

BEZOS: ... No, I'm sure you're right in fact that all of us won't. And it will be a mixture. And it will be a continuum. And it will happen very slowly.

ZAHN: And when do you think it's realistic that we will be reading our books online?

BEZOS: Well, I think before it's a significant fraction of the market you're talking about three to five years before it's even sort of double-digit percentages and maybe even longer. By the time maybe it's 10-plus years before it's a significant, you know, really big fraction.

ZAHN: OK, back to stock prices. Do you think your stock is fairly priced?

BEZOS: I have no idea. And that's not--it's very interesting. And it's a great question. And it's one I get asked a lot.

But my job and the job of the management team at Amazon.com is to try and build an important and lasting company. Wall Street analysts and investors have what I think is often an even harder

job, which is to figure out how much such a company is worth when. And I don't envy them that job.

ZAHN: You no doubt know a president of a major technology firm came out several weeks ago and said technology stocks were way overpriced. And I've also heard people in your community say the same of Internet stocks. What is the trend?

BEZOS: Well, one thing you know for sure is that the stocks are volatile. And I think that's enough to warn off most small investors.

I've been for a long time now recommending that small investors not invest in Amazon.com except maybe the smallest portion of their portfolio just on the basis of the volatility. Amazon.com, like all Internet stocks, can be up 20 percent in a day or down 20 percent in a day or more. And for a small investor I think a very good investment criteria should be the ability to sleep well at night.

ZAHN: Can you do that now? How much money have you lost on paper over the last month or so?

(LAUGHTER)

ZAHN: Come on, you're among friends here, Jeff. You can share with us.

BEZOS: I'm sure it's a matter of public record. I honestly don't know. And it's very unimportant because measuring Amazon.com's stock-price performance over a period as short as a month is completely meaningless.

What we're doing is we're focused on the long term, building what we hope will be a lasting company. And you do that by focusing on customers, which is what we do obsessively, why we offer such low prices and such big selection.

ZAHN: Well, it was good of you to join us so late in the evening. Appreciate it again. Congratulations.

BEZOS: It's my pleasure.

ZAHN: "Time" magazine's Man of the Year--I think you should have like a crown or something...

(LAUGHTER)

ZAHN: ... to signify that this honor has been bestowed upon you.

BEZOS: Thank you.

ZAHN: OK, thanks again for your time.

And that wraps it up for us tonight here at THE EDGE. Thank you very much for being with us.

And remember, if you want the edge, watch THE EDGE. Have a great night. See you tomorrow. Please join us then.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:04:00.00

SUBJECT: FOX Hannity & Colmes, January 6, 2000

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maura M. Pally (CN=Maura M. Pally/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Hynes (CN=Scott Hynes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FOX NEWS' ``HANNITY & COLMES"
JANUARY 6, 2000

SPEAKERS: SEAN HANNITY, CO-HOST
ALAN COLMES, CO-HOST

ALAN KEYES, REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE Republican
presidential candidates, Ambassador Alan Keyes. How are you, sir?
U.S. SENATOR ORRIN HATCH (R-UT), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
STEVE FORBES, REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

KEYES: Pretty good. How are you?

HANNITY: A little combative, contentious with Tim Russert on a
couple of occasions, you guys battling for air time sort of like what me
and Colmes do here.

COLMES: Yeah.

HANNITY: Ambassador, what did you think?

KEYES: Well, I think that that was a problem with the format tonight. We actually had protested it when they put it together. I think it's good to have exchanges. But they need to be moderated so that people don't have to fight for the floor.

It is not right. It's not consistent with the dignity of a presidential race. This should not turn into some kind of Jerry Springer presentation.

HANNITY: And did you feel it was?

KEYES: We're talking about the choice of the individual who's going to occupy the most serious office in this nation's life. And I think the debates around that ought to be conducted with more decorum. And I thought tonight's debate in the Russert section...

HANNITY: Well, one other...

KEYES: ... the part I think about the Tim Russert show kind of got out of hand.

HANNITY: ... All right, one of the criticisms, though, of these debates though, Ambassador, that there's not enough give and take, there's not enough freedom for people to come in. And people have defined them as joint press conferences. Was this an effort maybe to get away from that format, make it a little more freewheeling? I happen to like it better. I thought tonight's debate by far was...

KEYES: Yeah, but...

HANNITY: ... the most lively, most interesting. I got more out of it...

KEYES: ... This is not--no...

HANNITY: ... And I want to see people challenged.

KEYES: ... I'm sorry, that's not true. I don't believe one got more out of that section.

HANNITY: Yeah.

KEYES: This is not a gladiatorial combat. Right? This is something where each individual should have an opportunity to address...

HANNITY: But Ambassador, I want you to be able...

KEYES: ... the issues (inaudible)...

HANNITY: ... I want you to be able to look in the eye...

KEYES: ... I have no problem...

HANNITY: ... of George Bush and challenge him...

KEYES: ... No, excuse me, Sean...

HANNITY: ... And that's what I liked about tonight's debate (inaudible).

KEYES: ... I have no problem with this format.

HANNITY: OK.

KEYES: I do very well in it...

HANNITY: I...

KEYES: ... Steve Forbes had a problem, and that's not fair...

HANNITY: ... right.

KEYES: ... OK? Others had a problem, and it's not fair. We shouldn't be judging people on the basis...

HANNITY: All right...

KEYES: ... of whether or not they can...

HANNITY: ... there...

KEYES: ... let me finish, sir...

HANNITY: ... Go ahead. Go ahead.

KEYES: ... of whether they can wrestle their way into some free for all...

HANNITY: All right, well, let me go to...

KEYES: ... We should allow--we should allow a format that gives these gentlemen...

HANNITY: ... (inaudible)...

KEYES: ... a chance to have their say. And tonight's format let Tim Russert run roughshod over people and then had the whole thing dissolve...

HANNITY: All right...

KEYES: ... into a little bit of chaos because people refused to let him do it. It wasn't right.

HANNITY: ... let me ask you, you used the term "where have all the conservatives gone?" And a big part of this debate became the issue of gays in the military. And you were the only candidate up there that said the current policy--don't ask, don't tell--is wrong. We should say it's wrong. And we should say that gays shouldn't serve in the military. One clear distinction between you and your fellow candidates.

KEYES: Well, I think it is a clear distinction. But I think we have a lot of folks, including everybody else in this race apparently who doesn't understand the seriousness both of the homosexual challenge to our national security where it seriously affects morale and discipline.

Senator McCain kept talking about the leadership. The political general who are going to cow-tow to their political masters may go along with this stuff. That doesn't mean that the rank-and-file troops, that doesn't mean that the people who are actually having to do these things on the front line. I know better. I know that they don't appreciate it...

HANNITY: All right...

KEYES: ... I know that it's causing tension and difficulty. I know that people are leaving the military in droves because of the demoralization that results...

HANNITY: ... let me...

KEYES: ... We shouldn't let this happen.

HANNITY: ... Let me ask you to dovetail. Dealing with cultural issues, you had an opportunity to ask Senator John McCain a question. You asked him about his answer to a previous question about a rock band. And he said his favorite was Nine Inch Nails. What did you think of his answer tonight?

KEYES: I thought his answer was totally inadequate tonight. And it also showed that he's not really serious at all about the challenge that we face on the moral front.

You don't make light of the influence that is had by these groups. We know that they contribute to declining morality, licentiousness, violence. Therefore, if somebody asks you what your favorite rock group is, you don't name one and give credibility to one that is actually among the worst offenders in the cesspool that can sometimes be out there.

You could name Point of Grace. You could name other groups that are actually wholesome, good music, popular, contemporary. You don't have to pick the...

COLMES: We know--we know that...

KEYES: ... worst devils and make jokes about it. It's not funny. It really isn't.

COLMES: ... Well, you know, we know that Senator McCain is not grooving to Nine Inch Nails while you're talking to HANNITY & COLMES. Listen...

(LAUGHTER)

COLMES: ... would you--I made him laugh. Can you believe it? I made Alan Keyes laugh. Would you...

HANNITY: By the way, Nine Inch Nails is his favorite group. It's...

COLMES: ... No it's not. You wouldn't vote for Tim Russert, though. You wouldn't support him as a candidate I'm guessing, right?

(LAUGHTER)

COLMES: It wouldn't happen.

KEYES: Well, I wouldn't want to anticipate the process. If he declares...

COLMES: Look, I think he was doing his job. You know, it's tough to be a--just a on HANNITY & COLMES, we're always fighting for time. You're always trying to...

KEYES: Well...

COLMES: ... control six different Republican candidates...

KEYES: ... Alan, Alan...

COLMES: ... all of whom want a piece of the pie is very tough.

KEYES: ... Alan, come on. Come on, Alan. What he was doing was shilling for Bush and McCain. He kept...

COLMES: Oh, you believe that?

KEYES: ... in the beginning of the debate when we were supposed to be giving questions to individual people, he would go down the line. And every time somebody gave an answer, he turned back to Governor Bush. Why? On what basis?

COLMES: No, no...

KEYES: It totally violated the format. And it was being done I think at the behest of the Bush campaign.

COLMES: Dr. Keyes...

KEYES: Is that an unbiased media representative?

COLMES: ... You know, Tim Russert...

KEYES: I hardly think so.

COLMES: ... he's on a competing network. But I think he's one of the best interviewers in the business. And I also think to say that he was shilling--to sacrifice his credibility to shill for two of the candidates is a very serious charge. You really believe that?

KEYES: He did it. I didn't do it. And don't tell me that I have to do something. Anybody who watched that debate and had eyes knew exactly what was going on and saw it from the beginning.

So it's not an assertion on my part, Alan. You watched the debate. You can see what happened.

COLMES: You know, there's a perception about you that whatever question gets asked, the answer always involves God, morality, and a diminution of how we're doing as part of the pop culture. Do you feel that you might have--I know you're not going to say you focus too much on that. But can you understand why there might be that perception of you because almost every question results in that kind of answer?

KEYES: I have said quite seriously and I deeply believe the moral crisis is the top priority this nation faces. When your house is burning down, when the foundations are crumbling, if somebody stands in front of the burning house and shouts ``fire, fire," you don't look at the flaming house and say, ``Why are you obsessed with fire?"

That's what you're doing here. I tell you the house is burning down. I keep saying ``fire, fire," and you say, ``Alan, why do you keep

saying ``fire, fire"? Well I'll tell you, it's because the house is burning down...

COLMES: All right, we only have...

KEYES: ... And so that crisis is the one we need to address.

And yes, I keep coming back to it because that's where we should be focusing our attention.

COLMES: ... We only have a moment left here before we get to break. Let me ask you, maybe we can agree on this, Elian Gonzalez, the boy from Cuba, should he go back or should he stay in America?

KEYES: I think that that is properly up to his father if his father in fact has been properly meeting his parental obligation. The bonds of family should not be superceded by political and ideological concerns. We should respect those bonds.

God decides what country we are born in, some people in America, some people in Cuba. But your father is your father. And the only objection I have to the INS decision--and it's a strong one--is that we don't know that that father has made a free decision...

COLMES: The father wanted the boy, was OK with the boy coming here...

KEYES: ... And until we do, until we do...

COLMES: ... and then changed his view about it.

KEYES: ... excuse me, until we know that the father has made a true and free decision...

HANNITY: All right...

KEYES: ... the boy should stay in America.

HANNITY: ... Ambassador Alan Keyes, thank you for joining us.

Good job on the debate tonight.

KEYES: Thank you.

HANNITY: You'll be back here tomorrow night after tomorrow's debate.

KEYES: Yes indeed.

HANNITY: And we wish you well tomorrow night as always.

END

SPEAKERS: SEAN HANNITY, CO-HOST

ALAN COLMES, CO-HOST

U.S. SENATOR ORRIN HATCH (R-UT), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

HANNITY: Now joining us from New Hampshire, Republican presidential candidate Senator Orrin Hatch is with us.

Senator, are you declaring yourself the winner?

(LAUGHTER)

SEN. ORRIN HATCH (R-UT), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: No, I'll let you do that. And I hope you will.

I think we did OK because it was kind of an unruly bunch. But you know...

HANNITY: Yeah.

HATCH: ... I think I'm the only one that really just treated everybody fairly and well.

HANNITY: I thought this was the best debate so far. It was lively. It was passionate.

You were lively and passionate, Senator, more than you have been in the other debates. And I thought you did a terrific job, I really did. And compared to Gore and Bradley...

HATCH: Thank you.

HANNITY: ... all of you guys are a better choice. We'll get into that.

Listen, a couple of things came up tonight, and I wasn't clear on your position. A lot of talk about gays in the military in this debate tonight. And I'm not--I still wasn't sure of your position. Now you did get cut off at that point. But what is your position specifically?

HATCH: I'm against having active gays in the military. If they're not going to live the moral lives of the military, they shouldn't be in the military.

But on the other hand, I'm against preventing anybody who's a citizen of this country from serving this country if they're going to live the laws.

HANNITY: Don't ask, don't tell?

HATCH: But keep in mind--yeah, I think don't ask, don't tell is the best we can do right now. But keep in mind, I said look, if I'm president of the United States I will not expect the people in the military to live a law that I'm not willing to live...

HANNITY: Yeah.

HATCH: ... because everybody knows I'm willing to live a straight-laced life.

HANNITY: All right, another issue that came up and I wasn't sure of your position, and I just want to clarify it if I can...

HATCH: Sure.

HANNITY: ... And I will say in your defense there was a lot of back and forth, so it was hard to get positions at times. The issue of this Cuban boy Elian Gonzalez became a big part of tonight's debate. You used the term "what is in the best interests of the child," but you didn't define it. What is in the best interests of Elian Gonzalez?

