

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 10:03:34.00

SUBJECT: FOX Special Report, 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 SPECIAL REPORT WITH BRIT HUME
January 6, 2000

BRIT HUME, HOST: Welcome to Washington. I'm Brit Hume.

With the debates now coming thick and fast, the presidential campaigns in both parties are sharpening as the candidates hit each other with increasing force on the issues. Among the Democrats, Bill Bradley's hopes for an all-positive approach seem to have wilted in the face of Vice President Gore's assault. And Mr. Gore was at it again. Senior White House correspondent Jim Angle reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JIM ANGLE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The morning after, and Vice President Gore was courting voters over breakfast.

UNIDENTIFIED VOTER: You will have my support.

ALBERT GORE (D), VICE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Thank you, sir.

ANGLE: But some locals are still playing hard to get.

GORE: I'd like to have your support in the primary.

UNIDENTIFIED VOTER: Yeah, well, I'll have to think about it.

ANGLE: And the vice president was eager for voters to think about something in particular.

GORE: I hope that some of you listened attentively to the answer that Senator Bradley gave last night to my question about Medicare.

ANGLE: In the debate, Gore asked Bradley why he hasn't set aside a pot of money to shore up Medicare. Bradley, with only moments to go, gave a hurried answer in which he said little.

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: If we grow faster than 2.9 percent, it's going to have money dedicated to Medicare. It's as simple as that.

ANGLE: Bradley argues that economic growth will raise more money for Medicare and that medical advances will lower its costs. Gore ridiculed what he characterized as Bradley's view.

GORE: Well, if seniors exercise more and eat better, and if we have some unexpected advances in health care treatments, then we won't--maybe we won't need to save Medicare.

ANGLE: Bradley was in Boston collecting the endorsement of 50 state legislators and a memento of his visit to the land of the Celtics. He sought to keep the focus on Gore's opposition to his plan for universal health care, to which Gore says there are too many obstacles, financial and political. Bradley dismissed that argument as almost unpatriotic.

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Think of the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt or Lyndon Johnson. Now, do you think Franklin Roosevelt would have gotten Social Security if he would have said, "We're going to do 20 percent this year and 40 percent next year and 30 percent the following year?" No!

ANGLE: Bradley is also running a new ad that will blunt another Gore charge, that Bradley neglects other issues in his pursuit of health care. The new ad running in Iowa highlights education.

BRADLEY (campaign commercial): And that's why I've proposed training and placing 60,000 new teachers a year for the next 10 years.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ANGLE: Vice President Gore today renewed his call for Bradley to join him in halting television ads. Gore said the ads are just "fuzzy images of poll-tested slogans masquerading as substantive dialogue." Of course, Gore would also like to save money by not running the ads on the theory that he'll win the nomination and need the cash to fight against Republicans. So far, Bradley isn't going for it.

Brit?

HUME: Jim, which of these candidates appears to you to need to win New Hampshire more?

ANGLE: I think Bradley, clearly. For him, the circumstances are perfect. It's a more college-educated, liberal voter there. That's the best thing for Bradley--very small organized labor, which is one of Gore's advantages. Democratic activists say if Bradley can't win in New Hampshire, where could he win?

Brit?

HUME: All right, Jim. Thanks very much.

Wednesday's debate between Gore and Bradley highlighted one of the perils of primary fights. Nominations tend to be won by candidates who do best among a party's activist constituencies, which can mean taking positions not always ideal for appealing to the country as a whole. That's what may have happened to Gore and Bradley on the subject of gays in the military. Julie Kirtz has the story.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JULIE KIRTZ, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Campaigning at a New Hampshire diner, Al Gore brushed aside an encounter with Republican presidential candidate Gary Bauer, who criticized Gore for his position on gays in the military.

GORE: We just said hello, and I--you know, just a passing comment.

KIRTZ: But coming out of the restaurant, Bauer had a different take.

GARY BAUER (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I can't believe the vice president of the United States thinks that the people in charge of defending the United States have to agree with him on the gay rights movement.

KIRTZ: In Wednesday night's debate, both Gore and his Democratic opponent, Bill Bradley, said they want to make a sweeping change in military policy to allow homosexuals to serve openly. And when asked whether a litmus test should be applied when nominating members of the Joint Chiefs, Gore said yes.

GORE: I would insist, before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy.

KIRTZ: Bradley said simply he would expect top commanders to follow his lead.

BRADLEY: 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.

KIRTZ: Easier said than done, as President Clinton learned when he took office. He backed off his support for gays serving openly in the military after then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs Colin Powell objected. The result was compromise legislation passed by Congress known as ``Don't ask, don't tell."

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: 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.

KIRTZ (on-camera): Many high-ranking military officials and retired officers strongly oppose allowing gays to serve openly. They say it would disrupt military discipline. And according to some, a president would have a hard time finding top people for the Joint Chiefs if there is a litmus test.

Regardless of who becomes the next president, any litmus test will have to wait because the current chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Hugh Shelton, has just been reappointed to another two-year term.

In Washington, Julie Kirtz, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: And next, details from the Republican presidential campaign. Stay tuned.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: John McCain is trying to get the focus back

onto his campaign platform. He's been bogged down by allegations he helped a special interest group, despite his talk about getting that kind of influence out of Washington. FOX NEWS correspondent David Shuster is traveling with McCain and has the latest.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID SHUSTER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): At lunch, Arizona Senator John McCain was trying his best to get past the controversy, telling jokes with Manchester firefighters.

U.S. SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Every politician has a price. Mine is obviously a chili lunch.

SHUSTER: But the serious allegations that McCain did a favor for a contributor continued to dog the campaign finance reform candidate. He was peppered with questions at every stop about Lowell Paxson, whose broadcast company benefited from a decision made by the Federal Communications Commission. McCain has pushed the FCC to make a ruling on Paxson's request for a television station license that had languished at the FCC for two years.

The firestorm comes just days before a scheduled fund-raiser at Paxson's home in Florida, which the McCain campaign has decided to cancel. From the front page of "The New York Times" to an appearance on "Nightline" to the campaign trail, McCain has been forced to defend himself.

MCCAIN: I asked for a decision from a bureaucracy, not a favorable one, and I will do that again tomorrow if someone comes to me and said they've waited two years or more than two years for a decision from a bureaucracy.

SHUSTER: Paxson also defends the request.

LOWELL "BUD" PAXSON, PAXSON COMMUNICATIONS CHAIRMAN: ... because when they take three years to approve something, that is ridiculous, absurd, and it violates my rights as a citizen to have timely action on any application I put before the FCC.

SHUSTER: McCain tried to get back on message, criticizing what he described as an excessive tax cut plan proposed by George W. Bush.

MCCAIN: I just don't think it's a wise thing to do, to devote the entire surplus to tax cuts, particularly since the majority of his tax cuts go for the wealthy.

SHUSTER: By contrast, McCain is proposing a smaller tax cut targeting the middle class, but he is still working on the numbers, which he expects to release next week. In the meantime, voters in New Hampshire seem satisfied with the blunt talk and McCain's pledge to root out special interests despite the distractions of the week.

MCCAIN: The day that I am inaugurated as president of the United States, I would say, "My friends, I campaigned on this issue. I asked for the endorsement of the American people. I told them I would get this changed. Now, my dear friends, it's time the Congress reacted to the will of the American people."

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHUSTER: The applause for McCain after those lines at all of these town hall meetings is just as loud as ever. And while that may be of some comfort to the candidate and his staff, they acknowledge that the honeymoon that they have enjoyed with the media has certainly come to an end.

Brit?

HUME: David, how much time does John McCain spend preparing for these debates?

SHUSTER: Brit, not much at all. He has said repeatedly only about an hour for all of these debates, and he says that the questions he's been getting at these town hall meetings--he's done almost 80 of them--that all these various questions, he says, are the best preparation possible, he said. He has talked about every possible issue that could come up at these debates, and he says that that is what has prepared him the best.

Brit?

HUME: All right, David. Thanks very much.

In the meantime, Texas Governor George W. Bush has been focusing on his message for the latest debate. He'll square off with the rest of the GOP presidential candidates at the University of New Hampshire. And as FOX NEWS correspondent Carl Cameron tells us, Bush is hoping talk of his tax cut plan at the debate will push him to a clear lead over McCain.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

GEORGE W. BUSH (R), TEXAS GOVERNOR, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Well, I'm asking for the vote.

VOTER: OK.

BUSH: Give me your consideration. Thank you.

CARL CAMERON, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Appearing unannounced at a New Hampshire restaurant, it was George W. Bush unleashed, kissing diners, posing with the help, showing off his Spanish. By the time he left, this was the unsolicited response from patrons.

For Bush, the fun and games are serious campaign business. He promised--after being criticized--to make himself more available to voters and the media in the new year. He's now begun to stop regularly and often to answer reporters' questions and rap John McCain as the weaker when it comes to cutting taxes.

BUSH: There is a difference of opinion that is emerging in the course of the primary, and Senator McCain, who I think is a very good Republican and is a good man and a friend, and I disagree to the extent of our vision of tax cutting.

CAMERON: He toured the New Hampshire headquarters of Scudder Investments, visiting with employees. Then Bush took part in a town hall-style meeting with the workers, in which he pledged to make tax cuts a priority. And this time, he whacked McCain for his top priority, campaign finance reform. Bush says McCain's proposed reforms would hurt Republicans and conservatives. Call it the Bush one-two punch.

BUSH: We have a difference of opinion on tax cuts, and a difference of opinions on how to make sure the campaign funding laws are fair for everybody.

CAMERON: Bush believes that any campaign finance reform also has to include new rules and regulations to make sure that labor unions aren't able to give increased donations to Democrats and thereby give that party an advantage over the GOP.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

Tonight at the debate, the Bush campaign says the Texas governor will focus more and more on taxes, trying to underscore what they believe his strength is over McCain, and again, keep on pounding away at campaign finance reform, say that too is McCain's weakness.

Brit?

HUME: Carl, what--what do they expect out of Forbes and McCain in this upcoming debate?

CAMERON: Well, talking to the Forbes advisory staff, saying they tonight really want to go at both McCain and Bush as weak on taxes. This is kind of his "Hail Mary" opportunity with only a few days left before the Iowa caucus and New Hampshire primary, and watch for McCain trying to get back on his stride after a week on defense. He's had kind of a rough patch up here.

HUME: Carl, thanks very much.

The Commission on Presidential Debates has chosen three sites for debates this fall: the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, and Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. A vice presidential debate has been set for Centre College in Danville, Kentucky. The nominees for each party will have the right to refuse to participate in one or more of these debates, and to be eligible you have to be at least 15 percent in national polls.

And next up, we'll talk politics with the pollster Doug Schoen. Stay tuned for that.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BRIT HUME, HOST: The latest John Zogby national poll shows 42 percent of likely voters think they--say they are ashamed to have Bill Clinton as president, 39 percent say they're proud to have him as their president. The party break-down for that question: 61 percent of Democrats say "proud," 20 percent say "ashamed." Republicans: 8 percent say "proud," 75 percent "ashamed."

In the race for the Democratic presidential nomination, Al Gore has a 20-point lead over Bill Bradley, Bradley having lost 5 points since November.

And George W. Bush continues to overpower his rival, John McCain, 56 percent to 12 percent. McCain has lost 2 points since November.

And an election match-up shows Bush over Gore 50 percent to 39 percent. Bush leads Bradley by only 5 points, and McCain leads Gore 44 percent to 37 percent, but trails Bradley by 5 points.

And speaking of polls, we turn for analysis to Doug Schoen, who's not working for any of the candidates this time, but was President Clinton's top pollster in 1996. He's in our studios in New York.

Welcome, Doug.

DOUG SCHOEN, DEMOCRATIC POLLSTER: Welcome. Thank you.

HUME: Thanks for coming in.

Did you watch the Democrats' debate last night?

SCHOEN: I did.

HUME: And what did you make of it? Does anybody seem to be gaining any real advantage in these exchanges?

SCHOEN: I don't really think so. I think Bill Bradley's trying to position himself as an outsider, a man of change, and I think Al Gore is positioning himself as the establishment Democratic candidate who stood up to Newt Gingrich and, as he put it, stayed and fought.

HUME: Now, let's talk about that a little bit. This seems to be one of those elections--Peter Hart, for example, your--your

Democratic polling colleague, said on this broadcast a short time ago that this looks like one of those primary elections or primary campaigns which will be probably more about getting the constituencies of the party behind you than about having a compelling message.

If that's the case, then it seems that Gore's going in the right direction and Bradley may not be. What do you think of that?

SCHOEN: I tend to agree with that, Brit. I think that labor's with Gore. Minorities are with Gore. Party leaders, Senator Kennedy's with Gore. The South I think will be strongly for Gore. And I think it's going to be very tough for Bradley, with the absence of a compelling message, to overtake him.

HUME: Now--and the reason Bradley doesn't--is it that this is not a year for a compelling message, in your view, or is it simply that Bradley doesn't have one?

SCHOEN: I think it's both, frankly. I think that Bradley hasn't really articulated a vision that is diametrically different from Al Gore's, and I think that with good times, there's not really a ferment to get rid of an incumbent vice president who has served in a very popular administration.

HUME: Now, ordinarily, in a situation like this, with peace and prosperity, and some people would say prosperity like we've almost never had, the cold war over, this is not a setting in which incumbent party candidates are typically turned out of office or rejected. Yet you--Mr. Gore continues to trail in these national polls, and some--and by noticeable margins.

In your view, what--is that the--sort of the Clinton X factor in this? Is that what the cause of that is?

SCHOEN: No, I really don't think so. I think if you go back to 1987 and '88, George Bush trailed the Democratic standard-bearer, Mike Dukakis, until he was able to develop a persona of his own. I think, as Gore himself has said, he's beginning to get comfortable with his own message and to grow on the campaign trail. And I think increasingly, as voters get comfortable with Al Gore, they're going to move in his direction. And indeed, the margin in most polls has narrowed from 15 or 16 points down to the 11 and...

HUME: Can you imagine a scenario in which this does not end quickly? In other words, does this look like it's going to take a while, or do you think there'll be an early knock-out in the Democratic race?

SCHOEN: Well, I think that if Bill Bradley doesn't win either New Hampshire or Iowa, it's over. And if he wins one of the two, he has to have a breakthrough March 7th in New York or Michigan or California to carry on the process. So I think, barring some breakthrough by Bradley, it'll probably end sooner rather than later.

HUME: Now, it--but a breakthrough certainly is--is within the realm of possibility, given the fact that he's--that he's still leading in New Hampshire. And we're hearing now that in Iowa, there's a new "Des Moines Register" poll, apparently, that shows him only, you know, something like 15 points--13, 15 points--down, which means he could do--he could beat the old expectations game out there and maybe have some sort of a bounce.