HATCH: Well, let me just tell you this. And I practiced law many years before I came to the Senate. And I had some child custody cases where we had to battle it out in court and determine what was in the best interests of the child.

And I can tell you this. In every case, I worked for the best interests of the child. And that's what this system ought to do.

Castro ought to butt out. All of these politicians and political types ought to butt out...

HANNITY: Should he stay?

HATCH: ... And we ought to let our system that works determine what's in the best interests of this child. And if being with his father is in the best interests, fine. If not being with his father...

HANNITY: All right...

HATCH: ... because his mother sacrificed her life...

HANNITY: ... right.

HATCH: ... to come over here, then that's fine with me too.

HANNITY: Based on your knowledge of the case, Senator, what is in the best interests of the child in this controversial case?

HATCH: Well, I think it's too early to tell. You know, I think that INS has done what INS really probably is bound to do. But INS knows that that's going to be appealed and taken to the courts.

The courts then are geared up and ready to do what's right here...

HANNITY: All right...

HATCH: ... And I have confidence that they'll do what's right

here...

HANNITY: ... Let me...

HATCH: ... My own personal belief is that...

HANNITY: ... Yeah.

HATCH: ... normally there's a presumption in favor of the remaining parent.

HANNITY: Let me ask you this. I don't know if you had an opportunity to watch Gore and Bradley debate last night...

HATCH: I didn't. I did not.

HANNITY: ... OK. Believe me, you didn't miss much. They--more big government programs, nationalizing healthcare, taking shots at the Republicans, that's about all it was.

HATCH: Those two guys...

HANNITY: It's all predictable.

HATCH: ... Those two guys are going to spend over \$1.5 trillion as we sit here...

HANNITY: That's what I want to know. That's what...

HATCH: ... It's unbelievable.

HANNITY: Nationalized healthcare, why is it bad?

HATCH: Well, it's bad because we'll be the same as most other states with nationalized healthcare where if you need a hip transplant it takes three years to get it. Or if you need a knee transplant it takes three years to get it. Or if you have a heart condition, it might take six months before you can get any help there.

I mean, it's ridiculous. Any time you put your faith in the central government totally, then the central government controls your life...

COLMES: You say central government...

HATCH: ... I've got to tell you, our system of healthcare is the best there is. You're looking at the guy that put home healthcare into existence. It works. You're looking at the guy that brought pharmaceutical prices down through creating the modern generic drug industry. It works.

You're looking at the guy that just recently at the last session of this Congress actually saved the...

COLMES: Senator...

HATCH: ... nursing home industry...

COLMES: ... Senator Hatch, I don't want to be like...

HATCH: ... Now, we had to do it the right way...

COLMES: ... I don't want to be like the debate where you get cut off...

HATCH: That's all right.

COLMES: ... But we've got to move forward here...

HATCH: Sure.

COLMES: ... Look, I think eventually there's going to be more national healthcare. I think people need it. Many people use the emergency room as their first line of attack when they have to get help. And that costs the taxpayer more money than it would if they had coverage.

HATCH: Well, keep in mind there is a place for government. When people cannot help themselves but would if they could, then government ought to come in and health. But you know, the problem with nationalized healthcare is we're helping a lot of people who can help themselves but won't and expect government to do everything for them...

COLMES: I think there's a good marriage there somewhere.

HATCH: ... When you start--there is a good marriage. But when

you start moving in that direction where we're helping too many people who won't help themselves but could help themselves, then that's the direction of centralized (inaudible)...

COLMES: Well, I think the Democrats have talked about those people who can't help themselves. But I want to move on to something else...

HATCH: ... No, they're not. No, they're not. They want to cover everybody no matter what. Now why would we cover everybody with regard to pharmaceuticals when two-thirds of them have private insurance?

Why wouldn't we make that system work and cover those in a drug benefit package that would take care of those who literally can't help themselves (inaudible)...

COLMES: Well, I'll tell you what Bill Bradley has said. He wants to give everybody the same care that you get as a senator...

HATCH: ... Well, so do I.

COLMES: ... the same care that the government workers get.

HATCH: Well, now Alan, so do I. And you know that because I've said it before on your program that I believe that everybody ought to be able to get the best healthcare.

But to be honest with you, mine's a combination of private and government. And have to say I would hope that everybody in America could have adequate healthcare...

HANNITY: Senator...

HATCH: ... And most people do. You're also looking at the guy that put the child health insurance program through, the CHIP bill that every governor now takes credit for, not one of which supported it, except Governor Dean of Vermont when we did it...

HANNITY: ... Senator...

HATCH: ... And that now is going to take care of seven million kids who are the poorest of the poor kids...

HANNITY: ... Senator...

HATCH: ... not on Medicaid whose parents work.

HANNITY: ... we are out of time. But it's always a pleasure, sir...

HATCH: Oh, come on.

HANNITY: ... Great job on the debates...

(LAUGHTER)

COLMES: He's just getting rolling. What are you talking about?

HATCH: We're just getting going here.

(LAUGHTER)

HATCH: It's great to see you guys.

HANNITY: You're welcome back any time.

END

SPEAKERS: SEAN HANNITY, CO-HOST

ALAN COLMES, CO-HOST

STEVE FORBES, REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Mr. Forbes, I think you had once again probably the funniest line tonight about hugging John. But what about that issue that this is your second run for president, you're polling at around in the single digits still. Shouldn't you be doing better by this point given how familiar the American people may be with you?

FORBES: Well, actually, I think the American people are just beginning to pay attention to this race after the holidays. They're certainly doing it in New Hampshire and Iowa.

And as we speak, we're getting support in both of those states. That's the purpose of a campaign is to get your message out. And I have a more powerful message, more substance, more bold ideas than all of the other candidates put together.

And tonight in this debate, we've got a first inkling of a real substantive fight and issue. And that is on the issue of taxes. Senator McCain has come in with a very small tax cut. George Bush has come in with a very convolute and fairly small tax cut. I'm on the only major candidate who's proposing getting rid of this tax code and giving working Americans a substantial tax cut now, not some vague promise in the future.

COLMES: Right. You're talking about a 17 percent flat tax with a \$13,000 exemption for adults and \$5,000 for children...

FORBES: That's right.

COLMES: ... And some economists say that's not going to meet the deficit gap. That would not pay all the bills.

FORBES: Well, actually it would end up raising more revenue because when you reduce the burden on the American people, on working Americans, what happens? You get more activity, more investment, more productivity, better paying jobs. Remember, in the early '60s, John Kennedy reduced tax rates, proposed reducing them 20 percent. The revenues didn't go down 20 percent...

HANNITY: They went up.

FORBES: ... They went up, and the economy boomed.

HANNITY: Same with Reagan.

FORBES: Same as in the early 1980s. And so that's what we're going to do today for this new era. We're going to reduce the burden, get rid of this crazy tax code and unleash the energies of the American people and give working Americans a real break.

HANNITY: Mr. Forbes, welcome back to the program. Glad to have you. You did a great job tonight.

FORBES: Thank you.

HANNITY: And compared to those other guys last night, you guys were all on target. So I applaud you.

You took a few jabs at George W. Bush. You said that he would keep the current tax code and that he's offering Clinton-Gore light, I think was the phrase you used.

And then Gary Bauer challenged you and said, "Well, you're getting rid of the mortgage deduction and charitable contributions." How do you respond to those things?

FORBES: Well, in terms of what George Bush has proposed, it's very clear. It's a five-to eight-year phase in of fairly small tax cuts. Making people go through hoops and loops to figure out what they qualify for just keeps the current code in place. And we've tried that for 30, 40 years. It doesn't work...

HANNITY: Yeah.

FORBES: ... So we ought to get rid of it and give people a real tax cut, real break, real incentives right now.

HANNITY: Let me...

FORBES: In terms on the business side, if you don't allow the farmer, if you don't allow the small business person to recover their investment, you destroy them. As a businessman, I understand it. Gary, as

I said in the debates, has got some educating to do.

HANNITY: You had a couple of good lines. There's no doubt. I'll ask him about it when he joins us in a few minutes.

The boy Elian Gonzalez. You had very strong language. You said Bill Clinton is sacrificing this boy to Fidel Castro...

FORBES: That's right.

HANNITY: ... Those are harsh words.

FORBES: No they weren't because just as we would not return a child to Adolf Hitler, we would not return a child to Stalin's Russia, why in the world would we return a child to Castro's Cuba? The man is a tyrant.

HANNITY: We're almost out of time. What about the right of the father, though? Are we deciding that this father never sees his son again?

FORBES: The mother has custody. She sacrificed her life to get this boy to the United States. The father is in a dictatorial country under severe pressure. Let him come here for a while and make a decision. You know he would stay if he had that kind of freedom.

HANNITY: I bet--you know what? I agree with you. And I wish Castro would give him that opportunity.

And I agree. But are we then deciding that a boy never sees his father again? It's a very tough issue.

COLMES: Mr. Forbes...

FORBES: Castro is not going to be around forever. The Communist regime...

HANNITY: Thank God for that.

FORBES: ... there will fall just as it fell in the Soviet Union.

COLMES: Thank you, Mr. Forbes. I actually agree with you on the Castro issue.

FORBES: Thank you.

COLMES: Thank you for being with us tonight. Appreciate your time. Hope to see you again soon.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:05:01.00

SUBJECT: CNN Inside Politics, January 6, 2000

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maura M. Pally (CN=Maura M. Pally/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO]).
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Hynes (CN=Scott Hynes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
CNN Inside Politics
Aired January 6, 2000 - 5:00 p.m. ET

Debate Gives Bush Forum to Drive Home Differences With
McCain; Democrats Return to Campaign Trail After Testy
Debate; Buchanan Criticizes Ruling Tying Debate
Appearances to Poll Numbers

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

PAT BUCHANAN (REF), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: It's like
Coke and Pepsi saying no other soft drink can enter the
market unless they
meet a certain criteria. That's preposterous.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BERNARD SHAW, CNN ANCHOR: Pat Buchanan takes aim at a special commission's decision likely to bar him from presidential debates this fall.

Also ahead:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Hopefully be able to talk about the difference of ideas that we may have.

There's a difference between a chief executive officer and someone from the legislative branch.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: George W. Bush prepares to drive home his differences with John McCain in tonight's Republican presidential debate.

The Democrats keep trying to one-up each other a day after their face-off in New Hampshire.

Plus, a portrait of happy homeowners. Details of the Clintons' first night in their new digs.

ANNOUNCER: From Washington, this is INSIDE POLITICS, with Judy Woodruff and Bernard Shaw.

SHAW: Thanks for joining us. Judy is off today.

Six Republicans will debate in New Hampshire tonight, but in the minds of many voters there, it will be a showdown between candidates: George W.

Bush and John McCain. And this time around, there are signs McCain might find himself on the defensive about whether he has walked the walk for campaign finance reform. CNN's Candy Crowley joins us from the debate site in Durham, New Hampshire -- Candy.

CANDY CROWLEY, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT: Bernie, this is the fourth debate that all six of the Republican candidates have participated in, but you're right. Really, the two men of the hour are John McCain and George Bush. We go

into this debate

with a little bit of a problem for McCain. He hasn't seen much. But now there are these reports, and he confirms, that he has written a letter to the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, on behalf of the a campaign contributor who was trying to get a television license.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I was trying to see that a bureaucracy did its job, which is under my oversight. But again, I fully understand that with all of these hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars of money that's washing around in Washington in the control of special interests that we're all under suspicion. It renews my vigor for campaign finance reform.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

CROWLEY: McCain says in the letter he did not advocate that his contributor get the TV license, he merely tried to push the bureaucracy around and did absolutely nothing around.

As for George Bush, he was peppered with questions about the McCain problem. He demurred.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: Senator McCain must answer these questions. Senator McCain is the chairman of a very powerful committee in the United States Senate. He's a committee chairman. He has been there for a period of time to the point where he could earn this chairmanship, and he, you know, you ask him these questions.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

CROWLEY: As you can see by Bush's attempt to paint McCain as a Washington insider, the relationship between Bush and McCain, which thus far has been very cordial, seems to be fraying around

the edges a bit. But
Bush says as far as he's concerned the gloves are still
on. He says he wants
this to remain a civil campaign. McCain says the same
thing.

So tonight, the fourth debate between these two men.
What Bush will try to
do, he says, is to accentuate some of the differences
between himself and the
senator. Primarily that will be around the tax cut.
McCain has said that
Bush's tax cut is too much. Bush is prepared to note
that difference and to
stand on the plan he's put out -- Bernie.

SHAW: OK, Candy Crowley from the site.

The Republicans will appear on the same New Hampshire
stage where Al
Gore and Bill Bradley exchanged often sharp words last
night.

Today, the Democrats returned to the campaign trail,
apparently pumped up
by their debate performances, as CNN's Jonathan Karl
reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Are you cold?
Let's see if I can warm you up.

JONATHAN KARL, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): For an
energized Bill Bradley, Boston's Faneuil Hall was the
backdrop for a chilly
post-debate rally that attracted more than 500
supporters.

BRADLEY: This campaign is based on the radical premise
that you can go
out and tell people what you believe and get elected.

KARL: Bradley picked up the endorsements of more than 50
local
Massachusetts politicians in what the campaign billed as
a counterpoint to
Gore's endorsement from the king of Massachusetts
Democrats, Teddy
Kennedy. Here, Bradley did not even mention his opponent
by name,
keeping it positive in contrast to Wednesday night's
debate.

BRADLEY: I think you're in the Washington bunker. And I can understand why you're in the bunker. I mean, there's Gingrich, there was the fund-raising scandal, there was the impeachment problem. And I think that the major objective in the last several years in the White House has been political survival. I understand that. But the reality is the Democratic Party shouldn't be in the Washington bunker with you.

KARL: Gore responded with his familiar charge that he stayed in Washington to fight, in contrast to Bradley, who left the Senate after the Republicans took control of Congress.

Gore used the debate clarify his offer of mutually-forgoing TV ads, saying he would do it just in New Hampshire, where Bradley holds a lead in several polls.

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: If we had to rely on actually being the details of the policies, not just once every while but twice a week, every week until the nomination is decided, I think we might have a chance to really elevate the tone of our democracy. I mean it, seriously.

BRADLEY: You know, Al, your underdog pitch brings tears to my eyes.

GORE: Well, I hope that my upset victory brings tears to your eyes on February 1st.

KARL: But Gore has stepped up his New Hampshire ad campaign. Although so far Bradley has outspent Gore in New Hampshire by nearly a two-to-one margin, with a new ad running today.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: And that's why I propose training 60,000 new teachers a year for the next 10 years.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KARL: By the end of the week, the Bradley campaign says it will have spent \$2 million on TV ads geared towards New Hampshire.

(on camera): Gore and Bradley now turn their attention to Iowa, where Gore still holds a commanding lead in the polls. That lead will get a test this weekend, as the two candidates face off in their first Iowa debate.

Jonathan Karl, CNN, Boston.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: Let's talk about the Democrats' debate and tonight's Republican face-off with Richard Berke of "The New York Times" -- he joins us from Durham, New Hampshire -- and Robert Novak of "The Chicago Sun-Times." He's here in Washington.

Rick, first to you. In your judgment, what were Gore and Bradley trying to do on that stage last night and appeal to whom?

RICHARD BERKE, "NEW YORK TIMES": They were both trying to appeal to the liberal wing of the party. I was struck, Bernie, by the fact that they both said, asked about whether they would apply a litmus test in their appointment of Joint Chiefs of Staff, a litmus test on gays in the military, they didn't necessarily agree with the word litmus test, but they both said they would agree with that concept.

And they both also were asked about the liberal label and if they would accept that for themselves. And they both said, call me whatever you want.

They didn't reject the liberal label, something you never would have heard out of from Bill Clinton while he was running for president.

So they're both really appealing to the farthest left wing of the party, the core Democratic loyal voters.

SHAW: Let's go to the exchange you just referred to. The question was, would they require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs

of Staff to fully
support allowing gays in the military?

Listen to this.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

Joint Chiefs of
Staff, that that individual support my policy. And, yes,
I would make that a
requirement.

PETER JENNINGS, MODERATOR: Mr. Bradley, would you, sir?

BRADLEY: I can say it in much shorter words, I think.
And that is when
you're president, you are commander in chief. And you
issue orders. And
soldiers are good soldiers, and they follow your orders.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Now, Bob Novak, your assessment of what Gore and
Bradley
were trying to do on that stage last night in New
Hampshire and appeal to
whom.

ROBERT NOVAK, "CHICAGO SUN-TIMES": Well, Richard is
correct.

They are trying to appeal to the left wing of the party,
the base of the party,
as they call it. I thought that Vice President Gore went
farther than Senator
Bradley on the gays in the military. He said he would do
a litmus test.

Bradley just said well they all obey orders. Maybe
that's a distinction without
a difference.

But, Bernie, I've talked to some old-time Democratic
politicians today, and
they were very concerned about this debate and the way
this whole
campaign is going, because they believe that these sound
bites are going to
be stored and used by the Republicans in the fall. They
question whether
taking those positions really helps either one of them
that much in the
campaign, and -- in the primary -- and it could hurt
quite a bit in the general
election.

SHAW: Now, Bob and Rick, let's look at one of the humorous moments of that debate, when Bradley was asked about his reputation for being aloof.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: Am I aloof? I'm not aloof at all.

JENNY ATTIEYEH, NHPTV: Let me finish.

BRADLEY: The best thing I like about politics is going out and meeting people. I've just finished my 46th town meeting in New Hampshire. You can't be aloof in a New Hampshire town meeting.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Bob?

NOVAK: One other sound bite that wasn't used, Bernie, was Vice President Gore saying, there, is that aloof again? By -- I suppose in jest, but nothing is in jest in these debates -- in regard to Bradley. Gore is so poised to seize on anything that Bradley does wrong. I think this was a superior performance by Gore, compared to the "Meet the Press" performance, when he was rolling his eyes and sighing and all that sort of thing. But I do believe that he still comes off as much more tight, much less relaxed than Bradley, and that's an opinion that is shared by some of his own supporters.

SHAW: Rick Berke, what's the watch word for the Republicans tonight where you are? BERKE: I think it's going to be fascinating to watch the dynamics between Governor Bush and Senator McCain. Their last debate, it was practically a love fest between the two of them, so much so that I went and wrote a story about their relationship the next day because it was striking to me how they went out of their way to praise each other and say how great the other was.

You're not going to see that -- I don't think we will see that tonight. I think

we're getting down to the wire. We're getting into a very competitive race where already they are questioning each other's tax cut plans, Social Security plans, so forth. So I think we're going to see the gloves may start coming off tonight for the first time in a debate format.

NOVAK: That's quite correct, and there's going to be an emphasis, Bernie, on this tax cut question. Senator McCain made his first serious tactical mistake in the campaign. This is a Republican primary, and he's worried about having a tax cut for the rich, and instead saving Social Security. That sounds like Al Gore. I guarantee you that Governor Bush is going to attack Senator McCain on that tonight.

The question is, will Senator McCain back off from the idea that tax cuts for the -- for people who have been successful in this world, are improvident and unwise? Because there are some of his supporters who feel he has to get off that position if he is going to get Republican as well as independent votes in New Hampshire.

SHAW: Robert Novak of the "Chicago Sun-Times."

And Rick Berke - very quickly from you.

BERKE: I was just going to say I think you're also going to see McCain asked about the whole campaign finance questions that you talked about earlier. You know, he's trying to be the reformer in this state, can -- I don't think Bush himself will bring it up, but I would expect the questioners to, and that's going to certainly be an issue tonight.

SHAW: Well, we'll be watching. Richard Berke of "The New York Times," Bob Novak of the "Sun Times" and "THE CAPITOL GANG." Thanks very much.

And still ahead here on INSIDE POLITICS, we are going to talk to Pat Buchanan about something he and Donald Trump actually

agree on. They
are fuming about a new move that makes it very hard for
third- party
candidates to take part in presidential debates. We'll
have extended
coverage of the decision by the presidential debates
commission, and we'll
tell you what it may mean for the party that Ross Perot
built.

This is INSIDE POLITICS.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: When the Republican and Democratic presidential
nominees debate
one another this fall, it now seems unlikely that a
Reform Party candidate will
be on the stage with them. A special commission
announced new criteria
today for participation in those debates.

CNN's Jeanne Meserve begins our coverage of a decision
that may cause
serious problems for the already fractured Reform Party.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

PAUL KIRK, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL
DEBATES: The candidate, regardless of party, regardless
of affiliation, have
a level of support of at least 15 percent of the
prospective voters in the
general election.

JEANNE MESERVE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): With
that, the Commission on Presidential Debates settled one
of the most
controversial issues of campaign 2000: How a candidate
gets a seat in the
all-important fall debates.

One week before the first debate, the commission will
take an average of
five polls: CNN/"USA Today" Gallup, NBC/"Wall Street
Journal,"
CBS/"New York Times," ABC News/"Washington Post," and Fox
News/"Opinion Dynamics." Anyone with 15 percent or more
gets into the
October 3rd debate, as well as the vice presidential
debate two days later.
Everyone else is cut out.

The commission will repeat the exercise for the last two

debates. It's a major
change from 1996, when a far more complex formula was
used to exclude
Ross Perot. Perot sued the commission and lost. But the
criticism stung, and
this time the commission decided to keep it simple.

FRANK FAHRENKOPF, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES: So there's no question of anyone
being able
to hide the ball, change the results. The results are
out there. They're very
transparent.

MESERVE: Meeting that 15 percent standard could be
critical to this year's
Reform Party nominee. The last time a third-party
candidate got into the
debates was 1992.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1992)

ROSS PEROT (I), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: And you are
going to
hear a giant sucking sound of jobs being pulled out of
this country.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MESERVE: Perot took 19 percent in that election, but
four years later, after
he was excluded, Perot got just nine percent.

Whether Perot's poor showing was a result of his
exclusion is an open
question, but there are certainly examples of long-shot
candidates boosting
their polls with a good debate performance.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1998) JESSE VENTURA (REF), MINNESOTA
GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE: What is matter with industrial
hemp?
There's a product that will create new jobs.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MESERVE: In the 1998 Minnesota governor's race, Reform
Party
candidate Jesse Ventura was going nowhere until he was
allowed into the
debates. And the rest is history.

Pat Buchanan is a skilled debater. Here he is in a 1996
GOP primary

debate.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1996)

PAT BUCHANAN (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: My flat tax is

a
middle-class tax cut. Yours looks like one that was
worked up by the boys
at the yacht basin.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MESERVE: But he's got a long way to go to get into the
2000 presidential
debates. In our latest hypothetical three-way match-ups
with the leading
Democratic and Republican candidates, Buchanan draws
around five
percent. His possible Reform Party rival, Donald Trump,
draws 10 percent
in a similar match-up.

Jeanne Meserve, CNN, Washington.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: The special commission says the 2000 presidential
debates will be a
mix of formats, from a town-hall gathering to a
traditional "stand at the
podium" event.

And they will be held in a variety of cities. The
October 3rd debate will take
place at the John F. Kennedy library in Boston. Then
it's on to Wake Forest
University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for the
October 11th face-off.
Washington University in St. Louis will host the October
17th presidential
debate. A vice presidential debate also has been
scheduled on October 5th
at Center College in Danville, Kentucky.

Pat Buchanan suggested today that he hasn't given up
hope that he will take
part in those fall debates. He and other Reform Party
figures wasted no time
in blasting the Debate Commission's new 15 percent rule.

That story from CNN's Pat Neal.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

PAT NEAL, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Three-time presidential candidate Pat Buchanan was preaching against a new world order that would favor globalism over national sovereignty. But in Buchanan's world order, the Reform Party contender would be included in the presidential debates, 15 percent in the polls or not.

PAT BUCHANAN (REF), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Well, I think it's fair to say you have to be on enough ballots so that you can win the presidency of the United States, but these other criteria are artificial.

NEAL: Buchanan said the decision amounts to a conspiracy between Republicans and Democrats, since they're the only ones on the Debate Commission.

BUCHANAN: It's like Coke and Pepsi saying no other soft drink can enter the market unless they meet a certain criteria. That's preposterous.

NEAL: Buchanan's likely rival for the Reform Party nomination, Donald Trump, agreed:

"I am not surprised that the two-party political establishment wants to keep the American people from having a third choice. I am confident that were I to become a candidate, I would register strong poll ratings."

Russ Verney, a Ross Perot loyalist and former head of the Reform Party, called the decision an absolute fraud, and said it's the same situation as 1996, when Perot was left out of the debates.

Like Perot before him, Buchanan says he'll battle to be included.

BUCHANAN: We're going to fight this before the FEC, and we will fight it before the federal courts.

NEAL: One reason the long-time Republican made the leap to the Reform Party was the potential of participating in the debates,

where he believes he
could sway voters with his fiery pro-America talk.

Thursday's speech was classic Buchanan, declaring the
United States should
only go to war when attacked, or its vital interests are
imperiled.

BUCHANAN: If ever sovereignty becomes obsolete, we may
expect
America's involvement in endless wars, until one day we
pay the horrific
price in some act of cataclysmic terrorism on our own
soil. For
interventionism is the spawning pool of international
terror.

NEAL (on camera): Buchanan says he'll start his fight to
be included
immediately. Meanwhile, his rival, Donald Trump, goes to
Minnesota for a
long-planned summit with Governor Jesse Ventura, the
highest-ranking
Reform Party official. There, talk of the debates is
sure to be on the agenda.

Pat Neal, CNN, Boston.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: And when we return, we'll talk to Pat Buchanan
about that Debate
Commission's decision, and how he and the Reform Party
may suffer.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

NEAL: Pat Neal, CNN, Boston.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: And when we return, we'll talk to Pat Buchanan
about that Debate
Commission's decision and how he and the Reform Party
may suffer.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: More reaction now to the Presidential Debate
Commission's
decision to require third-party candidates to get at
least 15 percent in the
polls to participate in debates this fall. We're joined
from Boston by Reform

Party presidential candidate Pat Buchanan.

Are you sweating the possibility that you won't get 15 percent?

BUCHANAN: No, Bernie, I am not. I believe we can get that. But what I do think is an outrage and an insult to the Democratic process is to have the two major parties engage basically in a conspiracy to corner the market on the presidency of the United States. I represent now and am a candidate of the Reform Party. I expect to be its nominee. The Reform Party will get federal matching funds for its convention. We get federal matching funds in the fall. We're one of three recognized national parties, and to have the other two set criteria to keep us out of a debate that is going to determine the outcome of the election 2000 is just illegitimate, it is outrageous, it is an absurd conflict of interest.

SHAW: How do you mean this is a conspiracy? How can you prove that?

BUCHANAN: You can't demonstrate that, but let me ask you, Bernie, if Coca-Cola and Pepsi set up criterion by which Sprite could get into the market, it had to pass a certain threshold or it would not be allowed to compete, that would be a criminal conspiracy and restraint of trade. We have the two national parties, Mr. Fahrenkoph, former member of the Republican Party, million dollar a year lobbyist for the gambling industry, deciding whether the one major outside party should even be able to compete for the presidency. It seems to me, on its face, we've got a conflict of interest.