Is it possible that--that if he were to do better than expected in Iowa, then win New Hampshire, that this old, nagging question about electability could overtake Gore, or do you think not?

SCHOEN: You know, I really don't think so. I think that New York is certainly a place where Bill Bradley will do well, but when you get outside of New York and you look at the other state-by-state polls, which show, as your Zogby poll shows, at least a 20-point lead for Vice President Gore, that the vice president's in good shape. I think the key, really, Brit, is California.

HUME: Really? And--well, Bradley lived out there for a while. It's not a--I would think that the contours of the state politically are not bad for him. What's your take on that?

SCHOEN: I think they're not bad for him, but he's yet to develop any sort of rationale, I think, to appeal to West Coast voters. I just happen to think he's--I don't think he's gotten to that yet.

HUME: You don't--is--what--but what about this "outsider," "reform"--that kind of stuff flies in California.

SCHOEN: It does, but it's relatively new for Bradley. I mean, he's just beginning to articulate it. And the other problem he has with it, of course, is that he was a senator for 18 years. So it's a tough message for him to sell compellingly.

HUME: Now, the--the old wisdom about attack politics has generally been that attacking works, and you can--you can hurt your opponent, bring his negatives, as they say, up. But you don't usually look good doing it. Gore is the man on the attack. He seems comfortable there. It's a style of campaigning with which he seems familiar.

Is it possible, in your eyes, that this relentless charge that he's made could backfire against him?

SCHOEN: I don't think so. I think you're exactly--I think you're exactly right. I think he's done a good job of contrasting his issue positions with those of Senator Bradley. I think he's made a case on health care that there are problems both in terms of cost and scope with the Bradley programs. And he's attacked some of Bradley's votes in the Senate and suggested that Bradley has made some mistakes. And I think that those will at least give voters pause about Bill Bradley.

HUME: But might being the attacker give voters pause about Al Gore?

SCHOEN: You know, I think if it's an issue-based attack of the type that Gore's been making, that it's really not going to cause him all that much problem.

HUME: Really? You mean, he--you--you don't believe that there's an unattractiveness factor that creeps in and that can turn voters off?

SCHOEN: I think he's, frankly, looked more and more attractive as the tenor of his campaign has gotten more sharp.

HUME: And may I take it that you--that you--you don't have any plans to go to work for him, do you?

SCHOEN: No, we're not working for him and...

HUME: If you were advising Bradley, what would you say?

SCHOEN: Oh, if I was advising Bradley, I'd say that he would have to sharpen his message and try and come up with a compelling rationale for why he should be president and why Al Gore shouldn't.

HUME: And a more ambitious health care program of the kind that many Democrats might favor and that the Clinton administration, at least in terms of its overall contours, once did, in

your view, doesn't do it?

SCHOEN: I don't think that's enough in and of itself. It doesn't appear to be.

HUME: And where else would--what--so which issue would you pick?

SCHOEN: Well, it's tough. I mean, he started to flesh out a message of change as an outsider on campaign finance reform, but Al Gore, after all, has said he's for campaign finance reform...

HUME: Yeah, but he's--but he's also the Buddhist temple guy, too. I mean, he...

SCHOEN: Well, you...

HUME: He doesn't have good credentials on...

SCHOEN: I understand that, but you know, Bill Bradley's also said he's not going to make those kind of attacks. So he's sort of put himself in a box, I think.

HUME: All right, Doug Schoen, thanks for your comments. Hope you'll come back.

SCHOEN: Appreciate it, Brit. Thank you.

HUME: Good to have you. You bet.

Up next: The Cuban-American community in Miami erupts in protest. We'll have that story in a moment.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BRIT HUME, HOST: Attorney General Janet Reno says she supports the decision to send little Elian Gonzalez back to his father in Cuba. Reno told reporters in Washington she fully agrees with the determination that, quote, "The father has the legal right and the legal authority to speak for his child in immigration matters," end quote. But as FOX NEWS correspondent Jeff Goldblatt reports, Cuban-Americans are protesting the move.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JEFF GOLDBLATT, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Demonstrators vowed to shut down Miami, and they succeeded, taking to the streets for Elian Gonzalez, snarling traffic downtown, blocking access to the poor.

UNIDENTIFIED PROTESTER: We want our message heard.

LT. BILL SCHWARTZ, MIAMI POLICE: I think we were caught a little off guard. It was suddenly like a tidal wave of people.

GOLDBLATT: Police let protesters roam at will for more than an hour before reclaiming the streets. Dozens refusing to move were arrested.

UNIDENTIFIED PROTESTER: Even if it means getting arrested, you have to stand by what you believe.

GOLDBLATT: This simmering cauldron of tension reached a boiling point one day after the U.S. department of immigration ruled laws mandate Elian Gonzalez belongs with his father in Cuba.

JANET RENO, ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is a relationship that the law recognizes, that morality and the sense of right of all people recognize.

GOLDBLATT: But not Elian's family here in the U.S. They've been fighting for custody of the boy since his rescue at sea Thanksgiving Day. In the pursuit of freedom, Elian's mother and stepfather died, setting the stage for this tense diplomatic tug-of-war.

JOSE BASULTO, FAMILY SPOKESMAN: We've been ticked off (ph) for many years, and it's out time to tick off others that don't

show solidarity for what's happening.

MARISLEYSIS GONZALEZ, ELIAN'S COUSIN: Well, I hope that they do everything very safely and very calm, and I thank everybody for supporting us.

GOLDBLATT: Amid the crusade and all its symbolism, a tender moment as Elian returned home for the first time since the announcement.

(on camera): Elian's family says they'll tell the boy tonight that he may return to Cuba. They say that'll be a painful conversation because he doesn't want to go.

In Miami, Jeff Goldblatt, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: President Clinton and the first lady are learning more about their new neighborhood. The president and Mrs. Clinton spent Wednesday night at their new home in suburban New York and then chatted with reporters and folks in town before heading back to Washington. FOX NEWS correspondent Molly Falconer reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

MOLLY FALCONER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The picture of the modern suburban commuting couple, the Clintons strolled out of their new home together down a pebbled driveway not to meet the new neighbors, but to speak with reporters.

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (D), FIRST LADY, NEW YORK SENATE CANDIDATE: 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.

FALCONER: The president is on his way to becoming a New Yorker, as well. He'll shift his voter registration in time for the Senate race.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I want to make sure my vote counts. I expect to vote in the election in New York.

FALCONER: Before heading back to that other white house in Washington, the Clintons decided to get to know their home town a little better, making an unscheduled (inaudible) at a volunteer fire station in Chappaqua's small downtown. Both Clintons immersed themselves into a crowd of well-wishers sprinkled with a protester or two, Mrs. Clinton mingling with potential voters in a way she hasn't since they bought the house in November. The Secret Service almost seemed to lose control of the situation, but Mrs. Clinton appeared to be enjoying herself. And when the president said...

CLINTON: Come on, Hillary! We're late!

FALCONER: ... she just stayed longer.

(on camera): The Clintons' first visit to their new home lasted no longer than 18 hours, but the first lady promised to try and put down roots here and to try and put an end to the grumblings about the hassles of having the first family next door.

In Chappaqua, New York, Molly Falconer, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: On Wednesday we told you about a report regarding President Clinton's plans for the future. The article in "The Washingtonian" magazine claimed the president was going to move to New York to join his friend Vernon Jordan at an investment firm called Lazard

Freres. The president now says he has no such plans.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

CLINTON: 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.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

HUME: Hillary Rodham Clinton isn't the only one moving to New York with political aspirations. As we told you Wednesday, former Massachusetts governor William Weld has established residency in New York and says one day he'd like to govern the state. But as FOX NEWS correspondent David Lee Miller tells us, Weld doesn't want anyone calling him a carpetbagger.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID LEE MILLER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Former Massachusetts governor William Weld is still unpacking. He arrived in the Big Apple from Cambridge this week to start his new job as a managing partner for a prominent international law firm. But Weld is already eyeing another position, governor of the state of New York.

WILLIAM WELD (R), FORMER MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR: I returned here for professional reasons, and the possibility of running for governor of New York, something political, which I like, but something new, which I like even more, is a serendipitous by-product of that business decision. Honest!

(LAUGHTER)

MILLER: Weld's move to Manhattan coincides with the arrival of Hillary Clinton, who came here specifically to run for office. But unlike the first lady, Weld was born and raised here.

WELD: Yeah, I am moving in the same day as Hillary Clinton, but the irony is that if I was ever a carpetbagger anywhere, it was in Massachusetts, when I ran for governor, because I'm from New York.

MILLER: Although now in a New York state of mind, in 1997 Weld was nominated by President Clinton to be ambassador to Mexico. The appointment was blocked by Senator Jesse Helms, who accused fellow Republican Weld of being too liberal. That may be a selling point with some New Yorkers, but others say Weld becoming governor of a second state is a real long shot.

ALFONSE D'AMATO (R-NY), FORMER NEW YORK SENATOR, FOX NEWS POLITICAL ANALYST: I think, obviously, it doesn't hurt his law practice to have him mentioned as a potential governor, so I think it's good business. I don't think realistically it's something that will take place.

MILLER: But Weld sounds cautiously optimistic about a possible run and admits he loves a challenge.

WELD: On the issues, on the politics, I think I can see my way clear to a good campaign.

MILLER (on camera): No matter what happens, William Weld won't be moving into the governor's mansion any time soon. He says he won't challenge the current Republican governor, George Pataki. Furthermore, residency requirements prevent him from running for the state's highest office until he has lived here for five years.

In New York, David Lee Miller, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: Up next: There's a new development in the battle over abortion. We'll have the details next.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: Billionaire developer Donald Trump, who's flirting with a presidential bid on the Reform Party ticket, plans an advertising blitz on all three major networks and cable in five-minute "fireside chats" on universal health care and national debt reduction. Trump says he will strike while the Republican and Democratic candidates are recovering from their nomination fights this spring and have spent a great deal of money just to win their party's nomination.

The number of abortions performed in the United States is at a nearly 20-year low. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have released statistics that show there were about 1.9 million abortions performed in 1997, and that's the lowest rate since 1978. This comes as the government decides whether to regulate a French abortion pill. And as FOX NEWS correspondent Jonathan Serrie reports, the outcome will change the abortion movement in America.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JONATHAN SERRIE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The French abortion pill, RU-486, or Mifepristone, is soon expected to get the approval of the Food and Drug Administration for sale in the United States. And when it does, the abortion debate may never be the same.

DR. SUZANNE POPPEMA, PHYSICIAN: I think that it's going to defuse the anti-abortion movement.

SERRIE: Seattle doctor Suzanne Poppema won't show her face on camera out of fear for her safety. She helped conduct clinical trials of Mifepristone, a drug she believes will make pregnancy termination more accessible and more discreet.

POPPEMA: It's frightening to go through a terrible group of screaming people to get your legal medical service. For those women, if they could go to their own physician, take a pill and have essentially a miscarriage in the privacy of their home, that's going to make a huge difference.

SERRIE: For the pro-life movement, RU-486 is a difficult pill to swallow. It's easy to protest a handful of clinic, but what do you do when regular family doctors start offering abortion-inducing medication?

OLIVIA GANS, NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE: The pro-life movement will do what it's always done. We will continue to work to pass the most protective legislation possible to protect mothers and their unborn children.

SERRIE: But pro-choice activists believe RU-486 will be an easier sell to voters on the fence because the drug is intended for use within the first seven weeks of pregnancy.

SUSAN ESTRICH, USC LAW PROFESSOR, FOX NEWS POLITICAL ANALYST: Anything that moves the timetable up is going to be easier for most Americans to support and to accept.

SERRIE (on camera): Abortion rights advocates believe the FDA decision will be their most significant political victory since Roe v. Wade. The pope calls RU-486 "the pill of Cain," but both sides agree the introduction of this drug will dramatically change the debate over abortion.

In Seattle, Jonathan Serrie, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: Don't go anywhere, folks. Our panel of journalists is coming up next.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BRIT HUME, HOST: And a little reporters' bull session here with Fred Barnes, executive editor of "The Weekly Standard," Jeff Birnbaum, Washington bureau chief for "Fortune" magazine, and from the White House, Mara Liasson, White House correspondent of National Public Radio, FOX NEWS contributors all.

All right, let's talk a bit about the Democrats, Bradley and Gore at it again on Wednesday night. Any clear winner?

JEFF BIRNBAUM, "FORTUNE" MAGAZINE: I don't think there was a clear winner. I think there was a clear change, though. I think Bradley took the gloves off and really got rid of the whole pretense of being above the fray and got right into it and started punching hard at Gore, being a real politician. And while Gore, on the other hand, seemed much less--much more possessed of himself. He got rid of--there was no more earth tones, and he--there was a lot less pandering. He wasn't trying too hard. He seemed almost presidential.

FRED BARNES, "THE WEEKLY STANDARD": Bradley won for a simple reason: Gore made a stupendous mistake.

HUME: Which was?

BARNES: And that is when he said that he would question anybody who--any of the six men or women who would be on the--on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the chairman and the vice chair, to ask them to make sure that they believed, along with him, that gays should be allowed in the military fully and freely.

Now, I know for one that General Colin Powell, who was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thinks that that is a mistake and believes--and of course, none of the current members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would qualify under this standard, which is really incredible for a president to come and say, "I'm going to impose my political view on you if you want to be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

MARA LIASSON, NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO: You know...

HUME: Go ahead, Mara.

BARNES: I think Gore--this would, of course, hurt Gore in the general election.

LIASSON: Yeah.

BARNES: I think it's going to hurt him in the primaries. This was a huge mistake on his part, and I think it's going to grow, and he'll recognize it and back away from it. He said explicitly that he would have a litmus test.

HUME: Right.

LIASSON: Well, I thought that was the moment of last night's debate. I was stunned when--when I listened to that. And as a matter of fact, my impression of his answer was that, first of all, he was not prepared for the question. I thought it was a very well-phrased question from Peter Jennings. And you could--as he gave the answer and went further and further, you could almost see him walking out further and further onto the ice, and it's cracking beneath him. And finally, he's in the water.

And of course, Bradley, who went second, had a much more diplomatic answer. "Well, I'll be the commander-in-chief, and of course they should carry out any of my orders."

But I think it also is--is symptomatic of a trend,

which is that both of these candidates are fighting for the left wing of the Democratic Party. You see it with the Kennedy endorsement of Gore. Bill Bradley held a pro-choice rally recently, where he questioned Al Gore's pro-choice credentials because as a congressman he had a few pro-life votes.

I think these are precisely the kinds of things that do come back to haunt a Democratic candidate in a general election.

BIRNBAUM: Yeah, I agree with that completely. And the other telling part in the same direction was when both candidates...

LIASSON: Right.

BIRNBAUM: ... did not run away from the liberal label, which was incredible! It hasn't happened since Dukakis, certainly, because Dukakis went down in flames by...

HUME: Yeah, but...

BIRNBAUM: ... having that big ``L" painted on his chest.

HUME: Right. But--and he tried to deny it.

BIRNBAUM: He tried to--he tried to deny it, yes.

HUME: He kept saying ``It's not--it's about--it's about--not about--it's about," what, efficiency, not ideology or something like that?

BIRNBAUM: He--yeah...

LIASSON: Competence. Competence.

(CROSSTALK)

HUME: All right, let's...

BARNES: You know, I think both Gore and Bradley misunderstand what they'd have to do in order to allow gays in the military. They'd have to get Congress to go along. The law would have to be changed.

HUME: Right.

BARNES: It can't be done by executive order.

LIASSON: Yeah, and don't forget there was a veto-proof majority.

BARNES: Right.

LIASSON: That's why that policy failed.

BARNES: Right. It's--I mean, this is a real hornet's nest for Bradley, but particularly for Gore. I mean, you know--I mean, to say that Colin Powell wouldn't qualify, Norman Schwarzkopf--nope, he couldn't be on the joint chiefs of staff because he wouldn't agree.

HUME: You wonder if anybody in the history of the Joint Chiefs would (inaudible)

BARNES: I don't think so. I mean...

BIRNBAUM: Well...

BARNES: Here's what Colin Powell thinks, and that is that either you're going to have to disband the Joint Chiefs of Staff because nobody will agree, or you're not going to get what you're supposed to get from your military advisers, and that is their honest opinion.

HUME: I got you. All right, let's move on to the Republicans. John spent another day trying to fend off this--this little mini-scandal. Maybe it's not so mini--about the--about Paxson Communications, which is a contributor, and was to hold a fund-raiser this coming--in the next few days, which has now been canceled. How serious a problem?

BIRNBAUM: I think for it is a serious problem

because it's a bump in the road that comes very near the end of the journey for him, which is, I think, the New Hampshire primary. At least, it's the top of the hill for him. He certainly does not need to be labeled a hypocrite when a central part of his campaign is campaign finance reform.

BARNES: Yeah, it is...

LIASSON: I mean, this is the problem for any reformer. I mean, if you live by the sword, you die by the sword. And he's going to be held to a much higher standard. Of course George W. Bush has done things to help the oil industry or the other people who've given him contributions, but he's not running on a campaign finance reform platform. And I think is being held to a different standard. Today he tried to say, "Look, this is why I'm running for campaign finance reform because every action"...

HUME: "Stop me from misbehaving"?

LIASSON: ... "one takes"...

(LAUGHTER)

BIRNBAUM: "Stop me before I do it again!"

LIASSON: But I think--but I don't think that this--this incident in and of itself is a scandal. I just think that because he's running on a reform platform, is being held to a higher standard, and he's going to have other things like this come up.

HUME: Now, Fred, he says that he didn't ask for any specific decision. He simply pressed the bureaucracy to make a decision.

BARNES: Well, look...

HUME: Is that enough?

BARNES: No, no, that's not enough, and everyone knows when you send in a letter like that--a senator sends one to a regulatory commission and says, "I want you to vote right away"--they know what he's saying. They know which way he wants them to vote. He doesn't have to be explicit about it. And, of all people, knows what a letter like that means. I think he was caught in...

HUME: Yeah, chairman of the Commerce Committee.

BARNES: ... a hypocrisy here that strikes right at his real strength--you know, his saying "I'm different. I'm not like all these other guys." That letter shows he is.

HUME: And does this also suggest--I mean, this story--this--this story came--it started on--on--on Wednesday in "The Boston Globe."

BIRNBAUM: That's right.

HUME: It was talked about all day that day. It landed on the front pages, major newspapers, today. We're still talking about it tonight because of the fund-raiser he had to cancel. Is this a sign that this whole media atmosphere for, this whole honeymoon is over?

BIRNBAUM: I think the honeymoon is over, but it's also true this is a good story from the perspective of journalists. This is really "Man bites dog."

HUME: Right. Right. Now, we got...

BARNES: Oh, it's over.

HUME: We got one little thing we want to deal with. The Buchanan campaign is in paroxysms...

BIRNBAUM: Yes.

HUME: ... that means spasms--of rage tonight over the 15 percent-in-the-polls threshold for a candidate to participate in

the national--in the Commission on Presidential Debates presidential debates, which are very important events. Have a case?

BARNES: No, I don't think they have a case at all.

Look, if Pat's a serious candidate who has even a remote chance of winning, he'll meet the 15 percent criterion. If he doesn't, if he's just a fringe candidate, which I think he is, for a fringe party, the Reform Party, shouldn't be in the debates. And besides, you know, the Republican and Democratic candidates--they don't have to do debates by those standards. They can go have any debate they want, and the networks will be there. FOX NEWS CHANNEL will be there.

HUME: FOX NEWS CHANNEL will be there, for sure.

BIRNBAUM: This is actually a tightening up of the rules, looking back to 1996, where they were incredibly amorphous back then. My favorite from back then was that you could qualify--one of the criterion were if you had "the professional opinions"...

LIASSON: Right.

BIRNBAUM: ... "of the Washington bureau chiefs of major newspapers, news magazines and broadcast networks." I wouldn't value the...

(CROSSTALK)

BIRNBAUM: I wouldn't value the judgments of those people at all.

LIASSON: Yeah, this is...

BIRNBAUM: Being one of them.

(CROSSTALK)

HUME: I happen to be married to the bureau chief of this organization...

BIRNBAUM: Oh, she's...

HUME: ... and I value that opinion highly!

(CROSSTALK)

BIRNBAUM: ... the other end, but--but...

LIASSON: Yeah. This is...

BIRNBAUM: But--but 15 percent is, in fact, a low threshold for what they're looking for, which is a real chance to--for someone to become president of the United States.

HUME: Well--well...

BIRNBAUM: It seems pretty reasonable to me.

HUME: Now, the--it is being said by people who participated in this that, look, that--what you said, that you ought to be able to meet...

BARNES: Sure. Of course.

HUME: ... the 15 percent standard. But the argument is being made in response that, look, this is where people make their decisions as to who they're going to favor...

LIASSON: Yeah, you know, this...

HUME: How can anybody be expected to...

BARNES: Well, I don't...

HUME: ... get there...

LIASSON: Well, you know...

HUME: ... if they can't participate in the big event?

LIASSON: Well, you know, today Frank Fahrenkopf and Paul Kirk were asked that question. They're the co-chairmen of the commission. They said, "Look, this isn't a winnowing event. This is at

the very end."

BARNES: Yeah.

LIASSON: In other words, people will have had a chance already...

HUME: In other words, if...

(CROSSTALK)

HUME: Actually, the first one is in early October. I guess if you're not...

LIASSON: But that...

HUME: ... at 15 percent by October...

LIASSON: That's pretty late in the...

HUME: ... you're dead!

LIASSON: That's pretty late in the game. You know, it's interesting because Jack Gargan, who's the leader of the Reform Party, today said, look, he doesn't think there should be any criteria other than access to enough ballots to get 270 electoral votes, which means that you'd have--you know, you could have five or six or seven...

(CROSSTALK)

HUME: It would make the Republican debate...

LIASSON: The fact is, the Reform Party...

HUME: ... look like an intimate...

LIASSON: That's right. But look, the Reform Party has tried to challenge these rules in the past. They've always failed. And I don't think that they have much recourse.

HUME: All right, Mara, last word there. Thanks very much, Mara, Fred, Jeff.

That's all the time we have for the panel, but stay tuned for a look at a diplomatic translation.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: Finally, diplomats like to speak very carefully using fancy words like ``bilateral" to refer to two-way meetings and ``modality" to refer to the form of things. The idea, I suppose, is to make sure they're not misunderstood, but sometimes those fancy words can cause a problem, as they did for State Department spokesman Jamie Rubin, who used a big word with more than one meaning. Listen.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

REPORTER: The other statement was yesterday, and I had a problem in translating it into Arabic, so please help me if I...

JAMES RUBIN, STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN: My Arabic is very poor.

REPORTER: In talking about peaceful--normal peaceful relations, you elaborated by saying it would involve some kind of intercourse.

RUBIN: Right.

REPORTER: What did you mean by that?

(LAUGHTER)

RUBIN: Let me say ``interaction," and ``intercourse" are in diplomatic terms synonyms.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

HUME: And that's SPECIAL REPORT for this time. Please come again next time, and in the meantime, stay tuned for news.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 18:45:08.00

SUBJECT: ABC This Week, January 9, 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:
ABC THIS WEEK
JANUARY 9, 2000

SPEAKERS: SAM DONALDSON, HOST, ABC THIS WEEK
COKIE ROBERTS, HOST, ABC THIS WEEK
GEORGE WILL, WASHINGTON POST
BOB DOLE, FORMER REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE
ELIZABETH DOLE, FORMER REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL
CANDIDATE
GENERAL MERRIL MCPEAK (RET.), CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR
FORCE
COLONEL MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER (RET.), ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD RESERVES
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE DAN BURTON (R-IN), CHAIRMAN,
GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE
JEFFREY POLLOCK, DEMOCRATIC POLLSTER

DONALDSON: Welcome to our program.

There's a standoff this Sunday morning in the case of 6-year-old Elian Gonzalez. As you know, the U.S. Immigration Service has ordered that he be returned to his father in Cuba. But on Friday, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight issued a subpoena for the youngster to testify, apparently blocking his immediate return.

The committee chairman, Dan Burton, is with us today.

Welcome, Mr. Chairman.

BURTON: Sam.

DONALDSON: Well, during Friday, most of the day, we thought you weren't going to issue the subpoena. Later in the day, you did. Why did you?

BURTON: Well, we were waiting to see what the court was going to do in Florida. And they decided not to take any action of Friday. And we were concerned that the Immigration and Naturalization people would send the boy back over the weekend. So we thought the best way to make sure that the judicial process was followed was to issue a subpoena to keep everything on an even keel.

DONALDSON: Well, we want to ask you about the ramifications of this move. But before we do, I must tell you what you know, and that is, your action has inflamed Castro and Cuba even more than they were inflamed.

And for the latest, let's go to Miami and Mike Von Frem (ph).

Mike, what have you got?

MIKE VON FREM (ph), ABC NEWS CORRESPONDENT IN MIAMI: Good morning, Sam.

Well, the Cuban people thought that they would be celebrating the 6-year-old boy's return this morning, but instead, tens of thousands flooded into the streets this weekend to support a very angry father who demands his son back.

Now the distraught father has stood in front of cheering crowds to talk about the pain of being separated from his son. The enormous demonstrations last hours and are played over and over again on Cuban TV, where officials continually blame what they call the "powerful U.S.-Cuban mafia" in Miami for holding the boy hostage.

The father of the boy and Cuban officials have praised the U.S. Immigration Service for initially deciding that the boy should be returned. But the father invited myself and other reporters into his home where he blasted Dan Burton and blamed him for the delay, telling the congressman, quote, "Who is he? He's no one. What right does that man have? I am the boy's father."

Now, in watching all the demonstrations, it is striking to see Elian's classmates and other young children stand up to talk about the evil thing the U.S. is doing. Fidel Castro is clearly relishing the fact that the passions of the next generation have now been stirred against the U.S.

Cokie.

ROBERTS: Thank, Mike. Mike Von Frem (ph) in Havana.

Well, Congressman Burton, you've heard that. The father says, "Who are you? He is the father."

BURTON: Well, first all, Cokie, in Cuba they have a block captain system, and anyone who doesn't do the bidding of Fidel Castro or who complains about the government is in jeopardy of going to prison and for a long period of time.

I don't know that the father's under any kind of pressure like that. But we tried to get visas not only for the father but for his entire new family so they could all come to the United States so he wouldn't be under any pressure whatsoever when he talked about what was best for his son. That's the first step.

ROBERTS: And were the visas not granted?

BURTON: There was a visa granted for his--for the father, but not, to my knowledge, for the rest of the family. And we wanted them to come so there would be no pressure from the Castro regime.

The second thing is that this boy's mother risked her life to bring that boy to freedom--she gave her life to bring that boy to freedom. And so we believe, in a court of law, all of these factors should be heard and there should be a decision made by the court on what is best for the boy.

ROBERTS: Then let me ask you just a couple of quick procedural questions. If the INS says he should be back January 14th, are you going to stop him?

BURTON: Well, the INS is a bureaucracy here in Washington that goes by a hard and fast set of rules. This is a very unique case. I believe this case should be decided like any other custody case for a child. It should be decided in a court of law. And one of the reasons...

ROBERTS: But can we stop that from happening?

BURTON: Well, our subpoena, I hope, will be recognized by the INS and everybody to grant some time to the lawyers on both sides to make their case to a court. Hopefully that'll be done this week.

If the court decides the boy should go back, then we should live with that. If the court decides the boy should stay here, it's best for him to be in America--as his mother wished--then we should live with that.

DONALDSON: Mr. Burton, did you or your staff research the legalities of the subpoena? There are some lawyers who say that it doesn't have the force of any law.

BURTON: Well, the subpoena does have the force of bringing somebody before the committee. Now whether or not the INS will say that that does not supersede their authority as a branch--part of the executive branch--to send that young man back, that's something that we're not sure of. We don't know.

But I can tell you this: If the INS sends that boy back without due process of law, without a court making a finding based upon all the facts presented to them, then I will have the INS before our committee and they can explain to me and to the American people why they felt it was imperative to send him back before there was a judicial proceeding to make a clear decision on this boy's future.

DONALDSON: The boy's father has apparently told some reporters that he fears that you would subpoena him if he comes to the United States. Would you do that?

BURTON: No. The only reason a subpoena was issued was to make sure that there was plenty of time for the legal process to go forward. We just wanted to make sure that people didn't go off half cocked and send this boy back. Because once he's back in Cuba in a totalitarian communist country, he's never coming back. And so we wanted to make sure that due process of law was followed, as in any other case, and that's why I issued the subpoena.

ROBERTS: Congressman Burton, we saw the political hay that

Fidel Castro is making off this case. Is there also some hay that Republicans are making? We're seeing Republican members of Congress go give the little boy a puppy, give him toys. Senator Smith was there yesterday holding a press conference. Mayor Giuliani apparently, according to "Time" magazine, was going to have him drop the ball on New Year's Eve in Times Square. Is this becoming a Republican political heyday?

BURTON: I can't comment on anybody else. All I can comment is on the actions that I and my committee took. And I took those actions solely for one reason, and that is to make absolutely sure that the judicial process goes forward and there's a fair and open hearing on what's best for that young man. I have no political motivations whatsoever in doing what I did.