SHAW: Well, you're being very cost caustic, which is your wont, but you're denigrating Frank -- is it illegal for him to make a million dollars a year?

BUCHANAN: It is not illegal for him to belong to the Republican Party or Mr. Kirk to the Democratic Party. But let me ask you,

Bernie, why should
the Democratic and Republican Party, two out of the
three parties that are
federally recognized, decide the criterion by which the
third party may
compete?

SHAW: Pat, let me ask you this question -- instead of
complaining about the
decision, why don't you go out and get 15 percent and
you'll be in the
debates?

BUCHANAN: Exactly. That's what we intend to do, and I
believe we'll do
it. We're going to be the nominee. But, Bernie, what
they've set up is a
situation where both parties, if they don't want you in
the debate, can launch
with their five times as much money as they get, attack
ads on me to drive
me down in their own polls or the other polls, below 15,
at that particular
moment, and then say he's out of the debate, and we
don't fairly compete.
Bernie, they should not be deciding this issue. You have
two parties deciding
on the fate of the third.

SHAW: OK. We're fast running out of time. I've got three
or four questions
I have to ask you.

BUCHANAN: Sure.

SHAW: Does the presence of Donald Trump complicate your
goals?

BUCHANAN: No, because this is going to be in the general
election, and
it'll be Buchanan the nominee.

SHAW: How are you going to fight this?

BUCHANAN: We're going to file suit with the Federal
Election
Commission. I believe they've got 120 days to decide.

SHAW: When?

BUCHANAN: If they decide against us -- as soon as we can
-- we will go
into federal court, and we will tell the federal court
that you have got two

parties trying to kill a third's chance for the
presidency of the United States,
and this is a conspiracy, and it ought not be decided by
Republicans and
Democrats, but all Americans ought to decide whether I
am in that debate,
not the parties I'm running against.

SHAW: Of course you know the FEC has never been
overruled by a
federal court.

BUCHANAN: The FEC is made up of three Republicans and
three
Democrats. That is another absurdity when we have a
third party.

Bernie, the Reform Party has made it. We are recognized.
We get federal
matching funds. We get funds for our convention. We get
funds for the
election. We are a third party, and the other two are
trying to kill what is
new, and hopeful and different.

SHAW: Do you think -- just possibly, do you think that
this decision, these
criteria, issued by the Presidential Debate Commission
might, in fact,
boomerang, ricochet and actually energize Reform Party
members.

BUCHANAN: They're not only going to energize Reform
Party member's,
the American people, even those who disagree with me,
are a fair-minded
people. I mean, look, can you imagine if George Bush and
the folks said,
look, all the candidates who got less than 15 percent in
the polls -- that's
Mr. Bauer, Mr. Keyes, Mr. Forbes -- you are not in the
debates, and these
are the only two in the debates. When George Bush tried
that in 1980,
Ronald Reagan said, you know, I've paid for this
microphone, and I want
these fellows in that debate. When Bush said no, he was
finished as a
candidate.

This is going to backfire on these fellows, pulling a
stunt like this. And we are
a legitimate party.

SHAW: Pat Buchanan, Reform Party candidate, talking to us from Boston, thanks very much.

BUCHANAN: Thank you.

SHAW: Quite welcome.

There is much more ahead here on INSIDE POLITICS. Coming up:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL ANALYST: Quiz question: How many third-party candidates in this century have gotten at least 15 percent of the vote?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Bill Schneider has the answer, and he explains why it does not bode well for the Ross Perots of the future.

Plus:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BOB FRANKEN, CNN CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): A top priority for the House Republican majority is remaining the majority.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Bob Franken on the key issues on the Republican agenda for the coming year. And later:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

HILLARY CLINTON, FIRST LADY OF THE UNITED STATES: We are so pleased that we are finally here and moved in, and looking forward to, you know, many happy days here in the days and months ahead.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Hillary Rodham Clinton, on her first night of being a New York resident.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: We will have more of the day's political news coming up. But now, if you will, a look at some other top stories. President Clinton has rejoined those high-level peace talks between Israel and Syria. Administration officials are concerned about the pace of negotiations in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Four committees have been set up to discuss key issues. By late afternoon, none had met. A State Department spokesman says Mr. Clinton hopes to get all parties, quote, "rolling up their sleeves" to do substantive work.

A NATO spokesman confirms a report in the German press. Altered videotape of a NATO airstrike on a civilian train in Kosovo bolstered NATO accounts of that attack. Turns out the tape, released by NATO last April, was played three times faster than normal. Now that served to support NATO's claim the attack played out too swiftly to abort. Now notice how fast the train appears to be traveling as the bomb zeros in. Now notice the effect produced when the tape is slowed by a factor of three. NATO says it had no knowledge the tape had been altered and stands by its account. At least 14 people aboard the train were killed.

A computer malfunction brought air traffic to a near standstill today in the northeastern United States. The problem grounded dozens of flights. It happened when a central air traffic control facility near Washington experienced a data-transfer mishap. The trouble has since been fixed, and normal airport operations have resumed. Federal Aviation Officials say it does not appear the glitch was Y2K-related. To learn more about today's air traffic mishap and get updates on conditions at airports around the country, please log onto our Web site at cnn.com.

It's been a day of more protests in Miami, Cuban-Americans voicing their

disapproval of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's decision to have Elian Gonzalez returned to his father in Cuba. Earlier today, at least three dozen people were arrested. The 6-year-old is expected to be reunited with his father soon. To facilitate the process, his father is asking the National Council of Churches' help. Elian was plucked from the waters off the coast of Florida on Thanksgiving. His mother drowned on the trip from Cuba.

Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker has been ordered to undergo psychological testing. The order follows Rocker's disparaging remarks about homosexuals and minorities in comments to "Sports Illustrated." The remarks left the Braves organization wondering what to do about the outspoken pitcher.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

STAN KASTEN, ATLANTA BRAVES: What we had was a player who was remorseful, acknowledged not just a horrible mistake on his part but also serious wrongdoing and was eager to take whatever steps he could to fix this, to get whatever help would be required to ameliorate this problem.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: The Atlanta Braves baseball team are owned by Time Warner, which also owns CNN. When INSIDE POLITICS returns, Bill Schneider takes a look back at third-party candidates and their support to find how many would qualify under the new debate rules.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: Now, again, the issue of who should be included in presidential debates. New rules announced today by the commission on presidential debates allow only candidates who have at least 15 percent support in national polls to participate. Now that could eliminate third-party candidates from these debates this year.

Joining us now with some historical perspective, our own Bill Schneider.

SCHNEIDER: Quiz question.

SHAW: What?

SCHNEIDER: How many presidential candidates in this century have gotten at least 15 percent of the vote? If you say three, well, we can't give you \$1 million, but you're right.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(voice-over): Teddy Roosevelt got 27 percent as a Progressive Party candidate in 1912, came in second, carried six states, too. He was a former president after all. Another progressive, Robert LaFollette, got 17 percent in 1924, carried only his own state of Wisconsin. And Perot, 19 percent in 1992 -- no states.

Hey, what about George Wallace in 1968? Sorry, he only got 13.5 percent of the vote, but he carried five Southern states. The race between Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon was so close, Wallace almost denied either of them an electoral vote majority, which would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives. Wallace didn't get 15 percent, but he almost had a decisive impact on the outcome.

Dixiecrat Strom Thurmond carried four Southern states in 1948, but he got less than three percent of the vote nationwide.

The 15 percent rule clearly excludes regional candidates like Thurmond and Wallace, whose support is concentrated in one part of the country. This time, the debate commission isn't asking, can the candidate carry any states, it's asking, is the candidate viable nationally?

Look at John Anderson in 1980. In September, Anderson was getting about 14 percent in the polls. The League of Women Voters invited him to debate

on September 21st. President Carter refused to show up.
Most of Anderson's vote came at Carter's expense, so Carter
didn't want to give Anderson legitimacy. Anderson and Ronald Reagan ended up
debating alone. In October, Anderson's support dropped below 10
percent in the polls. The league decided not to invite him to the
second debate. On October 28th, it was just Carter and Reagan. Anderson
ended up with less than seven percent of the vote and no states.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHNEIDER: This is a case of what the recently deceased
writer Joseph Heller called "Catch 22." You need to show you're a
nationally viable candidate to get into the debates, but the easiest way
for you to become a nationally viable candidate is to get into the debates.

The debate commission is saying, we're not going to make
you viable. You have to figure out some other way to do that on your own
-- Bernie.

SHAW: Thank you.

We're not done with this subject. Joining us now for
more, the co-chairmen of the commission on presidential debates, Frank
Fahrenkopf here Washington, and Paul Kirk, who's in Boston.

Gentlemen, a very simple question: Are these new rules
meant to deny some candidates a free ride?

Paul Kirk?

PAUL KIRK, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL
DEBATES: Bernie, thank you.

These rules are meant to give the American voter, the
prospective voters in the next election, the decision-making power to decide
whether they want -- who are the principal rivals they want for the
presidency of the United States. And we're now nine, 10 months away from that
decision. The

campaign is a long way from over. Campaigns are a winnowing out process, a time for candidates to accumulate strength, to gain respect, to build support. That's what it's about.

At the end of the day, when the decision is made, if, on the average of these polls, that 15 percent of the American people, the prospective voters, say, we'd like to see this candidate as a president of the United States, we favor him or her, that candidate comes into the debates. But let's not misunderstand it. The whole purpose of this criterion is so the American people, the voters, will decide by the support they bring to whoever candidate they decide to support.

SHAW: Frank Fahrenkopf, is this meant to deny some candidates a free ride?

FRANK FAHRENKOPF, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES: Well, I don't know what you mean by a free ride. If it means that you...

SHAW: Getting in on the debates, a stage full of candidates.

FAHRENKOPF: Well, yes. I mean, you know, most people don't realize it but that in every presidential year there's over 100 candidates who run for office. Of course you can't have 100 people on the stage. You also have legitimately over the last six and eight years the third-party movement in this country. We tried to come up with a system that was fair, where everyone would know nine months out in advance what the barrier was going to be.

And I thought Pat Buchanan's arguments were very, very interesting, because just a few months ago on "Meet the Press," he said, if I'm at 15 percent, I ought to be in the debates. He has repeated that 15 percent figure on a number of shows, including on this network. Well now, apparently, he's unhappy with it. So he can't have it both ways. I think

he's being a little
disingenuous.

The purpose here is to present to the American people in
the fall the leading
candidates, those who have a realistic chance of getting
elected. We think
the American people will tell us that by taking the
average of the five polls.

SHAW: For you to say that Pat Buchanan is unhappy is an
understatement.

He excoriated everything you have done. He said that
this is a stunt, he
warns of a national backlash, he calls it outrageous and
he said very
seriously that what you have done is committed a
conspiracy.

FAHRENKOPF: He's saying that there is a conspiracy among
the two
parties, while Paul and I are ex-chairman of the two
national parties. The
national parties have nothing whatsoever to do with the
debate commission.

We get no money from the national parties, we get no
money from the
federal government. We raised the money privately. There
is no conspiracy,
Pat knows that, but Pat's, you know, trying to develop
his own following,
and he's got to say what he has to say to get the
nomination, I guess.

SHAW: Paul Kirk, he says he's going to take you to
court.

KIRK: Well, that's OK, Bernie, we've been taken to court
at the end of
every cycle. In all these cycles, the courts, the FEC,
others have said what
the commission has done, the criteria they've applied is
objective, it's
pre-established and it stands as it always do. What
we've tried to do this
time, we've changed somewhat and modified, streamlined
the criteria, so
would be absolutely no doubt in whose hands this
decision rests.

SHAW: Let's look a little closer at one of the
criteria within these criteria.

How -- where did you come up with 15 percent, why not 10
percent, why

not 12 percent?

KIRK: That's a question that can be debated anywhere.

This was the
considered judgment of people on the commission. Others
-- some looked
back at history, Bill gave us some, that 15 percent was
a fair and reasonable
threshold. You have to keep in mind what the mission of
the debate
commission is and what -- where we are at the time those
decisions are
made. We go through a long -- some of the campaigns are
four years long.

We get to the end and what the American people, I think,
want and what the
commission is charged to do is put forth a debate in
which the principal rivals
for the presidency debate and compete. Not as was
mentioned earlier we'll
give some other candidate who hasn't built up the
strength an opportunity to
go at the end of the campaign and see if he can make it
or not. That's not
what campaigns are about. The debates are just a
specific format within a
long campaign period.

SHAW: But, Paul and Frank, you mean to say that if Pat
Buchanan gets
14.5 percent, 14.9 percent, you would deny him a place
on the stage?

FAHRENKOPF: Well, let me tell you how it works -- go
ahead, Paul. I'll
follow.

KIRK: No, I was just going to say there have to be at
the early part of a
process like this, there have to be clear lines and
rules of the road and rules
of the game. And now all the American people know what
the rules are,
every campaign knows what the rules are, I don't -- yes,
you can argue,
well, 14.8, but it's not going to...

SHAW: Will you?

KIRK: It's not going to vary. People know what the
benchmark is, we'll
abide by it, and the choice will be made. Otherwise, it
would be totally

unfair.

SHAW: OK. I just want to be clear.

KIRK: You can't set the rules and then change them at the end of the game.

FAHRENKOPF: It's 15, Bernie. It's 15.

SHAW: It's 15 percent.

FAHRENKOPF: Frank Newport of Gallup, who is an adviser to the commission, who also does work with this network, indicates to us that the five polls that we're going to average in fact already round either up or down. It shouldn't be a second rounding.

SHAW: OK. Wait a minute. We're fast running out of time. But what about this reality when polls are taken, they have a plus or minus 3 percent margin of error, what do you do about that? Doesn't 14.5 or 14.9 percent then become very relevant?