DONALDSON: Did you consult your Democratic counterpart, the ranking member?

BURTON: I did not, because time was of the essence. Once the court decided not to act on Friday, the Immigration and Naturalization Service could have taken this boy Saturday or Sunday and sent him back to Cuba. And what we wanted to do immediately was to make sure that that would not happen.

ROBERTS: We're out of time, Chairman Burton, but a quick question on another subject. Do Republicans plan to put riders on armed services bills this year saying no money can be spent to have gays openly serve in the military?

BURTON: I don't have an answer that. I don't think that will happen, but I don't have an answer right now, Cokie, I'm sorry.

ROBERTS: OK. Thanks so much for being here. We appreciate your being here.

BURTON: Thank you. Thank you, Sam.

ROBERTS: When we come back, our interview with Elizabeth and Bob Dole and this week's controversy over gays in the military.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

DONALDSON: Joining us now are Elizabeth Dole and Bob Dole. Senator, Mrs. Dole, welcome very much.

E. DOLE: Thank you. Nice to be with you.

DONALDSON: Well, it's delighted...

(LAUGHTER)

Some people say that you've endorsed George W. Bush because you'd like to be on his ticket.

E. DOLE: Oh, Sam please.

DONALDSON: But you're here to speak for yourself, you tell us why you endorsed him.

E. DOLE: George Bush is a man of accomplishment. He has executive experience, not only in business, but as the governor of the second largest state in our country. A record of achievement there. Also, he brings people together from both sides of the aisle.

You know, Pete Lane (ph), the speaker of the house, has worked very effectively with him in Texas. The late Maude Bullock (ph), who was lieutenant governor, a Democrat. And I think that he tries to bridge differences rather than to exploit them. And I think, too, that those who know him best admire him most. For example, the Republican governors who've worked closely with him and know about his outstanding record, and that says a lot for a person. He'll be a great leader.

DONALDSON: Well, Mrs. Dole, I have to tell you, I know someone

who ran for the presidency who had no executive experience. Senator Dole, tell us. Do you agree? Are you for George W. Bush, hook, line and sinker?

B. DOLE: I haven't endorsed a candidate.

DONALDSON: But our program is open to people to make announcements.

B. DOLE: That's correct. I'd forgotten that; I hadn't been here for awhile. But, you know, my view is we have some good candidates in the race. I think Bush will be the nominee. I think he's gaining in New Hampshire, and of course, I hope he beats Forbes badly in Iowa. Forbes is not my favorite candidate.

DONALDSON: Well, if you think he'll be the nominee, forgive me, why not endorse him?

B. DOLE: (inaudible) probably doesn't make any difference what I do. I don't want to hurt anybody's prospects. I mean, John McCain's a friend of mine, too, as you noted earlier. But my idea is we have good candidates in the race. I do think Bush will be the nominee.

ROBERTS: Mrs. Dole, you say that--you laughed when Sam said, people said you were doing this to get the number two spot on the ticket. Would you accept the vice presidential nomination?

E. DOLE: Cokie, it's just so premature at this point to even speculate on that. They don't have a nominee yet, but when George Bush becomes the nominee, the Republican Party has a wealth of really talented, outstanding (inaudible).

B. DOLE: But I would accept it if it's offered to me.

(LAUGHTER)

ROBERTS: But they're rumblings in the Bush camp that a vice presidential candidate needs to bring a big state. All those pointing to Lyndon Johnson for Jack Kennedy; the last time we know a vice presidential candidate helped deliver. Is that--do you agree with that?

E. DOLE: Well, I think it depends on what the situation is many months from now. There are many things that go into the consideration of who the vice presidential candidate ought to be and we're a long way from that now. So, I think clearly it is too early to speculate and that may well be one of the factors at that time.

ROBERTS: And the other thing you hear is that Republican female candidates, for instance, Governor Whitman in New Jersey, has never carried the woman's vote. Is that--do you think that being on the ticket would bring the woman's vote? You saw all of those women show up at your events.

E. DOLE: Yes, I was delighted to see women of all ages show up at my events, as well as young people and many who had become kind of disenchanted with politics.

But let me say that George Bush is doing very well with women. Two-thirds of the women of Texas elected him--his reelection campaign. Voted for him. And certainly right now the polls indicate that he's doing very well.

And let me just say one other thing, Sam, and that is that I was pleased that both George Bush and I, in all the polls that I saw throughout 1999, were beating the vice president of the United States, Al Gore, and we were ahead of him with respect to women.

Now, I'd like to make a prediction here.

DONALDSON: Please.

E. DOLE: You know, in the 2000 election, 53 percent of the electorate will be female. The real--I think the most important swing

voters will be middle-class mothers, older women, so I'm going to predict that the traditional gender gap is going to be turned inside out. Al Gore is going to have the gender gap and George Bush will be carried to the White House on the votes of women.

DONALDSON: Let's talk about the facts here.

(LAUGHTER)

ROBERTS: Well, that would be very different from your situation.

B. DOLE: Right, we had a good time.

DONALDSON: Forgive me for chomping at the bit, it's only because I want to explore the business about women. Senator Dole, you want to pay close attention to this. I want to read a portion of the Republican platform of 1996 and here it is.

On the subject of abortion: ``The unborn child has a fundamental individual right to life which cannot be infringed. We support a human life amendment to the Constitution, and we endorse legislation to make clear that the 14th Amendments protections apply to unborn children."

Now Senator, among political reporters who covered you it's no secret that you might have wanted a little different plank. Do you think the Republicans, in the year 2000, should have in their platform a plank which says we want a Constitutional amendment which in effect would ban abortions?

B. DOLE: I think if they're going to add that plank, it ought to provide exceptions for rape, incest or the life of the mother, which the human life amendment does not. But I also believe, as I believed in '96, that, you know, we're a diverse party, we have different views, and you can be pro-choice or pro-life and still be a good, active, solid Republican.

DONALDSON: But so-called pro-choice--Mrs. Dole, what do you think? You know what the polls say about this in this country.

E. DOLE: First of all, I believe that the nominee of the party traditionally takes the leadership in determining what the platform is going to say, and George Bush will have much to say on the subject, I'm sure. What I've tried to do is to keep this from becoming such a divisive issue, and frankly, Sam, often...

DONALDSON: But, isn't it (inaudible) of those words?

E. DOLE: ... often, it's the press, the media, who seem to enjoy getting Republicans fighting each other over this, and frankly I think that good and honorable people can disagree.

DONALDSON: But do you think...

E. DOLE: And that we should agree to respectfully disagree and let's move onto other subjects, because I don't think this is the number one subject--it's not the number one subject for women in this country. Women care about education, they care about tax cuts, they care about retirement security, they care about health care, a lot of other issues.

DONALDSON: Doesn't Strom Thurman hold the record for filibuster, Senator?

(LAUGHTER)

E. DOLE: I've always like to talk.

DONALDSON: We're happy to hear you, but I do need to ask you--give you a chance to answer my question directly, if you will. And that is, do you think a human rights amendment to ban abortion should be in the platform in the year 2000?

E. DOLE: Well, again, I'm not the one who's going to be determining the leadership for the platform. Now, I would support a human rights amendment, but it is not going to happen in this country. There's not been a vote in 15 years in the Congress.

DONALDSON: Well, if it's not going to happen, why put it in the platform?

E. DOLE: It's--at this point in time, it's not going to materialize because there are not the votes, there's not the support in the country for it.

ROBERTS: Senator, who said let's move to tax cuts. I want to show you an ad that Steve Forbes is now running in New Hampshire. Could we see the ad please?

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, FORBES AD)

(UNKNOWN): There's something you need to know about George W. Bush. In 1994, he signed a pledge with my organization that he would not support sales tax or business tax increases. In 1997, unfortunately, he broke this pledge.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

ROBERTS: Now, you've seen ads like that before.

B. DOLE: I've seen ads like that before. I think I raised taxes 16 times in the Forbes ad.

ROBERTS: What affect can this have on the Republican nomination?

B. DOLE: I think it can certainly damage the nominees, as I found out in 1996, because you can take--let's say it happened in Texas, a big tax bill and a couple of increases and all the rest are reductions. You can say, you know, fairly honestly, Well, he'd raise taxes, but it's a distortion of what really happened. And I would hope that Steve Forbes understands the damage he did in '96 and will not repeat it in an effort to harm either Governor Bush or Senator McCain or anyone else.

ROBERTS: Do you think it was wise for George W. Bush to take a tax pledge in New Hampshire? You've been there, too.

B. DOLE: Well, I didn't take the tax pledge in New Hampshire because it occurred to me that there could be some emergency where you wouldn't have that choice, but again ...

ROBERTS: And you lost.

B. DOLE: That's right. I'm not sure I lost because of that, but I did lose. But I think he responded to the question that he would have a tax cut which I think's important and I certainly support.

ROBERTS: Now, the other big issue that we've seen in the Republican camp this week is John McCain and the question of letters to the FCC on behalf--or trying to get them to act. Where those letters inappropriate?

B. DOLE: I would guess if you searched the files of the 100 Senators, they've all had letters like that.

ROBERTS: But you said that you put your letters like that in the Congressional record.

B. DOLE: In some cases where it was very--when I thought it would be very sensitive, I put a copy of the letter in the Congressional Record, which I think is a pretty good idea. Of course, you'd have a big record every day because there are a lot of letters written. But on the other hand, if we're elected to Congress, we have an obligation to represent our constituents and if we can't write the bureaucracy--and McCain didn't say how they should rule. He said, Please rule on this

issue.

DONALDSON: Senator, in the Paxson Communications case, he wrote a letter which said he wanted this on the agenda in the December meeting and he said, "I want an answer from each you," meaning each commissioner, "if you don't put it in the agenda." Isn't that coming right up to the point of bullying?

B. DOLE: Well, I don't know. I don't know the circumstances of that case.

DONALDSON: Would you write that letter?

B. DOLE: I didn't write that letter, but would I write a letter like that? I don't know, I'd have to go back and search the files, but there are letters written by most every senator representing constituents. I think John McCain is a man of integrity and honesty, and I take his word for it. He's released every letter he's ever written, so I think that's pretty good.

DONALDSON: You've been a Cabinet officer, did you get letters like this from people from Capitol Hill, and if so, how did you respond to them?

E. DOLE: I think that what happened here is not inappropriate. Certainly it was a matter of just--make a decision, up or down, one way or the other, just get it done. And in this particular case, it had been sitting there for a very, very long period of time. And I think even asking the different members if you're not going to put it on the agenda--again, it's just trying to get them to move.

DONALDSON: There's also that appearance--that's the problem.

E. DOLE: Whatever you decide, just do it. Just make a decision, whatever the decision is.

DONALDSON: But that's the point that your husband brought up, the appearance.

E. DOLE: Well, I think that he put out all these letters, as Bob says, all 100 senators have done it. I mean, it's not inappropriate to ask for your constituents that a decision be made. Up, down, whatever it is.

B. DOLE: Well, it just seems to me that's the one question you raise with all of us who've been in politics. Well, you may have written the letter, you may not have asked for a decision but if somebody gave you money afterwards or before, there is the appearance. And I don't know how we're going to avoid that. It's been there forever, so....

ROBERTS: So, of course he would say campaign finance reform and that's a subject for another day because we're out of time now, but thank you both so much for being here.

B. DOLE: Thank you very much.

E. DOLE: Thank you.

ROBERTS: Senator Dole and Mrs. Dole.

B. DOLE: Happy new year.

E. DOLE: My pleasure. Thanks.

ROBERTS: Coming next, this week's controversy over the future of don't ask-don't tell, and later, George Stephanopoulos with a focus group of New Hampshire's all-important independent voters.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

ROBERTS: The issue of gays in the military was back on the front burner this week. Bill Clinton ran into tough political problems with the issue, and how his vice president has as well. And at the end of

the week, Al Gore was trying to do damage control.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

ROBERTS (voice-over): It started Wednesday night in a debate in New Hampshire, after both Democratic candidates said they supported gays serving openly in the military.

PETER JENNINGS, ABC NEWS: 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?

VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I would insist, before appointing anybody to the joint chiefs of staff, that that individual support my policy. And, yes, I would make that a requirement.

ROBERTS (voice over): The next night, the Republicans were quick to disagree, with most of them supporting the current policy which allows gays and lesbians in the armed forces, as long as they don't reveal their sexual orientation.

GOVERNOR GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I'm a ``don't ask, don't tell" man.

ROBERTS (voice over): By Friday, Gore was backtracking on his earlier statement.

GORE: I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinion of officers in the U.S. military.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ROBERTS: Joining us from Portland is retired General Tony McPeak, former chief of staff of the Air Force, and an outspoken opponent of attempts to liberalize the current ``don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Thanks for being with us, General McPeak.

MCPEAK: Good morning, Cokie.

ROBERTS: And from Seattle, retired Colonel Margarethe Cammermeyer, who, in the days before that policy was discharged from the Army National Guard for admitting to investigators that she was a lesbian. She later won reinstatement in federal court.

Nice to have you with us, Colonel Cammermeyer.

CAMMERMEYER: Nice to see you again.

ROBERTS: And also with us for the questioning is George Will. Sam, you wanted to start here.

DONALDSON: Well, I think there are two questions here. Let's take the first one first, and that is, General McPeak, why do you oppose allowing gays and lesbians to be open about their sexual preference and still be members of the military services?

MCPEAK: Well, Sam, I distrust simple answers to a complicated question like that, but if I had to sum it up in one line it would be my concern about the military efficiency of our front-line combat units. That's my concern today and it was the concern of all the chiefs in '93 when Clinton brought this issue up the first time.

DONALDSON: Well, General, what it is about it being gay and lesbian that wouldn't allow you to be efficient in the front lines?

MCPEAK: Well, being gay and lesbian is not the issue. It's open homosexuality in the ranks. We have homosexuals in the armed forces--have, going back to the Revolutionary War. They've served honorably and well.

The issue is not: Can homosexuals serve? They can and do. The issue is, in our front-line, hard combat units, the tooth part of the military--you saw the film, ``Saving Private Ryan." The rangers that have to go up that cliff, would their military efficiency be improved if we

allowed declared, open homosexuality in those units? The chiefs were concerned that it would not, that it would seriously degrade their readiness, and that's why we instead ``don't tell" be part of the compromise.

DONALDSON: Colonel Cammermeyer, if you had to go up that cliff...

CAMMERMEYER: I don't know how--yes, I don't how my sexual orientation is going to make me more efficient climbing the cliff or being in a foxhole. I think that the notion that your sexual orientation has anything to do with either military readiness or your ability to do your job is rather ludicrous.

I still have a hard time--you know, this is eight years ago that we had this discussion before. I don't quite understand the rationale, because how is it that my sexual orientation has anything to do with anyone else?

ROBERTS: George.

WILL: General, let me read the relevant portion of the law that Sam was really talking about. It says, ``The presence in the armed forces of persons who demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards, morale and good order and discipline....," et cetera.

Are we not talking there about acts itself, and therefore the ``don't ask, don't tell" is perfectly satisfactory?

MCPEAK: Well, I regard it as perfectly satisfactory. But you have to remember that we insisted, when the Congress put this in the law, that declaring homosexuality--in other words, openly parading it in the units--was a kind of act and a dismissible offense. In fact, that's what happened. The rate of discharge for homosexuality has gone up since ``don't ask, don't tell" came in because the law is working. People who declare their homosexuality and try to be open about it have to leave. That's what the law says and it's working as intended.

WILL: But, General, ``don't ask, don't tell" was itself a compromise, a move to the left, if you will, from the prior policy. Why is it that no one really seems to be pushing to go back to the policy prior to ``don't ask, don't tell"?

MCPEAK: Well, I think the chiefs were quite content not to ask the question. It is true that people--as Colonel Cammermeyer has asserted--people with a homosexual orientation is not the problem, as long as they're circumspect about it. We know how to deal with this. I mean, we have a certain amount of sophistication, even as hard-line military guys.

So it's the openness of it. It's appearing on the Phil Donahue show, or Oprah Winfrey show, carrying a sandwich board around--that's what's divisive inside a unit where you have to have cohesion.

And let me make a point here. It's not so bad in the motor pool. It's a non-issue in the commissary. In the (inaudible) corps of the Washington State National Guard, whether they have unit cohesion--probably a good idea if they did have, but if they don't, it's not--doesn't have mortal consequences to the republic.

It's in the fighter squadrons, it's in the nuclear submarines, it's in the rangers and special forces and the airborne. That's where we have to have unit cohesion.

CAMMERMEYER: But that's not what this law is about. The law is about, you know, even the words of ``coming out"--you know, if I asked the general, you know, ``Did you have a nice time over the Christmas

holidays?" And he said, "Well, you know, I spent it with my wife and my grandchildren," and he said--you know, he might to say to me, you now, "How did you have--did you enjoy your Christmas?" And I would have to be mute. I would have to say, "Well, you know, I'm not allowed to talk about having a family."

And so, you know, what they're confusing is, is acts and words. It's not like people are going to be changing uniforms and going around with triangles on. This is really an absurd policy that really affects women much more so than men.

You know, if a woman rebuffs a man's advances, all of a sudden she's lesbian and becomes part of a witch hunt. And so that this is really--it makes no sense. What is it that you fear?

WILL: Colonel, the supposed proof that "don't ask, don't tell" is failing is that there has been there have been--it has set a large increase in the number of people discharged. Let me give you some numbers and ask you to comment on them.

The number of people discharged for homosexual acts is actually down since 1994. Eighty percent of all discharges are for voluntary statements most made early in first-term enlistments, and most result in honorable or non-classified--non-declared discharges.

It looks to some people as though this is just an easy way of getting out of the military.

CAMMERMEYER: And if you listen to what people are saying from the Department of Defense, in, sort of, defense of policy and the increase in discharges, they're saying heterosexuals are using this policy as a way of getting out.

When I joined the military in 1961, women couldn't have dependents and be in the military. And so part of the notion was, Well, gee, I'll go get a free education and then just get pregnant and be discharged from the military.

I mean, it seems to me like the easiest way is just leave the laws as they exist elsewhere, get rid of this policy, and then have people judged on their ability to do their job rather than non--you know, red herrings, if you will.

DONALDSON: General McPeak, we're out of town, but one question to you on the litmus test issue. Al Gore has backed off of that now, but he has said that he does want people that he nominates to agree with him on this policy, which he wants changed. Is there anything wrong with that? Presidents appoint people to the Supreme Court on the idea that they will agree with him, although they often run off and not.

MCPEAK: Well, the president has the right to chose whoever he wants and I--and, by the way, senior officers will obey orders. But the Constitution gives the Congress the authority to regulate the armed forces. And this is not just a policy, it's a law, passed by an overwhelming--veto-proof majority in both houses.

So I expect that no president--Al Gore or any other candidate for president--will ask any senior officer if he agrees to violate the law.

ROBERTS: Thank you, General McPeak. Thank you, Colonel Cammermeyer.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 18:45:12.00

SUBJECT: NBC Meet the Press, January 9, 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:

NBC MEET THE PRESS
JANUARY 9, 2000

SPEAKERS: TIM RUSSERT, HOST, NBC MEET THE PRESS
U.S. SENATOR JUDD GREGG (R-NH)
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE LINDSEY GRAHAM (R-SC)
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JERROLD NADLER (D-NY)
BOB SHRUM, GORE CAMPAIGN SENIOR ADVISER
GENERAL JOHN VESSEY (RET.), FORMER CHAIRMAN, JOINT
CHIEFS OF STAFF
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE BARNEY FRANK (D-MA), JUDICIARY
COMMITTEE

RUSSERT: First the Democrats. We're joined by Bob Shrum,
representing Al Gore, Jerry Nadler, representing Bill Bradley. Welcome
both.

SHRUM: Nice to be here.

NADLER: Good morning.

RUSSERT: Mr. Shrum, let me start with you. In the debate the other night in New Hampshire, the vice president talked about gays in the military, and a litmus test for appointing members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "The New York Times" had this headline yesterday, which we'll put on the screen, "Gore Reversal Shuns Litmus Test Over Gay Troops, Disavows Debate Stance."

Let me show you and our viewers exactly what the vice president had to say on Wednesday and then on Friday.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I would insist, before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy. And yes, I would make that a requirement.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GORE: That is not what I meant to convey.

I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinion of officers in the U.S. military.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Why the flip-flop?

SHRUM: Well, it's no flip-flop, and it's the same statement.

What he said both times was that he would insist that people appointed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree to support his policy as president. He never said in the New Hampshire debate that he would inquire into their personal convictions.

His litmus test is the constitutional one, civilian control of the military.

RUSSERT: But he would want to know their views before he appointed them.

SHRUM: No, he would want to know--if you read the New Hampshire transcript, Tim, which I know you have, because you were there, if you read the transcript, he says, "I would insist that they support the policy." That would be the requirement.

RUSSERT: "The New York Times," "The Washington Post," every major paper. Are the Gore advisers saying, Our candidate stumbled?

SHRUM: Well, I don't know what Gore adviser said that. It certainly wasn't me. And the fact of the matter is that his position in both places is exactly the same. I defy you to find a place in that transcript in the New Hampshire debate where he ever said he would inquire into someone's personal position.

The litmus test is the constitutional test, civilian control of the military.

RUSSERT: Congressman Nadler?

NADLER: Well, I don't know why you feel it imperative to call black white. You just saw him say he would inquire in advance. He made a major mistake. He admitted it. He retreated. He changed his position. I don't know why that's terrible in American politics, to make a mistake, admit you made a mistake...

SHRUM: Jerry, what did he say?

NADLER: ... and change your position.

SHRUM: What did he say?

NADLER: He said, (inaudible)

SHRUM: Can you repeat anything from the transcript?

NADLER: I can repeat it from what I saw on television.

SHRUM: No, what--what--what--what--what did he say?

NADLER: I don't need a transcript. What he said--what he said was...

RUSSERT: Well, (inaudible), clarify it. "I would insist before appointing anybody..."

NADLER: That's the point.

SHRUM: Keep reading.

RUSSERT: "... to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the individual support my policy. And yes..."

SHRUM: Right there.

RUSSERT: "... I would make that a requirement."

SHRUM: (inaudible)

NADLER: "That the individual support my policy" before he is appointed. This--that is a litmus test that he--How do you feel about this issue, and my...

SHRUM: I believe...

NADLER: ... let me finish--and this policy? That was a mistake. The vice president admitted it. He changed his position to match Senator Bradley's position, which is basically that we expect military officers to follow orders. I don't see what's so terrible about saying he made a mistake and he admitted it and he changed his position.

SHRUM: Well, because he didn't say what you're saying he said. He said what Tim just read.

NADLER: I saw it on television.

SHRUM: "I would insist that he support my policy." Every president insists that the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff support their policy. That's why Harry Truman had to fire Douglas MacArthur in Korea, for heaven's sake.

NADLER: But that's not what he said.

RUSSERT: Congressman...

SHRUM: That is what he said. I defy you, I'll bet you \$10, find him saying that he's going to examine their personal convictions.

RUSSERT: Congressman...

SHRUM: Jerry, you just want to make a point for Bradley instead of talking about the substance.

RUSSERT: Let's put it all on the table. Congressman Nadler, why would Bill Bradley be a better Democratic nominee than Al Gore?

NADLER: He'd be a better Democratic nominee for essentially two reasons. Number one, he doesn't have the baggage that the vice president carries, perhaps unfairly, but realistically. And that's why every poll shows he does better by 10 points among independents, among key ticket-splitting voters. He's the stronger candidate.

SHRUM: What's the baggage? What are you talking about, baggage?

NADLER: The baggage, all the scandals, many of which were unfair. But the fact is, there's a lot of baggage from the eight years or seven years he's been as vice president.

The second reason he'd be a better president, I think, a better Democratic candidate and a better president, is that he is articulating a broader vision of where to take this country in terms of universal health care. And I note that Al Gore seems--is trying to say that he's supporting universal health care, but he's not. His plan doesn't get there, and there's no date by when it would get there.

And he's lying about Bradley's plan. But Bradley has a plan for

universal health care, essentially the same plan that George Bush proposed, which most Democrats thought was too cheap and too minimal. And now Gore is saying it's too expensive.

And I don't understand why, when Bill Clinton's plan, which was much more expensive and more elaborate, when we had \$290 billion deficits in 1993, that wasn't too expensive, but now that we're rolling in money, the vice president says that Bradley's very reasonable plan, essentially the same as the Bush plan, which he said was too cheap at the time, is now too expensive.

I think that perhaps because he's been fighting with the Republicans in Congress so much, I'm afraid that the vice president is beginning to forget about some key--core Democratic goals, like universal access to health care for everyone. It's immoral that 44 million people don't have access to health care. Bradley would give it to them, Gore would not.

RUSSET: Bob Shrum?

SHRUM: Listen, Ted Kennedy has endorsed Al Gore, and I think people take his views on who's for universal health care a lot more seriously than they take yours. The fact of the matter is that right now after your old boss, Pat Moynihan, endorsed Senator Bradley, and said he was endorsing him because he would run better against George Bush, the new "Newsweek" poll shows Bradley running 16 points behind Bush and doing worse poll after poll.

Shows Al Gore running 7 points behind Bush and doing better, poll after poll. And Jerry, I don't understand...

NADLER: (inaudible)

SHRUM: Wait a minute, Jerry, I didn't interrupt you. I don't understand how you can support a health care plan that puts no money aside for Medicare, number one, and number two, that would take 70,000 people who are on Medicaid in your congressional district, hand them a little \$150 voucher, tell them they're not going to get their Medicaid any more, and send them off...

NADLER: (inaudible)

SHRUM: ... to try to negotiate--for example, for the postal workers' plan, which doesn't cover vision care, doesn't cover eye care, and would actually require them to pay \$4,000 extra in co-pays for their care.

NADLER: Well...

SHRUM: What are you going to say to the people in your district about that?

NADLER: I'll say the following. First of all, the polls you cite are of--are--don't look at people who know who Bill Bradley is yet. It's a name recognition game. The vice president is known to everybody, Bradley isn't yet. When you poll people who know both candidates, Bradley does a heck--which they will be November, obviously--Bradley does a heck of a lot better than Gore against the Republicans.

Secondly...

SHRUM: Why did Bradley (inaudible)--why did Bradley...

NADLER: Excuse me, excuse me. You said you didn't...

SHRUM: (inaudible) do better than Gore?

NADLER: ... I didn't--(inaudible)

SHRUM: But why did Bradley used to do better than Gore?

NADLER: Secondly--secondly--He didn't used to do better than Gore.

SHRUM: He did used to do better than Gore against Bush.

NADLER: Secondly--Excuse me. Secondly--He's still doing better against Gore than...

SHRUM: No, he's not.

NADLER: (inaudible) against Bush among people who know who they are.

SHRUM: He's not.

NADLER: Second point, with respect to what you said about Medicaid, there you go again, lying about Bradley's proposal.

SHRUM: (inaudible)

NADLER: Lying, lying knowingly, and that's what's getting me really angry about this.

SHRUM: How about giving the facts?

NADLER: Bradley's--Excuse me. I'll give you the facts.

SHRUM: What is the facts?

NADLER: I'll give you the facts. Bradley's so-called \$150 a person payment...

SHRUM: Voucher.

NADLER: ... which--It is not a voucher. It's an average amount that would be made available for single people...

SHRUM: Right.

NADLER: ... single people, except for pregnant women and those with AIDS, et cetera, who are covered completely separately under Bradley's plan, do not get Medicaid at all. So they get zero now. Under the vice president's plan, they would continue to get zero.

SHRUM: There's only...

NADLER: Under Bradley's plan, under Bradley's plan, they would have access to the same health insurance that members of Congress get, which is a pretty good plan. I'm on it myself. And the fact of the matter is...

SHRUM: What does yours cost per month?

NADLER: (inaudible)--they were...

SHRUM: Do you know what yours cost?

NADLER: (inaudible)

SHRUM: Do you have any idea what your premium is?

NADLER: It's about \$140.

SHRUM: I don't believe that, there's not a (inaudible)

NADLER: Well, the fact is...

SHRUM: ... in fact, there's only two plans available...

NADLER: ... because (inaudible)

SHRUM: ... in New York State for \$140 (inaudible)

NADLER: Well, then, maybe I have (inaudible)

SHRUM: ... less than \$150.

NADLER: Excuse me a minute. And that's an--if a New York--First of all, the \$150--But again, you're missing the point. Right now, those people, single people, have nothing. And under Gore's plan, if they're between 18 and 55, they will still have nothing. And you're saying what Bradley is giving them is inadequate. Compare that to zero.

NADLER: Now, the family figure, the family figure for people who are now on Medicaid--because you have to have a family to be on Medicaid--the average family figure in the Bradley plan is \$5,000, not \$150...

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: ... there are only two of the 24 plans...

NADLER: ... dollars a month, a year.

SHRUM: ... in New York that you could buy for that amount of money.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: You're throwing the people in your district off Medicaid and sending them out...

NADLER: Even assuming it's...

SHRUM: ... to the private insurance market and telling them to negotiate.

NADLER: Even--let me say this one thing. Even assuming it's--that you're correct about two plans, they would have access to two plans. They're not being thrown off Medicaid because they're not...