FAHRENKOPF: Well, what the indication is to us from the experts out there is that -- sure you can -- with every poll you have a certain margin of error, but we're talking about give polls here, that's going to be thousands and thousands of people that will eliminate and lower down that margin of error.

And I also want to say, because I have to, because Pat has charged us with a conspiracy, we've gone back to a system that is very much like the League of Women Voters used in place, setting out there a number that had to be met. Clearly, the League of Women Voters weren't conspiring to keep third-party candidates. We allowed Ross Perot in the '92. He was right to be in then. We think he was not right to be in, in 1996. So, you know, we reject those charges made by Pat Buchanan. SHAW: Frank Fahrenkopf, Paul Kirk, co-chairmen of the Commission on Presidential Debates, obviously we think this is a very important subject,

that's why we devoted
more than 12 minutes to it today on INSIDE POLITICS, and
we'll be following it very, very closely.

Gentlemen, thank you.

KIRK: Thanks, Bernie.

SHAW: Quite welcome.

Up next: Is Al Gore's campaign manager ruffling
Republican feathers.

Plus, the Republican agenda: Bob Franken looks at the
GOP's top priority.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: Democratic candidates fanned out from their debate
in New Hampshire last night. Vice President Al Gore on the road
now, as is Senator Bill Bradley arriving here at a rally at the Des Moines,
Iowa airport.

Al Gore's campaign manager, Donna Brazile, has a
reputation of being outspoken and assertive, qualities the vice president
wanted as he revamped his campaign team. But on the subject of race and
politics, she has infuriated one very prominent Republican.

Wolf Blitzer joins us now with details -- Wolf.

WOLF BLITZER, CNN ANCHOR: Bernie, he is an
African-American Republican, an icon in many respects: General Colin
Powell. Now, Donna Brazile, of course, is African-American as well. And
yesterday, she gave an interview to Bloomberg.com, an outspoken interview.

Among other things she said this: "The Republicans bring
out Colin Powell and J.C. Watts, the congressman from Oklahoma, because
they have no program, no policy. They play that game because they
have no other game. They have no love and no joy. They'd rather take
pictures with black children than feed them." Strong words from Donna
Brazile.

To which General Colin Powell today has written a very tough letter to Vice President Gore, reminding him that the two men together with President Clinton worked on many projects to help America's children, black and white. Among other things General Powell in his letter to Vice President Gore said this, "I do so to help feed, educate and spiritually nourish all of America's children, black and white, and not just for a photo op. And I do so as a Republican."

The vice president, in the letter that he received from General Powell, was also reminded of this by General Powell:

"We can debate and disagree over specific programs and approaches, but let's not start the new century by playing the polarizing race card, which immediately contaminates and destroys the opportunity for open debate on issues of importance to all of our children."

To which the vice president's press secretary Chris Lehane, the campaign press secretary responded that General Powell is a great American, he has contributed a lot to this country. But Chris Lehane goes on to condemn the Republicans for being a party that is not conducive to helping African-Americans in this country, and he goes on to say, "Donna Brazile is doing a great job as campaign manager," suggesting she's not about to be fired -- Bernie.

SHAW: Wolf Blitzer, very, very interesting, thank you.

Congress won't reconvene until January 24, but the Republican leadership met today to announce its agenda for the year.

Our Bob Franken takes a look at the familiar issues that top the list.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: The Republican leadership met today to announce its agenda for the

year.

Our Bob Franken takes a look at the familiar issues that top the list.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

REP. J.C. WATTS (R-OK), CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN: A top priority for the House Republican majority is remaining the majority.

REP. DENNIS HASTERT (R-IL), HOUSE SPEAKER: The American people have a choice, of voting for a Congress and a party with new ideas and new energy, or going back to a Congress of old ideas.

BOB FRANKEN, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): This year's Republican ideas are last year's ideas, starting with...

DICK ARMEY (R-TX), MAJORITY LEADER: Tax relief for the American family.

FRANKEN: In fact, the first order of business for House Republicans will be another effort to repeal the marriage penalty. But coming out of two days of meetings may produce a new wrinkle in their tax strategy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You need to be honest with yourselves.

FRANKEN: GOP sources tell CNN the large majority in their party wants to avoid an all-encompassing tax cut, like the \$792 billion proposal in last year's budget.

Instead, Republicans want to discourage another presidential veto by passing popular tax cuts one by one.

They also will emphasize trade, as well as high-tech legislation.

And fending off the Democrats.

REP. RICHARD GEPHARDT (D-MO), MINORITY LEADER: We're still aware of how much of our agenda from last year is undone.

FRANKEN: That means HMO reform again, gun control, prescription

drugs for Medicare recipients, minimum wage legislation,
as well as a new
Democratic proposal to spend federal money repairing
decrepit schools.

Democrats feel they have the upper hand.

GEOFFREY GARIN, DEMOCRATIC POLLSTER: Right now I would
much rather be the Democrats than the Republicans
looking ahead to the
2000 elections.

REP. TOM DELAY (R-TX), MAJORITY WHIP: The best part of
this is
to look over the last five years.

FRANKEN: It's five years since Newt Gingrich and
Republicans wrenched
control of Congress away from the Democrats.

(on camera): Now it's the Democrats storming the
Capitol, and the
Republicans trying to hold on to their precarious
position at the top of the
hill.

Bob Franken, CNN, Capitol Hill.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: And still ahead, the first couple returns from
their Empire State
home. A look at how they rate life outside 1600
Pennsylvania Avenue.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: The first couple returned to Washington today
after spending the
first night in their New York home. While much unpacking
remains, Mrs.
Clinton can now tell the voters of the Empire State she
is indeed a New
York resident.

Kelly Wallace reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

HILLARY CLINTON, FIRST LADY: Welcome to our house.

KELLY WALLACE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): The
president and the first lady beamed as they strolled
down their driveway to

tell reporters about their first night in their new home.

H. CLINTON: We loved it. Well, it was a little overwhelming because there is so much to be done, and we stayed up very late.

WALLACE: Until after 1:00 a.m., in fact, unpacking boxes and moving furniture inside their \$1.7 million colonial in the upscale New York City suburb of Chappaqua, their first home after years in the Arkansas governor's mansion and the White House.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: This is the first home we have had since January of 1983, 17 years ago, when we moved back into the governor's mansion in Little Rock.

WALLACE: A family friend brought over a home-cooked dinner, and neighbors dropped off a bottle of champagne.

W. CLINTON: We also want to thank our neighbors who have been long-suffering with all the attention.

WALLACE: But not everyone is so understanding of all the security and all the media tracking the new occupants of Old House Lane.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They are causing a big furor.

H. CLINTON: I'm really going to work on that, I'm going to talk about it a lot. In fact...

WALLACE: Of course, this is also a political move, and so the likely Senate candidate took the opportunity to shake a few hands in downtown Chappaqua.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mrs. Clinton, how does it feel to officially be a New Yorker?

H. CLINTON: It feels great.

WALLACE: The first lady needed to establish residency in New York in order to run, and is now a registered voter in the Empire State. Her husband

plans to follow her lead.

W. CLINTON: I've got a particular interest in the election up here next year, so I want to make sure my vote counts.

WALLACE: The Clintons stayed in Chappaqua less than 24 hours before heading back to Washington.

(on camera): The first lady refused to answer questions about the financing of her campaign. Instead, she wanted to focus on the new home, and clearly try and get the message out to New Yorkers that she is now one of them.

Kelly Wallace, CNN, Chappaqua, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: Well, that's all for this edition of INSIDE POLITICS.

We'll see you again tomorrow, when our Bruce Morton will be live from Columbia, South Carolina, previewing that Republican presidential debate in that state.

And as always you can go online all the time at CNN's allpolitics.com.

And, please, this programming note: The Democratic presidential race will be the focus tonight on "CROSSFIRE." The guests will be Bradley New Hampshire campaign director Mark Longabaugh, and former Gore chief of staff Ron Klain. That's at 7:30 p.m. Eastern.

I'm Bernard Shaw. and "WORLDVIEW" is next.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 18:16:16.00

SUBJECT: Weekend Television Update -- note revisions to This Week and Meet

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey T. Haynes (CN=Audrey T. Haynes/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick M. Dorton (CN=Patrick M. Dorton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura M. Quinn (CN=Laura M. Quinn/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Serena C. Torrey (CN=Serena C. Torrey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce R. Lindsey (CN=Bruce R. Lindsey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cathy R. Mays (CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore (CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Loretta M. Ucelli (CN=Loretta M. Ucelli/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: walitskys@panet.us-state.gov (walitskys@panet.us-state.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Camille Johnston (CN=Camille Johnston/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark J. Bernstein (CN=Mark J. Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephanie A. Cutter (CN=Stephanie A. Cutter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Ricci (CN=Linda Ricci/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mara E. Rudman (CN=Mara E. Rudman/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sidney Blumenthal (CN=Sidney Blumenthal/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
MEMORANDUM

TO: JOE LOCKHART, ANN LEWIS, DOUG SOSNIK, JOEL JOHNSON, AND LORETTA
UCELLI
FROM: JULIA PAYNE
RE: WEEKEND TELEVISION

*Please check weekend Washington Post for listing changes

FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 2000

WASHINGTON WEEK IN REVIEW (Gloria Borger guest host)

Topics: Campaign 2000; Cuban boy; OSHA
Guests: David Broder, Susan Feeney; Martha Raddatz; Mara Liasson

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 2000

EVANS, NOVAK, SHIELDS & HUNT (CNN)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: Governor Vilsack (IA)

CAPTIAL GANG (CNN)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: Pollster Geoff Garin

SUNDAY, JANUARY 2, 2000

FOX NEWS SUNDAY (FOX)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: Bill Bradley

Topic: Campaign 2000) Iowa
Guest: David Yepsen

Roundtable: Juan Williams, Brit Hume, Mara Liasson

FACE THE NATION(CBS)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: John McCain

Topic: Reform Party
Guest: Governor Jesse Ventura

Roundtable: Gloria Borger, USNWR

THIS WEEK (ABC)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: Bob and Elizabeth Dole

Topic: Gays in the Military
Guest: Gen. Merrill McPeak (ret), CoS USAF; Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer (ret), Army National Guard

Topic: NH voters , focus group
Guest: George Stephanopolous, Jeffrey Pollock, Democratic pollster

Roundtable: George Stephanopolous, George Will

MEET THE PRESS (NBC)

Topic: Campaign 2000
Guest: Senator Judd Gregg; Rep. Lindsey Graham; Bob Shrum; Rep. Jerry Nadler

Topic: Campaign 2000 Roundtable

Guest: William Safire, Al Hunt, Joe Klein, and Bill Kristol

LATE EDITION (CNN)

Topic: Africa and the United Nations

Guest: Ambassador Richard Holbrooke

Topic: Campaign 2000

Guest: Senator Tom Harkin, Senator Paul Wellstone

Topic: NY Senate Race

Guest: Ed Koch, Susan Molinari

Roundtable: Susan Page, Steve Roberts, and Tucker Carlson

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:04:59.00

SUBJECT: CNN Crossfire, January 6, 2000

TO: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maura M. Pally (CN=Maura M. Pally/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer H. Smith (CN=Jennifer H. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicole L. Davison (CN=Nicole L. Davison/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jenni R. Engebretsen (CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Vandivier (CN=David Vandivier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Reich (CN=Steven Reich/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toby C. Graff (CN=Toby C. Graff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca L. Walldorff (CN=Rebecca L. Walldorff/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (CN=Jonathan M. Prince/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Shesol (CN=Jeffrey A. Shesol/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Li (CN=Gordon Li/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov (CN=Paul K. Engskov/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega (CN=Dag Vega/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph P. Lockhart (CN=Joseph P. Lockhart/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Gotbaum (CN=Joshua Gotbaum/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Hynes (CN=Scott Hynes/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irma L. Martinez (CN=Irma L. Martinez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aprill N. Springfield (CN=Aprill N. Springfield/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann C. Hertelendy (CN=Ann C. Hertelendy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katharine Button (CN=Katharine Button/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer (CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rochester M. Johnson (CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: June Shih (CN=June Shih/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine (CN=Alison Muscatine/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (CN=Laura D. Schwartz/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Ferguson (CN=Jennifer Ferguson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin M. Roland (CN=Robin M. Roland/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CNN Crossfire

Aired January 6, 2000 - 7:30 p.m. ET

Which Democrat Will Win in New Hampshire?

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: You know, Al,
your underdog pitch brings tears to my eyes.

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Well, I
hope
that my upset victory brings tears to your eyes on
February 1st.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

ROBERT NOVAK, CO-HOST: Tonight, the New Hampshire primary is just weeks away. After votes are counted, which Democratic candidate will be laughing, and which will be crying?

ANNOUNCER: Live from Washington, CROSSFIRE. On the left, Bill Press. On the right, Robert Novak.

In the CROSSFIRE, Ron Klain, former chief of staff to Vice President Al Gore and an adviser to the Gore campaign. And in Des Moines, Eric Hauser, press secretary for Bill Bradley.

NOVAK: Good evening, welcome to CROSSFIRE.

Al Gore and Bill Bradley squared off in their fourth Democratic presidential debate. And it's not just the vice president calling the former senator a quitter. The former basketball star also took off the gloves.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: When I hear you talk, Al, it reminds me of a Washington bunker. I think you're in the Washington bunker. And I can understand why you're in the bunker. I mean, there's Gingrich, there was the fund-raising scandal, there was the impeachment problem. And I think that the major objective in the last several years in the White House has been political survival. I understand that.