SHRUM: No, because the plans...

NADLER: ... on Medicaid.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: ... one small point, the plans they have access to, for example, don't cover vision care, don't cover eye care, and require them to spend \$4,000...

NADLER: All right, but now (inaudible)

(CROSSTALK)

RUSSERT: Let's step back...

NADLER: ... to nothing.

RUSSERT: ... let's step back and look...

SHRUM: And no money for Medicare, Jerry.

RUSSERT: Let's step back and look at the race in its totality.

Mr. Shrum, is it fair to say that Bill Bradley is trying to paint a bold vision, saying, We need national health care? He said we need registering and licensing of all handguns. He said we should get rid of don't ask-don't tell before the vice president.

SHRUM: I don't think that's accurate, but that's all right.

RUSSERT: Well, Barney Frank will say so in a matter of moments.

SHRUM: No, but, I mean, we all know the vice president was arguing for it inside the Clinton-Gore administration.

RUSSERT: Publicly, publicly.

SHRUM: Yes, but it was in the papers that (inaudible).

RUSSERT: But in terms of health care, gun control, gays in the military, a lot of issues that liberal Democrats, primary voters, care about, Bradley's people are saying he has stepped forward, he's been bolder, and that Al Gore is a cautious politician.

SHRUM: See, I think that's wrong. I think, number one, Al Gore is saying we can do health care and education at the same time, we don't have to choose between them. We can do health care and Medicare at the same time, we don't have to choose between them. We can move toward universal health care without giving Jerry's constituents \$150 voucher to go out and negotiate...

NADLER: There you go, telling the untruth again.

SHRUM: ... in the insurance market. But you haven't proved it's an untruth, you just call it an untruth.

NADLER: No, I have proven it. And you don't answer the fact that the people who are subject to the \$150 average cost, which is \$1,800 a year, under Gore's plan and under current, aren't on Medicaid, aren't eligible, have nothing. So it's not decreasing, even if it isn't increasing enough. It's increasing from zero...

SHRUM: Jerry, I want to ask you a question...

NADLER: ... to some of the plans that we get in Congress.

SHRUM: ... if somebody in your--if somebody in your district, let's say, somebody in your district, family in your district, let's say family of four, you give them the \$5,000 Senator Bradley wants. And the health care plans--I have a whole list of them--cost \$8,000 a year in premiums, where are they going to get the extra \$3,000?

NADLER: First of all, under Bradley's plan, it's an--it's not a cap, it's an average. And what that means, what that means, is if that amount of money can't buy the health care plans, that amount of money will be increased. That's a weighted average...

SHRUM: No, no, no, no, no, no.

NADLER: ... for the--Excuse me.

SHRUM: Weighted average, I understand it...

NADLER: That's a weighted average for the entire country.

SHRUM: (inaudible)--What states get less than \$150? Name one.

NADLER: I don't know (inaudible)

SHRUM: Name one. I know you don't.

RUSSET: All right, all right, before we go...

NADLER: (inaudible)

RUSSET: ... before we go, as is obvious to everybody who's watched the Democratic debates, watched this this morning, the Democratic Party is divided badly between Al Gore and Bill Bradley. If this primary process continues through February, through March, one of the candidates eventually becomes the nominee, there is no money left because they've spent it all on the primaries.

How badly wounded will the Democratic Party be trying to get through the summer into a fall campaign?

SHRUM: Jerry and I probably agree on this. I think the Democratic Party will unite. I think that people will get together. I think running against George Bush and this irresponsible tax cut that he's proposing, which would also, by the way, devastate Medicare and leave no money for Medicare, it's something we can argue against. I think Democrats will unite behind Al Gore, and he'll be the next president.

NADLER: I--well, I think Democrats will unite behind Al Gore or Bill Bradley, either of whom, from either of our point of views, are infinitely superior.

SHRUM: I agree with that.

NADLER: Infinitely preferable. But I have to say one other thing, because I haven't had a chance to mention this. Bob keeps saying that Bill Bradley will leave no money for Medicare. That's not true. The fact of the matter is that Medicare was supposed to go bankrupt in 2008. Last April they said, no, no, no, it's 2015. But that's assuming an average economic growth rate of 2.15--of 2 percent. The fact is, we're growing at 4 percent.

SHRUM: Jerry, you weren't (inaudible)

NADLER: Medicare is not going to have a problem...

SHRUM: Jerry was quoted on the floor of the House...

NADLER: ... as long as...

SHRUM: ... last year as saying we have...

NADLER: ... as long as...

SHRUM: ... to put more money into Medicare.

NADLER: ... as long--as long as we...

SHRUM: (inaudible)

NADLER: ... keep the economic growth rate up...

RUSSERT: Time--time...

NADLER: ... we'll have plenty of money (inaudible)

SHRUM: We got to put more money into Medicare.

RUSSERT: Time out, time out, time out. Congressman Nadler, before we go, will you introduce formal legislation next year in Congress to do away with the don't ask-don't tell policy for gays in the military?

NADLER: I will introduce that legislation if the people at the Human Rights Campaign Fund and others think it's advisable tactically to do it, and I will consult with people like Barney Frank and see what he thinks. I certainly would want to do that. I think it's the right thing to do and ought to be done.

RUSSERT: We'll be talking to him in just a moment. Jerry Nadler, Bob Shrum, thank you both.

SHRUM: Nice to be here.

RUSSERT: And may the best man win.

Next up, the Republicans. According to the polls, across the country it's Bush over McCain. But in New Hampshire, McCain is ahead of Bush. We'll talk to both campaigns.

Then our political round table, the candidates and the issues. We'll put them in perspective. Hunt, Klein, and Safire, all coming up right here on MEET THE PRESS.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RUSSERT: And we're back. Senator Judd Gregg, representing George W. Bush, Lindsey Graham, representing John McCain. Welcome both.

Senator Gregg, let me show you a new 30-second television commercial that Steve Forbes is on the air with in New Hampshire about your governor, George Bush.

GREGG: We have to watch all 30 seconds.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, FORBES CAMPAIGN AD)

UNIDENTIFIED ACTRESS: There's something you need to know about George W. Bush. In 1994, he signed a pledge with our organization that he would not support sales tax or business tax increases. In 1997, unfortunately, he broke this pledge. He proposed an increase in the business tax and sales taxes.

Governor Bush wants people to examine his record to see how he will perform as president. And his record, as far as taxes are concerned, is a record of broken promises.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: And they have provided this documentation, Taxpayers for Accountability, George Bush's signature saying, "I will not raise the sales tax." He did just that.

GREGG: Well, actually, he cut taxes in Texas by over \$2 billion, the largest tax cut in the history of the state. And that's a pretty good step forward, and that's on a gross basis, in other words, if you net out all the taxes, he ends up on a net basis, he ends up with a \$2 billion tax cut, and that's what he's proposing as candidate for president, that he'll cut taxes.

Equally important, I think, is that Steve Forbes has a record here of unfortunately going very negative, very strongly negative. I think that those of us who sat through the last election in New Hampshire and saw what he did to Bob Dole hope that he won't try to do that again to the front-runners in our party. It's a self-destructive event for our party to

have that sort of disingenuous and inappropriate type of attack.

Governor Bush is running an extremely positive, upbeat campaign. He is bringing to this election a view of the world which I think is good for our party. It's definitional, it's positive, it speaks to the better nature of the American people.

He's put on the table a lot of good policies in the area of education, in the area of foreign policy, and in the area of taxes, where I think we saw a party have to go out and tell the American people what we stand for and how we're going to institute it. And he's doing that in a very aggressive and positive way. And I would hope that we as a party would respond to positive campaigns rather than negative campaigns.

RUSSET: For the record, he--although he did break his word on raising sales taxes, you're saying that he neutralized that, or compensated for it...

GREGG: I don't think...

RUSSET: ... by over--by cutting taxes overall.

GREGG: Actually, I don't think on that pledge that he broke his word on that either. My understanding is that he did not raise sales taxes, that his package did not have a sales tax increase in it, that the chief sponsor of the bill has stated that there was no sales tax increase in his tax package, and that overall, the governor has cut taxes in Texas by over \$2 billion. And he's proposed a tax cut at the federal level which is very aggressive, very positive, and would be good for the country.

RUSSET: Congressman Graham, John McCain...

GREGG: So I believe he stuck by that statement.

RUSSET: Well, they give documentation which shows sales tax did go up.

GRAHAM: And can I--can I--can I say something about this?

RUSSET: Please.

GRAHAM: This is sort of a form of gotcha politics. I've heard what Governor Bush has--his explanation, and I accept it. I think his overall tax package was a net decrease in taxes. There may have been some shifting of tax burdens from property tax relief and a burden over to somebody else, but it was a net, net tax cut, and he certainly followed the spirit of cutting taxes.

And I think that's just a bad form of gotcha politics. It really is not valid when you hear the whole story.

GREGG: Can I just (inaudible)...

RUSSET: You have said, you...

GREGG: ... can I just quickly from...

RUSSET: ... let--let--let--let--let--let--let--let me give the congressman...

GREGG: ... (inaudible) chief sponsor in Texas on this issue?

RUSSET: Real fast.

GREGG: Steve Forbes is dead wrong to claim that those 75 tax increases were in governor--were Governor Bush's. I know. I was the House sponsor of the governor's tax cut. And those 75 tax increases were not part of our legislation, which cut taxes by over \$1 billion. That's Tom Tratnick (ph), the--from Midland, Texas, who (inaudible)...

RUSSET: But they were signed into law. They became part of the bill, even though they may (inaudible).

GREGG: Yes, but overall he cut tax by \$2 billion.

RUSSET: Congressman Graham, your man, John McCain...

GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

RUSSERT: ... has said that George W. Bush's tax plan for America is one that, in effect, helps the rich.

GRAHAM: Yes.

RUSSERT: He played class warfare.

GRAHAM: Right.

RUSSERT: He's saying that 60 percent of the benefits to go the top 10 percent of the people in the country. Should John McCain be playing class warfare?

GRAHAM: To be honest with you, I think John should focus on what his tax plan does. And no, I don't think we need to be saying that John McCain's campaign finance reform bill will destroy the Republican Party. Because Tim, when you say that, you're saying that Lindsey Graham wants to destroy the Republican Party. That's not true.

What I've encouraged John to do is talk about what's on people's minds. And let me talk a little bit about taxes. Here's what John does with surpluses. There is a real good-time Charlie attitude going on in this campaign. The Democrats are spending the surpluses that may not come about on big government, from health care to education.

And here's what John McCain is trying to do. One, the surpluses may not come about, because they're based on spending assumptions that Congress is not abiding by. In 1997, we set spending goals, and those surpluses are assuming we'll hit our spending targets. We're 0 for 2. Two years in a row, we've busted our spending limits. The economy may turn south.

Here's what John McCain's saying. If surpluses come about, let's save Social Security. Let's take 63 percent of those surpluses and put it into a system that's been stolen from. Let's pay down the \$5.8 trillion national debt and let's also cut taxes.

I believe most Americans running a business understand that John's got the most balanced approach. It may not poll well, as opposed to the biggest tax cuts you can think of, but it's good common-sense politics, it's fiscally responsible. Tim, the surpluses, if they come because of good times, ought to help future generations. We ought to try to get our kids out of debt. We ought to reduce the debt. We ought to put money back into Social Security, because we've stolen from it.

And yes, have a tax cut that we can afford. That's why I like John McCain the most.

RUSSERT: Is George Bush's tax plan fiscally irresponsible?

GRAHAM: It's--it is a large tax cut that's going to eat up all the surpluses if they come about. It does nothing, in my opinion, fiscally responsible to reduce the national debt. It doesn't address the Social Security issue.

Here's what Governor Bush said. There's plenty of money to take care of the debt, take care of Social Security, and give you a big tax cut. The truth is, this money is a projection 10 years into the future. And Congress' spending plan is going to destroy the projection if the economy goes south.

He has dedicated all the surpluses to a tax cut. The \$5.8 trillion debt needs to be addressed quickly. I think Social Security needs to be saved by putting money into it now during good times, because in 2030, there'll be one worker for two retirees, and that generation of Americans, you're going to have to double their FICA taxes if you don't do something now.

RUSSERT: Senator, John McCain is saying George Bush is going to

spend all the surplus and put Social Security and Medicare in jeopardy and not pay down the national debt.

GREGG: Well, of course that's inaccurate. First off, there is projected to be a \$3.3 trillion surplus over the next 10 years, and what the governor has suggested is that we cut taxes by \$467 billion over the next five years, which would leave over a trillion dollars to apply to reducing the debt and to issue--addressing the issue of Social Security.

And what you've got to remember here is that there is a philosophical difference, it appears, between Governor Bush and Senator McCain. Governor Bush says that when you've got excess money after you've taken care of Social Security, which we have, a trillion dollars over the next five years for Social Security, after you've taken care of the spending, which the government should do, such as national defense and caring for the most needy, then if there's money on the table, don't leave it in the cash register in Washington, because it'll get spent.

Return it to the people. It is a fundamental tenet of Republican philosophy that if you leave money with government, government will spend it, and government will grow. George Bush understands that. Why? Because he was a governor, and he's seen it happen. Unless you have somebody who's willing to discipline the government by reducing its revenues, you are not going to be able to control the rate of growth of government.

Now, maybe John doesn't understand that because he's been in Washington for 17 years.

GRAHAM: (inaudible)...

RUSSERT: Lindsey Graham, why...

GREGG: But Governor Bush does understand it.

RUSSERT: Why would John McCain be a stronger, better Republican nominee than George Bush?

GRAHAM: Because he's thinking about people that can't vote for him. And there is a philosophical difference between the senator and Lindsey Graham. Lindsey Graham's been in Congress five years. Lindsey Graham has seen the Republican and Democratic Congress break the spending limits we set in '97. Tim, we are not hitting the spending marks. The surplus projections are based on us hitting the spending marks. It's based on an economy that's running hot now but that may be cold one day.

The reason I like John McCain the most is if we have good times, for it to continue, he's going to invest those good times for people that can't even vote for him yet. He's going to put money...

GREGG: Well, John--John...

GRAHAM: Excuse me, senator.

GREGG: Well...

GRAHAM: He's going to put money back into Social Security because politicians for 40 years have stolen from it. That's where the surpluses need to go first.

(CROSSTALK)

GRAHAM: He's going to get our kids out of debt, and he's going to give you a middle-class working tax cut...

GREGG: No, (inaudible)...

GRAHAM: ... for 23 percent of the surpluses will be dedicated...

GREGG: Do I get to speak here? Do I get to speak here?

GRAHAM: ... to tax cuts...

GREGG: Is this--I didn't know the House...

GRAHAM: ... 63 percent will be dedicated...