GORE: I'm proud that I stayed and fought against the Gingrich Congress. I'm proud that I was where I think the American people needed a lot of folks to be, fighting against that, preventing them from shutting down the government.

(END VIDEO CLIP) NOVAK: But what made front pages of the nation's newspapers was the vice president saying, yes, he would impose a gay rights litmus test in naming members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Senator Bradley didn't go quite that far but did say the generals and

admirals he picked would
follow his orders to allow gays in the military.

If you didn't catch debate number four last night, never
fear. Debate number
five will be in Des Moines Saturday afternoon, broadcast
live on CNN.

Who's winning these debates? And are the debates really
preparing the
Democrats to run against Republicans next November?

Bill?

BILL PRESS, CO-HOST: Eric Hauser, I started out in
politics with Gene
McCarthy in 1968, so I like somebody who's independent,
I like somebody
who's an outsider. I thought that's what Bill Bradley
was, and then I hear him
last night giving this answer when challenged to give up
30-second
commercials.

Let's remind everybody what he said.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: Let me tell you, if you are not known by a
million people in the
country, as Al is -- I'm not known by as many people. My
only opportunity
to get known is through a 30-second television
commercial, which, quite
frankly, if you know what you believe is really not a
problem.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

PRESS: Now, Eric, that is classic insider establishment
BS, isn't it?

ERIC HAUSER, BRADLEY PRESS SECRETARY: No, not at all. The
couple points are, one, it is true. You can say -- you
can have an important
impression in 30 seconds if you're clear and candid and
direct with people.
Thirty-second ads, 60-second ads are not the only way to
communicate.

You do it in living rooms, you do it in debates, you do
it in speeches. But the
other part of it is 30-second ads aren't the problem,
30-second attack ads
are the problem. People aren't saying they want to hear
less of politicians

through the air, they're saying they don't want to hear
attack politics through
the air. So we'll keep a mix of communication, and we'll
keep it positive.

PRESS: Eric, you're doing what your boss does. You're
avoiding the
question. Look, Bill Bradley is not an unknown, and his
answer is the same
answer you hear from Mitch McConnell and Republicans on
campaign
reform. They say we can't do it because we need to keep
raising money,
basically, to fight the other side.

HAUSER: Bill, Bill, he is a lot less known than the vice
president. And,
more importantly -- and it was interesting. The vice
president sort of agreed
to this last night when said, now this time, Bill. It's
not a ploy, meaning last
time it was, meaning it still is a ploy. And it's a
gimmick. There's a lot of
stunts. There's a lot of gimmicks. It's a foolish idea,
and I don't think we'll do
it...

PRESS: And...

HAUSER: ... under any circumstances.

PRESS: And...

HAUSER: It's a form of communication with people. And If
you say what
you believe...

PRESS: And...

HAUSER: ... about health care and guns and campaign
finance reform and
look in the camera, tell people...

PRESS: And...

HAUSER: ... what you believe and why, that's fine.

PRESS: And, Eric, standing up -- Bill Bradley standing
up with John
McCain in New Hampshire and shaking hands was not a
campaign ploy?

HAUSER: Absolutely not. These have been guys that have
committed to

campaign finance reform since the very beginning of this campaign, that have made it centerpieces, that have proven something very important, which is you need cooperation and a national purpose to get campaign finance reform done. We haven't had that in the last seven or eight years, and you need that if you're going to get it accomplished.

NOVAK: Ron Klain, I was reading today the "Hot Line" publication, all the reaction to last night's debates from people who aren't committed -- journalists, analysts, neutrals. They all say your candidate lost. You doing something wrong?

RON KLAIN, GORE ADVISER: Bob, you're reading something different than what I'm reading. I heard a great reaction from people all over the country to the vice president last night. And it's no surprise. Once again, I thought he was right on the issues. I think he was right on the issue that Bill just raised, which was the question whether or not Senator Bradley would be willing to give up 30-second spots and focus the campaign on the issues through a series of debates.

And what the vice president said last night was if Senator Bradley isn't known throughout the country, he'd limited it to New Hampshire alone, where Bill Bradley is leading us, and where there's no reason why he can't agree to the vice president's proposal.

NOVAK: Ron, I'll send you that sheet from the...

KLAIN: Thanks, Bob, thanks. I appreciate that.

NOVAK: You'll see. But let me -- I try to be helpful. And I want to tell you what's wrong with the vice president. And let's just...

KLAIN: Thanks, Bob. I appreciate that.

NOVAK: Let's just look at this little piece from the debate last night.

KLAIN: OK.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: First of all, Al, let me explain to you, Al, how the private sectors works, OK? If you have -- if you have a health care plan...

GORE: Try not to be aloof.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: You may not have heard that. What Vice President Gore said was "try not to be aloof." And, you know, they're having a debate about health care, and he has read somewhere in some of the polling data that you have piled onto him that Bradley is too aloof. He reads it in the paper, and so in the middle of the health care thing, he says, try not to be aloof. That's the whole problem.

KLAIN: Well, no, no. Look, first of all -- by the way, I think the first question in that debate was a question from a journalist asking Senator Bradley about his aloofness. And, frankly, I thought Senator Bradley's answer was just plain, old condescending. He doesn't want to defend his health care plan because he...

HAUSER: Ron, Ron, wait a minute.

KLAIN: Eric, let me finish. I didn't interrupt you. Let me finish.

HAUSER: All right.

KLAIN: He doesn't want to defend his let care plan because he can't. It's a bad plan. It gets rid of Medicaid, it gets -- unstabilizes the health care system, it would explode the deficit. It's a wrong plan. That's why Senator Bradley can't defend the program.

NOVAK: You didn't answer my question, but I didn't expect you to. But I want to raise one other thing. You have been -- the vice president has been really attacking Senator Bradley as being the tool of

the pharmaceutical
companies. And he answered that last night.

And let's take a look at what he said.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: Less than one percent of the money that I ever
raised when I
was running in all of my Senate campaigns came from
anybody connected to
a pharmaceutical company, less than this 3/10 of a
percent in my presidential
campaign. So from my standpoint, that's not a problem.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: Now don't you think the vice president owes
Senator Bradley an
apology, raising this red herring of pharmaceutical
contribution, when less
than one percent of his contributions come from those
companies?

KLAIN: Look it's thousands and thousands of dollars,
whatever the
percentage is. And Senator Bradley has been, as I think
has been
documented in most of the major newspapers -- "The New
York Times did
a story about this a couple of weeks ago -- a very loyal
and overly loyal
friend of the pharmaceutical industry. And just this
week, when he
announced his big plan to close corporate tax loopholes,
none of them were
addressed to the pharmaceutical industry once again.

On the tax issue, the difference between these two
candidates couldn't be
clearer. Al Gore supports middle class tax relief, and
Bill Bradley hasn't
pushed that issue in this campaign.

PRESS: Eric, I've got a question for you here, but if
you want to...

HAUSER: Let me...

PRESS: ... give a quick response, go ahead.

HAUSER: Let me -- can I ask a question for Ron?

PRESS: Yes, go ahead.

HAUSER: Ron, how much, I mean, \$150 billion, \$350 billion, the vice president's tax cut range is extraordinary. And that's why we don't know exactly how much he's trying to spend. The fact is the vice president, by his own numbers, has overspent the surplus. So any talk of a tax cut...

KLAIN: Eric, that's just not true. The vice president has been right there on taxes...

HAUSER: Which one? No, he hasn't, Ron.

KLAIN: He's very clear on taxes, very clear.

HAUSER: How much? How much?

KLAIN: He's talked about getting rid of the marriage penalty. I wish Senator Bradley would support that.

HAUSER: But how much, Ron?

KLAIN: Health care tax cuts, savings tax cuts, a total of almost \$300 billion. And his plan, unlike Senator Bradley's, fits within the balanced budget...

HAUSER: No, it doesn't. KLAIN: ... and doesn't destabilize the economic future of our country.

HAUSER: No, it doesn't.

KLAIN: I'm sorry, Eric. Those are the facts.

PRESS: All right, let me jump in here with a tax question that didn't come up in the debate last night, Eric, which is the senator's statement yesterday that he wanted to eliminate or close some tax loopholes. Liberals love that, right? Tax loopholes amounting to \$125 billion. My question to you, Eric, is this is a senator who authored, when he was in the Senate, a tax break for pharmaceutical companies doing business in Puerto Rico, also a senator who flip-flopped on one of the worst tax loopholes, which is the ethanol subsidy in Iowa. I mean, isn't it kind of hypocritical of him to

talk about tax breaks

when he's -- I mean, loopholes, when he's the author of these two?

HAUSER: No, I -- you know, he is the author of the 1986 tax reform act, which was probably the greatest reform in of the tax code in American history, taking out billions of dollars in loopholes and lowering rates for millions of Americans.

PRESS: But he can't have it both ways, Eric.

HAUSER: No, but the point is, the interesting thing the other day after we made the proposal to save \$125 billion, is the Gore campaign said that Bill Bradley was new to the issue of tax reform. That's like saying he's recently tall. I mean, you guys have got to get the facts right. He offered the biggest bill on tax reform in the country, and we're going to continue that tradition in the White House.

NOVAK: I have to get away from the debate for a moment, Mr. Klain. The Gore campaign manager, Donna Brazile, made this statement, quote:

"The Republicans bring out Colin Powell and J.C. Watts because they have no program, no policy. They play that game because they have no other game. They have no love and no joy. They'd rather take pictures with black children than feed them."

And a black Republican, Governor Colin Powell was...

PRESS: General -- you said "governor."

NOVAK: I'm sorry -- General Colin Powell was absolutely outraged by that. He called it playing the race card. Are you identifying yourself with the outrageous statements by Donna Brazile?

KLAIN: Donna Brazile was 100 percent right. Look, General Powell is a great American. He's a great leader. He's a national hero. J.C. Watts is a great man, too. But the fact is that their presence in

the Republican Party, as
great leaders as they are, doesn't make up for the fact
the Republican Party
has no real agenda to help...

NOVAK: So you like to play the race card.

KLAIN: This is not about playing the race card; it's
about playing the truth
card, Bob. And the truth card is this: The Republican
Party doesn't have an
agenda to help minorities.

In fact, just yesterday, as this controversy was
erupting, the Republican
Party once again renewed their opposition to the vice
president's plan to
support school construction in our inner-cities. Where
is their agenda for
African-Americans in this country, Bob?

PRESS: Gentlemen, we're going to have to take a break.
We've got more
issues and more differences coming up. But as we go to
this break, here's
one issue that both candidates found last night that
they could agree on.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I respect,
Bill. I really do. I am not just saying that as a ploy.
I think he's a genuinely
good person.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You agree with him? ?

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I agree with
what
he said, yes. I think I'm a genuinely good person.

(LAUGHTER)

GORE: He also thinks he's a genuinely good person.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PRESS: Welcome back to CROSSFIRE.

In the first debate of 2000, Bill Bradley and Al Gore
agreed last night on
gays in the military, but they clashed over health care,

Medicare and
relations with Russia, among other topics. Tonight, we
continue to probe the
difference on the issues with representatives of both
candidates. In Des
Moines, Eric Hauser, press secretary to Bill Bradley.
Here in Washington,
Ron Klain, former chief of staff to Vice President Gore
and now adviser to
the gore campaign -- Bob.

NOVAK: Eric Hauser, I almost fell off my chair last
night when I heard
Senator Bradley, not only raise the impeachment issue,
when he talked
about Al Gore in the bunker, but say this about his
Democratic
administration's policy to Russia. Let's take a look at
it.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: I look at our relations with Russia over the
last eight years, and
I think we've had a missed opportunity. They came, they
wanted to know
what to do. I think that we have not pushed hard enough
for a reduction in
strategic nuclear weapons, destruction of nuclear
stockpiles. I believe that
we sent IMF money to Russia knowing that corruption was
rampant.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: Eric, any one of the six pack of Republican
candidates debating
tonight at Durham, New Hampshire could use that -- are
you just cutting all
of your ties with the Clinton administration?

HAUSER: No. We've got a disagreement with some of how --
some of the
Russia policy over the last six or seven years, but
there's a thread that
extends far beyond Russia, and it's missed
opportunities, and it's settling for
far less than we could do, whether it's Russia, or gun
control, or child
poverty, or health care, or campaign finance reform and
on and on and on.
The vice president made very clear last night that he
was willing to settle for
a lot less than Americans want, and that's unfortunate.

And it's clear on
health care, in particular, that he is leaving millions
of people behind without
insurance, without finances for insurance...

(CROSSTALK)

HAUSER: Well, let me make one other point on this one.
You've talked
about step by step to universal care. There is no more
money in your budget
for any steps. What you've proposed is as far as you're
going to get in a
Gore administration, and that's what you have settled
for and that's how...

(CROSSTALK)

HAUSER: Ron, talk about yourself for a minute.

PRESS: One at a time.

(CROSSTALK)

PRESS: Eric, OK, hold on.

KLAIN: Senator Bradley's proposal costs six times and
covers one percent
more persons and leaves nothing, nothing for education,
to save Medicare,
to promote fiscal responsibility and for tax cuts. Bill
Bradley has the small
agenda here. It's an agenda here; it's an agenda just
focused on health care.
Al Gore has leadership for the 21st century on health
care, education,
Medicare, Medicaid, the whole range of issues. That's
the biggest difference
here.

NOVAK: That's fascinating, but that's not the point I
was making. You
know, the first election I voted in was 1952, and the
Democratic candidate,
Adlai Stevenson, just trashed the Truman administration
up and down
America. They missed opportunities, they didn't do well
enough, and he
ended up winning nine out of 48 states for one of the
worst Democratic
showings ever.