GREGG: ... had a filibuster rule.

GRAHAM: ... to tax (inaudible).

GREGG: This is new to me. I didn't know the House had a filibuster rule.

RUSSET: Give you a chance to respond.

GREGG: Basically, John McCain's tax cut is a tax cut that Al Gore loves. I mean, it is essentially a tepid little tax cut. Let's put our toe in the water. And...

GRAHAM: That's unfair. Al Gore is not supporting...

GREGG: ... it's actually...

GRAHAM: ... John McCain. Al Gore's spending the surplus...

GREGG: Hold it. Do I get to respond here?

GRAHAM: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I apologize.

GREGG: There's two people that have been--that have said that Governor Bush's tax cut is too bold, Al Gore and John McCain. There are two people who've said that they agree with John McCain on campaign finance, John McCain and Bill Bradley.

The fact is that John McCain is running a campaign which is tepid on the issues which are core to the Republican Party, such as tax cuts and how we deal with campaign finance proposals.

RUSSET: Let me (inaudible) the campaign finance.

GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

RUSSET: Forty-five Democrats...

GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

RUSSET: ... 45 out of 45 voted for John McCain.

GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

RUSSET: Forty-seven Republicans out of 50 voted against it.

GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

RUSSET: His campaign finance bill is loved by the Democrats and despised by the Republicans. Why?

GRAHAM: Well, Lindsey Graham voted for Shays-Meehan. And let me tell you why Lindsey Graham did. And if you think I'm a Democrat, come to South Carolina, we'll have that debate.

Most Americans are watching a different movie than a lot of career politicians. Most Americans believe that what Clinton-Gore did in 1996 by taking Chinese money, by cheating every way you can cheat, by renting out the Lincoln Bedroom, needs to be fixed.

John McCain's got guts to stand up and say what they did in 1996 is illegal. John McCain is going to take the special interest groups from both sides of the aisle and say that when you try to get in politics and run ads that are deceptive, and try to beat a particular candidate because they don't agree with your issue, you're going to tell the public where your money comes from, and we're going to regulate the way you spend money.

I think most Americans, Republican and Democrats, see the money in Washington producing bad politics. And when John McCain stands up to people in his own party, like I have done, he is doing it in a way...

GREGG: Well, when he stands up to people...

GRAHAM: ... that will appeal to a lot of Americans.

GREGG: ... in his own party, he should...

RUSSET: Final word, senator.

GREGG: Well, standing up to people in your party--own party is different than taking out people in your own party, which the McCain

proposal would end up doing. Basically, it would undermine the capacity of Republicans to be competitive. Yes, there has to be campaign finance reform. George Bush is doing it. He's got a real-time disclosure of who's contributing to his campaign.

But you should not propose as your core element a proposal which would fundamentally undermine the capacity of Republicans to be competitive. And how can we nominate, as our candidate for president, somebody who, if he wins, will basically put in place legislation which would undermine the capacity of Republicans (inaudible)...

RUSSET: If McCain's the nominee, you'd support him.

GREGG: Of course I'd support him. But I'm just saying it would be a difficult process for us when he--if he's successful in enacting his bill.

RUSSET: Real fast.

GRAHAM: Tim, about Republicans and unilateral disarmament. Lindsey Graham is not going to destroy his party. What I believe will happen is if we have campaign finance reform, we will have better government, and that we're losing...

GREGG: (inaudible)...

GRAHAM: In '96 to '98...

GREGG: ... campaign finance reform.

GRAHAM: ... we outspent Democrats, senator. We've lost our way. We've got better ideas. We don't need...

GREGG: Well, yes, and you have to be able to express them.

GRAHAM: ... to have to collect money at million-dollar clips...

GREGG: You can't express them, you--it doesn't even have you much...

GRAHAM: ... is--Well...

GREGG: ... doesn't do much good to have better ideas.

RUSSET: To be continued. On to Iowa, on to New Hampshire, Bradley and McCain...

GRAHAM: Thank you.

RUSSET: ... and Bush.

Coming next, gays in the military has emerged as a major issue in campaign 2000. We'll talk to the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Vessey, and Congressman Barney Frank, right after this.

MORE ^BC-GREGG-NBC-MTP, 3rd Add, f2898,1719

Senator John Gregg (R-Nh) Interviewed On Nbc'S ``Meet The Press," Along With Representatives Lindsey Graham And Gerrold Nadler
xfdsu GREGG-NBC-MTP 3rdadd xfdsu

XXX right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RUSSET: We're back and joined by the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Vessey. Welcome.

Both candidates for the Democratic nomination have said they want openly gay men and women to be allowed to serve in the military. Get rid of don't ask-don't tell, allow people to serve, and acknowledge openly their gayness.

What, in your mind, would that do to the military?

VESSEY: Well, I'm not sure what it'll do to the military. The potential presidential candidates, if they're elected, need to get the advice of the military leaders of the country and certainly need to work with the Congress. The present law is don't ask-don't tell. The Uniform

Code of Military Justice makes homosexual activity a crime. Those are problems that have to be worked out.

But more importantly, the effectiveness of the armed forces have to be examined. The heart of the armed forces are the infantry squads in the Army and the Marine Corps. Those young men have to be a Super Bowl team. They have to work together, they have to live together, they have to sleep together on the battlefield.

Anything that would disrupt the unity of that team is a mistake, and that--for years we've categorized sexual activity as something that might disrupt the unity of that team, whether it's homosexual or heterosexual.

That's an issue that the military leaders and the president of the United States and the Congress would have to address. I call it the monasticism of the infantry. Certainly we've had homosexuals that have served and served with valor and distinction. But they've abided by that monasticism of the infantry.

RUSSET: Congressman Frank, disruption of the unity of a military operation.

FRANK: Oh, it's something to be avoided, and I appreciate the very thoughtful and reasonable tone that the general took. But I do have some differences within that.

I--it may have been that allowing gay men and lesbians openly to serve in the military 40 years ago would have been disruptive. But this society is evolving. Thirty years ago, when we first began to consider legislation to ban discrimination based on sexual orientation in the workplace, people made arguments very similar to the general, now, in a different context, but it's after all not only the military where we want to avoid disruption, police forces, fire departments, schools.

In fact, what we found in this country is that we have been able to say gay men and lesbians can work on the same basis as everyone else as long as they behave as everyone else. In other words, it has not been so disruptive.

Now, there have been disruptions. When Harry Truman integrated the armed forces racially, there was a temporary disruption. When women were allowed in--the general said "men," using the generic, but in fact if the military had been listened to exactly, we would not have integrated the armed services in 1948 and we would not have begun to put women into the armed services.

I think it is reasonable to say that any gay man or lesbian who comes into the military has to abide by the Uniform Code of Military Justice strictly on duty, et cetera, and cannot do anything disruptive.

What I would disagree with the general on--and as I say, I appreciate his very thoughtful tone--I would disagree--I do not think in America today, the interaction in a work situation between gay men and straight men is all that disruptive. I think we've had a lot of experience in this country where the predictions of disruption in a number of areas have turned out to underestimate the common sense of the American people.

RUSSET: General, do you believe that the integration of the armed forces with blacks, allowing women to serve, are analogous to allowing openly gay people to serve?

VESSEY: Well, no. But that's an issue that has to be decided by thoughtful people that deal with today's armed forces. I'm sort of an anomaly here, anachronistic, for that matter. But I think it has to be decided by thoughtful people who are in touch with today's military forces

and who are not either homophobes or homosexual activists.

RUSSET: Let--let--let...

VESSEY: Because the issue--the issue is the effectiveness of the armed forces, and the armed forces belong to the American people. They're the ones who eventually decide. The presidents don't make armies, that's empowered by the Constitution to the Congress. And also the rules and laws for governing the armed forces are the role of the Congress, the representatives of the people.

RUSSET: Al Gore said...

VESSEY: So it's an issue that has to be decided by those bodies.

RUSSET: Al Gore said the other night, "I would insist before appointing anyone to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the individual support my policy. And yes, I would make that a requirement." Do you believe a President Gore would have a difficult time finding someone to serve as a chairman of a Joint Chiefs of Staff who would support allowing openly gay men and women in the military?

VESSEY: Well, I think the issue is broader than the issue of homosexuals in the military. If they--if presidents are going to insist that the leadership of the military give them the advice that the presidents want to hear, rather than the best military advice these people can provide, they're making a great mistake, and I think they'll have a difficult time finding people to serve in the senior leadership positions, whatever the issue is.

RUSSET: Congressman Frank, you mentioned the military code, which now outlaws sexual activity, homosexual activity. Would you seek to change the military code?

FRANK: First, can I say, I--the general does himself a disservice to suggest that he's an anachronism. I think the kind of thoughtful approach that the general gives us on the basis of his experience is not at all anachronistic, it's still a very valuable contribution, even though we have some difference.

And I also want to say, when I talked about the women and the racial issue, it's analogous in this sense. Those were both disruptive. No one denies that they were disruptive. They were clearly--they--I think they worked out well. I think people tend to be more afraid of change than, in fact, experience shows.

As far as Uniform Code of Military Justice, yes, I would change it. By the way, it's not simply homosexual activity that's outlawed. Much other sexual activity is outlawed. Everyone I have talked to says that members of the military regularly in their private capacities violate the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Indeed, there was a case recently in which an airman was convicted of having had sex with a woman, neither of whom was married, but they were convicted of violating the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

He was, by the way, a heterosexual whose name was Fagg, F-A-G-G. So if people want to look up the case, it's Fagg versus the United States. It stands for the proposition that the Uniform Code of Military Justice can outlaw sexual activity between an unmarried man and an unmarried woman, both of whom are over age.

So I do think that's a little outdated. I think if you in fact said that anybody who violated the Uniform Code of Military Justice on sex--You know, we had the adultery case, Kelley Flynn, when Trent Lott came to her defense and said, Don't pick on that poor woman.

So the Uniform Code of Military Justice outlaws enough so that very, very many of the armed service--of the armed forces wouldn't serve (ph). And I think if you looked at the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and if you said to people, It makes it illegal for an unmarried man and an unmarried woman to have sex with each other, the recruitment problems we have would be exacerbated.

RUSSET: You are openly gay, but you're also a very shrewd political observer. Do you believe that the position staked out by the Democratic candidates, openly gay men and women in the military, will help or hurt them in a general election across mainstream America?

FRANK: Well, I'm trying to think whether I should describe myself as shrewdly gay, Tim, maybe we could get a synthesis there.

But yes, I think it does. I think that the American people have shown an understanding of the ability of people of different sexual orientations to interact in some contexts and not in others. But again, I want to stress, we had all these predictions of disruption about schools, about workplaces, about factories, about construction sites. And we have passed laws--and I would--Let me tell you something that I know is true.

There are tens of millions of people out there, many of them watching this show, who live in states where it is now illegal to discriminate in employment based on sexual orientation. And the overwhelming heterosexual majority doesn't even know that, because it is so little disruptive. They can interact with gay men and lesbians in such a casual way that it's not a problem.

So yes, I think that this is one that is going to...

RUSSET: Would Congress, would Congress...

FRANK: ... work out.

RUSSET: ... do away with don't ask-don't tell?

FRANK: Not this Congress, no, but this Congress wouldn't even pass a hate crime statute. The current Republican Congress would not do that at all. They tend to be very antigay.

But I do think--And by the way, the first step of a new Congress will be a gay civil rights bill dealing with civilians. Repealing this policy will not and should not be the first item on the agenda. A broader gay civil rights bill not covering the military will be.

But I think ultimately you will see the understanding in America that your sexual orientation is your own business. It does not prevent you from doing anything as long as you behave yourself and abide by the rules.

RUSSET: Congressman Barney Frank and General John Vessey, we thank you very much for a thoughtful discussion.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 18:45:14.00

SUBJECT: CBS Face the Nation, January 9, 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:

CBS FACE THE NATION
JANUARY 9, 2000

SPEAKERS: BOB SCHIEFFER, HOST, CBS FACE THE NATION
GLORIA BORGER, U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT
CORRESPONDENT
U.S. SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
GOVERNOR JESSE VENTURA (REF-MN)

SCHIEFFER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Senator John McCain and Governor Jesse Ventura. Presidential candidate McCain, who's trying to upset frontrunner George W. Bush, hit a bump in the campaign trail this week when reports surfaced that he had written letters to the FCC on behalf of campaign contributors. Is there anything wrong with that? Will the controversy affect his campaign? We'll ask him.

Then we'll talk with the colorful governor of Minnesota, Jesse Ventura, about the future of the Reform Party.

Gloria Borger will be here, and I'll have a final word on first ladies.

But first, Senator McCain and Jesse Ventura on FACE THE NATION.

ANNOUNCER: FACE THE NATION, with chief Washington correspondent Bob Schieffer. And now, from CBS News in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: Good morning again, and we're pleased to have Senator McCain in the studio with us this morning.

Well, Senator, let's get right to it. Your campaign was really sailing along, and then all of a sudden, someone accuses you of writing a letter to the FCC asking them to settle a case that involved one of your major contributors. You said you were doing what any committee chairman would do.

But both "The Washington Post" and "The New York Times" have editorialized and said maybe you should have known better, that you should have thought about how this might look.

Now this weekend, you have released hundreds of letters that you've written--I've got a big stack of them right here--that you've written to federal agencies over the years on behalf of constituents, sometimes with other senators and so forth.

But this story continues to bubble. Is there anything else you can do to get the focus back on what you want to talk about?

MCCAIN: Well, first of all, thanks for having me on. I like to always to be a warm-up act for Governor Ventura.

(LAUGHTER)

You know, I was a mediocre high school and college wrestler, so we have a lot in common.

Well, first of all, on this issue--and we haven't always been sailing along. This particular controversy is better than being asked whether I'm nuts or not--which was the last time that I was on this program, was the subject.

Look, I've always had two principles. One is, make bureaucracies react on behalf of the taxpayers; and second, do whatever I can to increase competition and lower costs in telecommunications. Those are the guiding principles I've had.

Today, we're asking the federal government to release all correspondence that I've had with every government agency.

But finally, let me remind you, I'm the chairman of the committee that is designated by the Congress to oversight the FCC, and it's my responsibility to try to see and make them act. And so, I believe that the record will be clear that I've done that on behalf of the consumer.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just go back and underline what you said. If I understand what you said, you're going to ask all federal agencies to release every letter that you've ever written to them on any subject.

MCCAIN: Yes, and I'm not sure we should force them to go back more than about 10 years, but, yes, I would like to do that, just to make sure that people know that there's a clear pattern of my acting on the behalf of my constituents and the consumers.

And I feel very strongly about this telecommunications issue. Perhaps the most important bureaucracy now is the FCC because of the telecommunications' importance to our economy. And they have been incredibly slow in making decisions which will help the consumers. And that's one of the reasons why I and many other members of Congress,

Republicans and Democrats, have been somewhat critical of them.