Isn't there a danger when you really dump on your own
record, Democratic

record of eight years, you're giving a windfall to the Republicans? HAUSER:

No, it's -- Bob, I think it's a difference of opinion on a critical issue in global relations. There have been some things the Clinton administration has done right. There have been things that Senator Bradley believes have not been done as well as they should have been. That's normal politicking. What's not normal politicking is attacking relentlessly on issues that are distorted, are unclear, are -- that's the difference in the Gore campaign. Unfortunately, he started with that back in October.

NOVAK: I want one more thing about the general -- looking forward to the general election. Last night, your candidate said that he would force members of the joint chiefs of staff to accept his views on gays in the military. Vice President Gore said he would have a litmus test on members of the joint chiefs of staff.

Don't you know, Eric, that the Republicans are going to take those soundbites in the general election and whichever of you is nominated, just cram it down your throat?

HAUSER: No I don't think so. I mean, I think it's an issue of common human respect, and that gays in the -- we believe gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military. And what Senator Bradley talked about last night was establishing that principle and that working in consultation with the Joint Chiefs and the military on enacting that principle in the course of his administration. He made the point that military officers follow their commander in chief and they'll follow this principle that he's laid out and the vice president has agreed with.

PRESS: Let me pick up on that, Ron, with you, because you know, I thought -- I remember as a Democrat attacking the Republicans all the time, because they wanted litmus test for appointees to the Supreme Court. Are

you saying now and is Al Gore saying that we are for
litmus tests when it
comes to the military?

KLAIN: What the vice president said last night was that
litmus tests for an
independent branch of the government, like the
Judiciary, is one question,
but it's, of course, common sense that people he will
appoint to jobs in his
administration will support his policies. That's why
it's the executive branch.

That's why the president is the commander in chief. And
I think it's common
sense that the vice president, who wants to rid our
military of discrimination,
is going to seek people to serve in high posts in that
armed forces that share
his views against discrimination. I think that is common
sense. I think it's why
both Al Gore and Bill Bradley agreed on that last night.

PRESS: Well, I totally agree that the "don't ask don't
tell" policy is
outrageous. It should never have been adopted. It should
be eliminated right
away.

But I think the question is: What is the proper role of
the military? Let me
just read you what one of the former marine commandants
said today,
quote, this is...

NOVAK: Commandant. PRESS: ... commandant -- Carl,
General Carl
Mundy. Quote:

"Military officers certainly execute the orders of the
president, but a litmus
test beforehand would place an officer in an untenable
position, saying: Do
you believe what I believe? I think it would be
unworkable."

Isn't that the issue? It is not that a soldier won't
obey orders, but you can't --
are you going to demand of the soldier that he agree
with you ahead of time?

KLAIN: The vice president as commander-in-chief is going
to demand
military officers be prepared to support and execute his
policies. I think

that's common sense for someone who is trying to bring an anti-discrimination approach to the U.S. military. I am sure that's what Harry Truman did when he integrated the armed forces, and I think it's sensible for Al Gore to want to do the same thing now.

I think it is a step forward in our society. It's a step for eliminating discrimination in the armed forces. I think it's the right place for the next president to be.

PRESS: Let me ask you just one other quick one on handguns.

KLAIN: Sure.

PRESS: Because I was surprised last night when Bill Bradley -- I mean, Al Gore has been good on handgun control.

KLAIN: Right.

PRESS: Bill Bradley said one simple thing: I want to license and register all hand guns. And the vice president would not go along with it. Why not? What is wrong with that policy?

KLAIN: Because what the vice president has is a policy that makes a heck of a lot more sense, which is licensing gun owners, and making sure that before you can go buy a handgun you have a photo ID, basic safety instructions, and a legal entitlement to buy them.

Registering handguns would be a bureaucratic nightmare. There is no way to actually implement it. Senator Bradley has no plan to do it. It would be an absolute disaster. It can't be done right now in our country.

And why not -- and why not do something that will make our streets actually safer?

PRESS: Eric...

HAUSER: Yes.

KLAIN: This is like a lot of things Bill Bradley has

proposed.

HAUSER: No, no, no, Ron...

KLAIN: It sounds good at first blush...

HAUSER: Ron, first of all...

KLAIN: but it wouldn't work.

HAUSER: Ron, first of all, we support licensing, but what you're doing is leaving 66 million guns in America without any check. The guns that are already out there, the only way to trace them, the only way to track them, the only way to know how they're used in crimes and how to find the people who use them, is to register. It's symbolic of so many things.

You have got to step up and do the big thing, because it's going to help a lot of people. And with that many guns out there unregistered, you're not going to be able to trace them, and...

KLAIN: It is symbolic of many things, Eric.

HAUSER: ... you're selling people short, you're selling people short.

KLAIN: It is symbolic of many things. It's a complicated plan Senator Bradley has laid out there that wouldn't work, that hasn't been thought through, that has no details, and wouldn't actually do anything to make this country better off.

NOVAK: All right, we're going to -- we're going to have to take a break.

I want to ask a quick question: Richard Berke of "The New York Times" on "INSIDE POLITICS" on CNN today. I think he's an objective reporter. He said both of you are running well to the left. Is that true? Eric?

HAUSER: I think we're running right to common sense, which is where most Americans are. You're not going to tell me that most Americans don't want

health insurance for everybody, don't want guns off the streets, don't...

NOVAK: Ron, quickly, are you running to the left?

KLAIN: The vice president is running on a common-sense agenda that will make America a better place in the 21st century.

NOVAK: You're both wrong, you're both running to the left, and that old left-winger Bill Press -- thank you very much, Ron Klain.

KLAIN: Thank you.

NOVAK: Thank you Eric Hauser in Des Moines.

HAUSER: Thanks, guys.

NOVAK: And that old left-winger Bill Press and I will be back with closing comments in just a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

PRESS: OK, if you love politics, CNN is the network to watch, and here a couple of programming notes: Iowa and New Hampshire, of course, aren't the only states where votes matter. The GOP candidates meet in South Carolina tomorrow night for still another debate. And in the CROSSFIRE tomorrow, to preview it, we'll be joined by Bush adviser Ralph Reed, and McCain's top man in the state, Congressman Lindsey Graham. That's Friday, tomorrow night, at 7:30.

And Saturday at 2:00, tune in to watch Democratic candidates Al Gore and Bill Bradley face off in still another debate, this one in Des Moines, Iowa. And of course, that is all on CNN.

Bob, first I have to tell you, I agree with you on -- I thought Donna Brazil's comments were out of line, and she certainly deserves an apology to Colin Powell, at least, and to J.C. Watts.

The other thing I have to tell you -- you know what I picked up last night

from this debate? I think Bill Bradley is surprisingly thin-skinned. I mean, he loves to put out these big ideas, but when you challenge him he really bristles -- and question whether he's really tough enough for the long haul.

NOVAK: Well, I've spent my whole life looking for a thick-skinned politician and I haven't found one yet.

But I -- let me tell you this, 27 percent of the U.S. -- of the officers in the U.S. military say they'll resign from the service if this "don't ask, don't tell" policy is abandoned. And when the -- when Vice President Gore says on national television that he would demand a litmus test for members of the Joint Chiefs, that is gold, porcelain, the platinum for the Republicans to use in the fall campaign.

PRESS: And they will, but it won't work.

From the left, I'm Bill Press. Good night for CROSSFIRE.

NOVAK: From the right, I'm Robert Novak. Join us again next time for another edition of CROSSFIRE.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> (Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 07:44:29.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

TO: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

--today's papers: Hooked on Debate

--the week/the spin: Cuba Getting Junior

today's papers

Hooked on Debate

By Scott Shuger

The WP leads with yesterday's announcement by House Republican leaders that they would support a tax cut only one-seventh the size of the \$792 billion cuts package they put forward last year, which was vetoed by President Clinton. The paper quotes Speaker Dennis Hastert opining that there is a tax agreement with the White House in the offing. USAT goes with the feds' new anti-terror measures, including tighter performance standards for the companies that do airport security screenings and a plan to be announced today by Clinton to make government computers safer from attack. Its most novel aspect: a college scholarship program that would give students graduate and undergraduate tuition subsidies in return for post-graduate government service as information technology specialists. The NYT goes with the SEC's report stating that PricewaterhouseCoopers, the world's largest accounting firm, violated the rule prohibiting the firm's partners from having investments in companies it audits. As a result, says the paper, the government will check out the other major accounting firms' compliance. The story seems oversold (by the SEC and by the NYT): The paper reports that nearly half the violations resulted from complications relating to the merger that created the firm, and no examples are given of firm audits that were in any way rendered dubious by prima facie investment conflicts. The LAT leads with the White House decision to continue to delay implementation of the NAFTA provision opening U.S. highways to Mexican trucks. The paper quotes unnamed senior trade and State Dept. officials explaining that the plan is to ensure that the matter is not resolved while Al

Gore is running for president, thus keeping the Teamsters, who vehemently oppose the opening, from abandoning him. With the exception of the WP's fronting of the SEC story, none of the leads makes the others' fronts.

The WP and LAT front last night's GOP presidential candidate debate, which also tops the WSJ front-page news box, but the late metro edition of the NYT stuffs it. According to the coverage, the debates were highlighted by 1) George W. Bush's declaration going his father's famous pledge one better: "This is not only no new taxes. This is tax cuts, so help me God." and 2) Bush and John McCain arguing about campaign finance reform, with McCain defending the compatibility of his reform stance with his recently exposed letter writing to the FCC to force a decision concerning a TV station that one of his major contributors wanted to purchase, and Bush claiming that McCain's reform would "hurt the Republican cause." All six of the GOP debaters came out against open service of gays in the military, contradicting the stance favored the night before by Al Gore and Bill Bradley in their debate.

The papers report that when asked if he would take the mantra "What would Jesus do?" into the Oval Office, Bush replied, "I would take an expression into the Oval Office of, 'Dear God, help me!'" The NYT says Alan Keyes added, "So would we." The WP and LAT attribute the quip to Gary Bauer. The LAT reports that when Keyes criticized McCain for saying he liked Nine Inch Nails, McCain climbed down quickly, saying the band was a "poor choice."

The editorial pages seize on McCain's FCC letters, with the WP saying he "badly overstepped the rules," and the NYT calling the letters "improper." The WSJ says the real scandal is that unelected bureaucrats at the FCC have power over large swaths of the private economy and that the least our elected representatives can do is ride herd on them.

The WP reports in a story inside that the Pentagon disclosed yesterday that the explanation it offered during the Kosovo war of how a passenger train came to be bombed had a flaw. The official explanation at the time, that the U.S. pilot locked onto an empty railroad bridge, and only after that did the train very quickly come onto it, was buttressed by the Pentagon's showing of a nose-cone video. But, says the WP, the Pentagon now admits the video was shown to reporters at three times normal speed. The paper notes that all other bombing videos released to the press during the war were shown at normal speed. The Pentagon insists the speed selection was inadvertent. In other words, they're willing to admit to a mistake in a non-combat zone, when lots of supervisors are involved, with lots of lead-time, and involving simple technology but can't contemplate a mistake when none of these favorable conditions obtain.

The WP and NYT run wire service stories reporting that according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the number of legal abortions in the U.S. (for 1997, the latest year for which data is

available) is at its lowest point since 1978. The WP story says that the CDC didn't try to figure out why the drop occurred. The NYT says it did and mentions among the factors "possibly different attitudes about the moral implications of abortion." Will there be more study of this last question by the CDC or is the government afraid to find out and/or publicize a possible result indicating an increasing belief that abortion is immoral?

USAT reefers, and the other papers run inside, Major League Baseball's decision that John Rocker must undergo psychological testing before it decides whether or not to discipline him for his recent disparaging remarks about gays and minorities. Today's Papers thinks this makes sense, since prejudice is a mentally disordered way of looking at the world. And hey, while we're at it, how about psychological testing for Jesse Jackson, Louis Farrakhan and Pat Buchanan?

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-todayspapers/index.asp>

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Moneybox: Weekend Cocktail Chatter

<http://www.slate.com/Code/Moneybox/Moneybox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4324>

Were the Y2K Preparations in Vain?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4319>

The McCain Mutiny

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4320>

the week/the spin

Cuba Getting Junior

By Matt Alsdorf and Jodi Kantor

The Immigration and Naturalization Service ruled that Eli n Gonz lez should be reunited with his father in Cuba. Gonz lez's Cuban-American relatives had argued that he should remain in the United States after he was rescued from a shipwreck in which his mother died. Protesters blocked traffic in Miami, and Gonz lez's family promised to appeal the ruling, charging that the INS was giving into blackmail by Castro. INS supporters countered that 1) the ruling was based solely on legal concerns; and 2) the only blackmail was Cuban-Americans' threats of political retribution against the Clinton administration. The INS's spin: He's being reunited with his family. Cuban-Americans' spin: He's being denied a better life in the United States.

Al Gore and Bill Bradley debated in New Hampshire. In their third meeting in a month, they clashed over health care and gun control and agreed on support for gays in the military. But most pundits said personality and leadership--not policy issues--were the true points of contention: Gore deemed Bradley "too intellectually removed" to deal with real-world problems; Bradley charged that Gore was not removed enough from the "Washington bunker" to generate creative solutions. The rosy Democratic spin: The frequent debates help both candidates practice "crisper critiques of one another and more polished defenses of their positions." The gloomy Democratic spin: The constant sparring over character issues makes them both less likable. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg offers his assessment of the debate in "Ballot Box," and William Saletan offers another take in "Frame Game.")

U.S. stock markets plunged. Tuesday's declines were the most severe in more than a year: The Dow Jones industrial average fell 3.2 percent, and the tech-heavy Nasdaq dropped 5.5 percent. Asian and European markets followed suit. The apparent cause: Investors waited for the new tax year to reap profits from recent stock gains. The counterintuitive causes: Wall Street darling Alan Greenspan was nominated for a fourth term as Federal Reserve chairman, and Y2K economic disruptions never surfaced--both of which increase the likelihood that the Fed will raise interest rates. Wall Street shrugged off the decline as a "necessary and expected" correction. Skeptics termed it an indication that investors are "even more confused than usual about what stocks are really worth these days."

Y2K came and went without terrorism or technological snafus. Airplanes stayed airborne and ATMs dispensed cash as usual. Observers said the Y2K bug's threat 1) was averted thanks to diligent preparation; 2) had been exaggerated by greedy programmers so that customers would commission expensive repairs; and 3) won't pass until companies and governments have used their "backroom systems," which were not repaired as thoroughly as critical programs. ("International Papers" sums up the millennium coverage from around the globe.)

Israel and Syria began peace talks. Syria wants to regain control of the Golan Heights, which Israel captured in 1967. Israel wants security guarantees and the restoration of normal diplomatic relations. The initial discussions were deemed "rocky," with each side claiming that the other was not following the agenda. Israel and Syria called the impasse a "crisis" that threatened to derail the entire peace process. Skeptics charged it was manufactured to convince Israeli and Syrian citizens that their representatives bargained hard. The Clinton administration downplayed the dispute, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the talks' first round; and 2) the difficulties show that "the two sides [are] getting into the knotty issues." Separately, Israel and Palestine agreed to a plan for Israeli troop withdrawals from parts of the West Bank.

Florida State won college football's national title. With a 46-29 Sugar Bowl victory over No. 2 Virginia Tech, the undefeated Seminoles became the first team to hold a No. 1 Associated Press ranking throughout the entire season. Sportswriters were happy for 1) Florida State receiver Peter Warrick, the undisputed star of the game, who "redeemed" himself after last year's arrest and suspension for theft; 2) Florida State coach Bobby Bowden, who got his first undefeated season and second national championship in 40 years of coaching; and 3) the Virginia Tech players, who "put season-long criticism of their toughness to rest" with a valiant comeback attempt.

Elizabeth Dole endorsed George W. Bush. In her long-expected announcement, Dole likened Bush to Ronald Reagan and said he would repair the presidency's tarnished image. Analysts called it a win for 1) Bush, who gains support from women voters; 2) Dole, who increases her chances of nabbing the vice presidential nomination; and 3) John McCain, who can again cast "Bush as the charmed insider and [himself] as the scrappy outsider."

Boris Yeltsin resigned. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin became Russia's acting president and is expected to win the presidency by a wide margin in March elections. In his surprise resignation speech, Yeltsin admitted his failings. Pundits agreed he had botched much of his job but also noted his shrewdness in 1) capturing the world's attention on New Year's Eve; 2) cutting his losses before his communism-busting legacy was further tainted by a money-laundering scandal or the war in Chechnya; and 3) designating his likely successor, who has immunized Yeltsin from prosecution.

La Niña is altering winter weather. The effects of the cooler-than-normal Pacific Ocean currents include 1) balmy temperatures on the East Coast; 2) tornadoes in Kentucky and Mississippi; and 3) cool weather in California. Midwesterners ran for cover. Easterners celebrated with "giddiness usually reserved for the first days of spring." Pessimists called the weather a "spooky" reminder of Mother Nature's power and predicted further climatic changes from the greenhouse effect.

The Indian hijacking crisis was resolved. The still-unidentified

Islamic terrorists released their 155 hostages after India agreed to free three of their jailed comrades. The hijackers were given 10 hours to leave Afghanistan and have presumably vanished into Pakistan. India accused Pakistan of backing the hijacking and giving shelter to the terrorists. Pakistan accused India of playing politics with the hijacking. The rest of the world again worried about a nuclear confrontation between the two countries. The Washington Post denounced Afghanistan and Pakistan for "trying to have it both ways on terrorism. They play host to terrorist groups, yet wax indignant when terrorists hijack an aircraft."

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said: <http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-spin/index.asp>

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box. Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> to see what's available.

For additional information about SLATE, go to <http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader Services.

This delivery powered by Exactis.com <http://www.exactis.com>

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> (Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 07:12:58.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Thurs., Jan. 6, 2000

TO: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Thurs., Jan. 6, 2000

--today's papers: Cogito Ergonomics

--international papers: Stormy Weather

today's papers

Cogito Ergonomics

By Eric Roston

The USA Today leads with the INS's decision to return six-year-old Elian Gonzalez to his father in Cuba by Jan. 14. All other papers front the story. The Washington Post goes with Labor Secretary Alexis Herman's backpedaling on an OSHA directive making employers responsible for safety and health violations in employees' home offices. The Wall Street Journal tops its World-Wide box with yesterday's Democratic presidential debate at the University of New Hampshire. The NYT goes local, and off-leads the uncertain status of fighting between Russians and Chechens in Grozny. The LAT, which leads with the governor's State of the State address, off-leads Gonzalez and reeffers the Labor Department story.

Officially, the INS judged the case based on law and research, but anonymous officials told the NYT that the administration did not want to damage relations with Cuba when it is trying to forge new contacts there. Justice Department officials indicated they would oppose threatened legal moves by Gonzalez' angry relatives, who are hosting the boy in Miami. No decision has been made on how Elian will be reunited with his father: The INS offered to bring Juan Gonzalez to the States to pick the boy up, but Gonzalez has said it's the Americans' responsibility to bring him home. Gonzalez senior may be under pressure from the Cuban government, the LAT and Post report.

Each story carries President Clinton's boast that his administration has kept the boy's plight "out of politics," but the

two Times dispute that statement. Castro, whose name isn't even mentioned in the Post, is treated with kid gloves in the NYT. Only the LAT reports that Castro has called the situation an abduction. Elian has been roped into someone else's game: He is the center of an "international tug of war" in the WP lede and a front-page LAT caption, and the "center of a political tug-of-war" in the USAT. The NYT turns him into "the central object in a tug-of-war." How can the situation almost unanimously be a political "tug of war" if so little is mentioned of who's tugging on the other end?

A flurry of calls between Labor and the White House resulted in Herman recanting the home office directive, the Post reports. The confusion shows that telecommuting has changed the workplace so, that traditional rules and regulations may no longer apply--or perhaps no one's sure how to apply them. Withdrawing the directive, which first made news Tuesday, may not affect the policy behind it. Almost 20 million people in the US work at home.

The NYT and WP front the S.E.C.'s filing of a civil suit against stock guru Yun Soo Oh Park, "Tokyo Joe" of Internet fame. Park, accused of committing four counts of fraud, is said to have advised followers to buy certain stocks, which he then sold on the sly as their orders lifted the stocks' prices. In 1998, he allegedly accepted 100,000 shares in a cigar maker and Boca Raton deli-owner; in return, he is said to have recommended the stock to his customers, without revealing his relationship to the company. The S.E.C.'s complaint is its most aggressive move yet against an Internet stock wiz.

The NYT, Post (in their business sections), and WSJ report that Amazon.com Inc.'s fourth-quarter revenue, \$650 million, failed to match analysts' "whisper number," which in some circles doubled earlier, published estimates of \$500 million. Stockholders were not impressed: investors beat the stock down 15 percent, lowering its market capitalization by \$4 billion, to \$24 billion.

Coverage of the fourth Bradley-Gore debate is pot luck. The NYT and WSJ dwell on both candidates' strengthening of earlier statements defending gays in the military. The Post summarizes the debate topics as "guns, health, ability" in its headline and mentions Sen. Edward Kennedy's endorsement of Gore in its subhead. The WSJ highlights in its World-Wide column (as opposed to its story) Bradley's accusation that Gore contorted his health care plan by claiming it would hurt minorities. According to the LAT, the debate centered on who might be a stronger president. A NYT front-pager reports that McCain, in the midst of a fight against the power of money in politics, twice in the past couple months urged the FCC to act on an issue that would benefit a major contributor to his campaign.

Chechens claim to have seized a village southwest of Grozny; Russians said the fighters fled the capital in desperation. NYT Moscow bureau chief Michael Gordon reports from North Ossetia, a Russian republic west of Chechnya: "It is impossible to verify

either side's claims since the Russian military has not taken reporters to Chechnya for three days."

Dept. of Misplaced Rhetorical Imagery: In light of last year's school shootings, the LAT lead headline is somewhat startling: "[Governor] Davis Issues a Call to Arms for Better Teachers, Schools." Coincidentally, New York Governor George Pataki, in the NYT lead, outlined changes in practices for recruiting teachers, saying that "right now, Colin Powell can't teach in the New York schools that he grew up in." The LAT story explains that Davis used images of warfare in his State of the State speech to drum up enthusiasm for hiring and training new teachers. The "war for the future," he said, "will be fought school to school, classroom to classroom, desk to desk." Today's Papers knows what he means, but had hoped imagery of classroom warfare might be left in the past.

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-todayspapers/index.asp>

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Is George W. Bush a "Weak" Governor?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/5/00&idMessage=4307>

The Case for Placebos

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-03/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

The Week/The Spin: Elian Nation

<http://www.slate.com/Spin/00-01-03/Spin.asp?Show=11/30/99>

international papers

Stormy Weather

By Alexander Chancellor

Several European papers led Wednesday with the stock market declines in the United States and Europe that were partially based on expectations of interest-rate hikes. In an editorial Wednesday on the reappointment of Alan Greenspan as chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, the Financial Times of London said that the move will

reassure investors but questioned whether it is also "the best news

for the long-term management of the US economy." The FT said, [T]o appoint any individual for a fourth term risks over-personalising the institution of the Federal Reserve Bank, and could discourage a

more open debate about policy." La Repubblica of Rome ran a front-page comment Wednesday comparing the reappointment of Greenspan to the Italian peasant tradition of carrying in procession a statue of the Holy Protector to placate the weather. "Yesterday Bill Clinton raised the blessed icon of Alan Greenspan in the world's central square against the sudden and furious storm that is sweeping through the stock markets," it said.

The French papers were more concerned with the real storm that caused huge damage in France in the past week. Le Figaro of Paris led its front page Wednesday with an estimate that the storm will cost the French economy between 60 billion and 70 billion French francs, about 3 percent of the state budget. However, the paper said it could also have positive effects on France's economic growth. According to a report in the Times of London, the storm brought down 270 million trees in France, ranging from 18th-century

oaks in Paris gardens to entire plantations in the Vosges Mountains. The French historian Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie was reported as saying that France's vast woodlands had suffered nothing comparable since detailed records began in the reign of Louis XIV--"Since 1660 at least, there has been no phenomenon on such a vast scale."

In an editorial Wednesday, Le Monde celebrated the first anniversary of the euro, the single European currency. "The event was historic," the paper said. "For the first time, 11 nations agreed to renounce their monetary sovereignty and to share it. Anti-European militants, American experts, and speculators of all kinds had explained for years that the project was impossible. One year later, they must admit they were wrong: the euro exists, it has established itself as one of the world's great currencies and, better still, it has kept most of its promises."

In a gloomy editorial Wednesday, the Moscow Times attacked the legacy of former President Boris Yeltsin and questioned the merits of his successor, Vladimir Putin. "Everyone talks about the Yeltsin

years as the reform years," the paper said. "But the fact is, there

is not a single major reform that was not begun by [former Soviet leader Mikhail] Gorbachev and at least slightly tarnished or rolled

back under Yeltsin. And now, with this less-than-heroic departure--immunity from prosecution tightly in hand--Yeltsin has sealed it that way. Yeltsin's legacy will be like Yeltsin himself, particularly during his second term: inarticulate, confused, self-absorbed, weak."

On Putin, the Moscow Times said there is "a shocking amount of wishful thinking masquerading as analysis." It said his record so far is "dispiriting." He did nothing about scandals at the FSB (the

successor agency to the KGB) when he was its director, and "[a]s prime minister, his only claim to fame has been to seize upon a truly bad situation in Chechnya as an excuse to wage an imperial war, one that punishes civilians in the name of protecting them." In an interview Monday with La Stampa of Turin, Mikhail Gorbachev said Putin would do anything for victory in Chechnya, whatever the cost in human lives. "Putin knows better than anybody that in the event of defeat--or simply of no victory--his position could rapidly deteriorate," Gorbachev said. "So he will do everything to win, at any cost, and whatever the number of deaths." Gorbachev added that Putin is part of the Yeltsin "oligarchy" and will not carry out the reforms that the West hoped for. "The regime will not

change, there will be no fight against corruption," he said. "Above all, the interests and privileges of the oligarchy will be protected."

During World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to Winston Churchill that Gen. Charles de Gaulle be ousted as leader of the Free French movement and fobbed off with the governorship of

Madagascar, according to a report in the Times of London Wednesday.

The paper was reporting on secret wartime documents just released by the British Public Record Office. They show that neither Roosevelt nor Churchill could stand de Gaulle. In a May 1943 "personal and most secret" memo to Churchill, Roosevelt called de Gaulle's attitude "well-nigh intolerable" and accused him of stirring up vicious propaganda in North Africa and attempting to cause strife between the Arabs and the Jews in Algiers. When visiting Washington, Churchill fired off a series of telegrams to his government colleagues in London, proposing in one of them that de Gaulle be "eliminated" as a political force. He called the general a "vain and even malignant man," and added, "He hates England and has left a trail of Anglophobia behind everywhere." Roosevelt was a little kinder. "De Gaulle may be an honest man, but

he has the messianic complex," he wrote.

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://bbs.slate.com/bbs/slate-internatpapers/index.asp>

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What

Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box.

Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> to see what's available.

For additional information about SLATE, go to <http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader Services.

This delivery powered by Exactis.com <http://www.exactis.com>

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.