And also, as I say, it's our oversight responsibilities.

And may I just finally say, look, these things happen in campaigns. It's very intense. There will be other, quote, "bumps in the road." This ain't bean bag we're playing.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I must say--and this may underline what sort of life I lead. I spent last night, Saturday night, going through the letters that your committee has released so far. And I must say in all fairness, I've been in Washington a long time, they look a lot like letters that most committee chairman write to the government. I can understand why the FCC may be a little upset with you because you seem to be on their case pretty good, telling them to make decisions. And most of the letters I see here seem to be along that line. But we'll wait and see what some of these other letters.

You're confident that you haven't written a letter in the last 10 years that would be seen as anything improper?

MCCAIN: I certainly am confident of that, adhering to those principles.

And by the way, in the case that surfaced, waited 700 days to make a decision. I thought after 700 days, they should make a decision. And I asked them simply to make a decision. But, you know, life isn't fair.

SCHIEFFER: OK. Gloria.

BORGER: Very quickly, would you challenge other candidates to release letters just like you're doing?

MCCAIN: No. They--sort of like the medical records when I released all those, they asked me and I said no. They can--they'll make the best judgments.

BORGER: Let's talk about Cuba. Republicans in the House have subpoenaed a 6-year-old little boy to appear before their committee to try and keep him in this country. What do you think about that?

MCCAIN: Well, I'd like to see efforts made to keep this young boy in America.

MCCAIN: We seem to forget that the young boy's mother gave her life so that he could, as we say on the Statue of Liberty, breathe free.

BORGER: But do you agree with this subpoena?

MCCAIN: If the subpoena's purpose is to keep the boy in the country, I would certainly support that and any other effort, including petitions for asylum et cetera. If it's to make him testify before Congress, I don't think we want to do that with a 6-year-old boy.

BORGER: Would you be in favor of Congress granting this boy dual citizenship?

MCCAIN: Sure, sure I would. I'd be glad to. Again, his mother gave her life. We all know what the government is like in Cuba. We don't want to send that boy back to an oppressive regime, and I'm told the only people that have ever been sent back to Cuba are criminals. This is going to be the first time a non-criminal was ever sent back. I don't think that's right.

BORGER: OK, gays in the military. Vice President Gore initially got himself in some hot water this week and he said that he would use that issue as a litmus test when choosing members of his joint chiefs of staff. In other words, they would have to agree with him on that. Then he backed off of that to a certain degree, so now, is his position OK with you?

MCCAIN: I don't know what he's backed off to. I guess--but his initial statement--it showed to me an incredible lack of understanding of the role of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff. The role of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff is to give his best military advice and counsel, honest counsel to the president of the United States. So what the vice president was saying basically, I won't accept the best counsel and advice of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff. That could have a terrible effect on the civilian military relationship.

And finally, look, the don't tell--"don't ask, don't tell" policy is a very--handles a very difficult and sensitive issue. In the view of everybody I've talked to that are military leaders, yes it's tough, but it's working. And there are cases that need to be reviewed. There are policies that need to be reviewed. But it's working and it's appropriate. And if we're going to change it, I don't think we talk about that in a political campaign. We talk about it after we become the president and say, I'll have a review of the policy.

By the way, I'm convinced that until people like Colin Powell and others give me advice to the contrary, I'll support it.

SCHIEFFER: Let's get back to the campaign and things we do talk about during the campaign. You were down in South Carolina this weekend. I must say the most raucous debate amongst the Republicans that I've seen thus far. Were you satisfied with that debate?

MCCAIN: Well, the acoustics were bad. I think that some of the questioners were not treated with respect. But, you know, this was a party function. I would like to see, perhaps, a more--less participatory--I love to have audiences at the debates, but I thought the whole set-up wasn't conducive to getting a real good debate accomplished.

SCHIEFFER: One of the things that...

MCCAIN: Those things happen. We'll have lots more.

SCHIEFFER: One of the things that came out down there is, obviously that local issue that's so controversial, should the Confederate flag fly over the state capital? Governor Bush was given several opportunities to say what he thought about that, and he simply wouldn't take a position. I don't want to ask you that question. What I want to ask you is, what does the Confederate flag mean to you?

MCCAIN: The Confederate flag is offensive in many, many ways, as we all know. It's a symbol of racism and slavery. But I also understand how others do not view it in that fashion. My forebearers from Mississippi fought under the Confederate flag. They were not slave owners, and I'm sure they considered their service--one I believe died in Shiloh--was honorable. So, I obviously understand why many Americans find it offensive.

I was talking to one of my supporters, who's a legislative leader in South Carolina. They're working very hard on a proposal that may resolve this issue. It's painful to all of them, and I believe that there's a good chance that they could get this issue resolved pretty soon.

SCHIEFFER: Well, do you stand with President Bush and that that's something they ought to decide, and that outsiders shouldn't take a part in it?

MCCAIN: We had a huge controversy in my state about the recognition of Dr. Martin Luther King as a holiday. I worked very hard to achieve that recognition of Dr. King, and I did resent it when people parachuted in from other parts of the country to try and tell us what to do.

So I do think that they should make that decision, but I also believe that a lot of us can work very hard to try and urge them to make a decision on this and come to some reasonable conclusion.

BORGER: Let's talk taxes. You're about to announce your new tax plan this week. It's apparently going to be half the size of Governor Bush's and you're going to expand the bottom 15 percent tax bracket. What else can you tell us about it?

MCCAIN: It's going to give tax relief to about 25 million Americans, low-and middle-income. It's not going to give a lot of relief to very rich. We're going to pay for it not out of the surplus, but out of closing corporate loopholes, partially out of the surplus, closing loopholes such as ethanol subsidies.

MCCAIN: And also we're going to eliminate some wasteful and unnecessary spending.

I worry about using the surplus completely for tax cuts. We've got a ticking time bomb out there called the Social Security trust fund, and I've believe that we've got to pay down the trust fund, start paying down the debt.

Governor Bush said that Washington is awash in cash. We've got a \$5.6 trillion debt.

BORGER: Governor Bush also said last week, "Not only no new taxes but tax cuts, so help me, God." Would you take that pledge, too?

MCCAIN: Oh, sure. I have voted against every tax increase in the 17 years I've been there. Lower-and middle-income Americans need tax cuts. Lower-and middle-income Americans...

BORGER: So you'd say--what would you say?

MCCAIN: I'd say that I am in favor of tax cuts for lower-and middle-income Americans. We need to have that family that's paying so much in the form of payroll taxes, in addition to the other taxes, to have some kind of relief.

Look, there's a growing gap in America between the haves and the have-nots. We all know that. And we better get those have-nots a lot of opportunities--education, tax breaks, economic opportunities, et cetera.

SCHIEFFER: The tobacco industry apparently is getting ready to funnel an enormous multi-million-dollar contribution to the Republican Party through, kind of, that back-door soft money. Should the Republican Party accept that money?

MCCAIN: The Republican Party should accept no, quote, "soft money," no uncontrolled contributions. I understand that there's a new loophole that's been created, \$100 million or so is going to be funneled in to these campaigns.

The people I talk to believe they are disconnected from government and they understand, when I talk to them, that the big interests and big money is depriving them of their government. That's the theme of my campaign. I want to reform the tax code, the military, education. We can't do it when Washington is in the gridlock of the special interests.

This thing is spiraling out of control, Bob. I mean, we're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars now unaccounted. There's a group in Washington running ads attacking the--morphing my--Bill Clinton's face into mine. I wish they'd at least get a better picture. We don't know where the money came from. At least we ought to know where the money came

from.

SCHIEFFER: OK, at that point we have to leave this, Senator McCain.

MCCAIN: Thank you.

SCHIEFFER: Good luck to you out on the trail. We'll see you again.

MCCAIN: Thanks for having me.

SCHIEFFER: We'll be back in a minute to talk with Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: We turn now to the other big story in presidential politics this week, the commission on presidential debates has decided that only candidates who have at least 15 percent support in the major polls will be allowed to take part in the debates this Fall.

Governor Jesse Ventura of Minnesota, the highest ranking official of the Reform Party, is with us now. He has called this an outrage and unfair. Governor, do you think that, in fact, this could wreck the Reform party at the presidential level?

VENTURA: No, I don't think it will wreck the Reform Party, but it's a just a clear case again of the two parties banning together to keep down the rise of a third party. It's a standard thing that has historically happened many, many times, and it will continue to move on. And I think the public should be outraged over this.

And let me give you an example. At the point of the primary here in the state of Minnesota, I was only polling 10 percent, which meant, by these standards, I wouldn't be allowed to debate.

Well, the moment I debated, I went from 10 percent up to 37 percent in six weeks and won the election. Now that could happen again, and I think this is a clear case of these people not wanting to see another Jesse Ventura election victory.

SCHIEFFER: Well, what can you or will you do about it, Governor?

VENTURA: Well, what I'll do about it is continue to speak out about it and educate the American public on it that they should be outraged over the fact that a bunch of lobbyists, who are the head of this committee--it's supposed to be non-partisan? That's a joke. I mean, one of them headed--or was part of the Republican National Committee, a paid for, in-the-loop lobbyist, and we've now got lobbyists dictating presidential elections? That shows how far the national politics has slipped in this country and how really disgraceful that it is.

SCHIEFFER: Well, can you sue or would you try to take them to court?

VENTURA: Well, I won't, but I know I was here earlier today in Minnesota. I had a press conference with Donald Trump, and Mr. Trump indicated that that may be one method that he would use in he so decides to become a candidate when he makes that choice. I personally am not going to sue because, you know, I don't have the means nor the lawyers to do that. And I'm far too busy running the state of Minnesota, being the governor.

BORGER: Governor, right now Pat Buchanan is running for the nomination in the Reform Party. You clearly don't support him. But if he were to win the nomination of the Reform Party for the presidency, what would it mean for the party?

VENTURA: Well, I don't know what exactly it would mean that the party is not going in the direction that I think it should go. I mean, my view of the Reform Party is that we're very centrist. That was the platform that I ran on here in the state of Minnesota and won with. And I think that by going farther left or farther right of these two other political parties is not the method you're going to use to achieve victory in any type of election. You've got to be a centrist movement in an attempt to be successful.

BORGER: If he were the nominee then, could you envision splitting off a different group from the Buchanan wing of the party?

VENTURA: Well, I have a positive attitude and I--you know, he hasn't won the nomination yet and I'm a firm believer you never put the cart in front of the horse. So, until he wins the nomination, that's a question I don't have to deal with.

BORGER: Now, the Buchanan campaign says that Pat Buchanan is very willing to meet with you, would like to meet with you. Would you be willing to meet with Pat Buchanan?

VENTURA: Certainly. I don't shut my doors to anyone. I'd be happy to meet with Mr. Buchanan. In fact, we have met once already very early when he was still a Republican candidate for president, at the time. And I'd certainly have no problem with meeting with him. But I won't fly to meet him and it's not any spite on his part, it's the fact that I have to govern the state of Minnesota and I have a job to do here. So, if we're going to meet, he's going to have to come here to Minnesota.

SCHIEFFER: Governor, under--as you foresee it now, under no circumstances though, could you support Pat Buchanan or can you see a scenario under which you would support him?

VENTURA: I can't see a scenario, but I've learned that, after 48 years on this planet, you never say never. I mean I said I'd never get involved in professional wrestling again, and lo and behold I did. So, you never say never. I mean, one never knows what tomorrow is going to bring. But certainly Mr. Buchanan and I have our differences.

SCHIEFFER: I say that because it seems to me that whoever the Reform Party winds up nominating, it would be in your vested interest--in the party's interest to support them, because if they fall below five percent in the next election, then they wouldn't get these federal matching funds in 2004.

VENTURA: Well, that's true and certainly that weighs on us. But in the case of Mr. Trump, Mr. Trump said he's not even going to use those matching funds anyway. So it depends on who your candidate is.

But, you know, certainly we don't want the party divided up. We want to come in unity when that happens. But you know what I find humorous? You've got what, five or six Republican candidates vying for the nomination and yet you don't hear the media saying is the Republican Party divided and falling apart?

Or, you have two debates on the Democratic side, and they're saying is the Democratic Party falling apart? This is a great opportunity for the Reform Party. We now maybe will have multiple candidates. In the past, there's only been Ross Perot. It's a great sign that we're growing.

BORGER: Let's talk about those multiple candidates. Donald Trump now seems to be inching towards running. Why do you consider him more viable than somebody like Pat Buchanan?

VENTURA: Well, because he's like myself in many ways. He's a private sector, very successful in the private sector. He's not a career

politician.

VENTURA: Mr. Buchanan is an inside-the-Beltway person. He's been there for longer than probably any candidate in this race, Republican, Democrat or Reform. And I just find it refreshing to see candidates who are from the private sector, like myself, who are willing to come and serve and are not career politicians.

SCHIEFFER: Let me--you talked about these candidates for both of the major parties. There seems to be a real split over this issue of gays in the military. Vice President Gore says that he wants a, kind of, litmus test, that he'll ask the people that he would choose for the joint chiefs of staff, he'll ask them in advance: do they support putting gays into the military.

Do you think, Governor Ventura, that is a proper question to be asked of our military leaders?

VENTURA: Well, first of all, I think gay people have every right to serve in the military. I mean, this is the United States of America, and who am I to tell someone they can or cannot serve their country? Who is anyone to tell anyone they cannot serve their country? Gays have served honorably in the military throughout its--the military history. I think it's a silly question to begin with.

I served six years in the United States Navy, and was a member of the Navy's elite underwater demolition SEAL teams, and I could care less about a person's sexual orientation. All I could care about was, can they get the job done and can I count on them when the going gets tough?

BORGER: So you think making it a litmus test, then, for your joint chiefs is fine?

VENTURA: I don't know. I'm not going to ever be in that position, because I'm not running for national office. Like I said, I state my position that I have no problem with gays serving in the military. It's my country, it's their country, it's all of our country, and how dare anyone say that someone is unfit to serve their country?

SCHIEFFER: Also, there's been a split among the Democrats and Republicans over the fate of this little Cuban boy and whether he ought to be sent back to his father in Cuba. How do you come down on that, Governor?

VENTURA: Well, I haven't really paid that much attention to it, in all honesty. You know, I'm very busy running the state of Minnesota, and that's a federal policy. But it's a tough question. It's tough either way. But if you believe in individual parental rights, I think you'd probably have to fall on the side of--you know, the boy's father has rights, and certainly those need to be honored because he is the biological father, I'd assume. And if he is the biological father, he has rights to his son.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, Governor, we'll leave it there. Thank you very much for talking to us today. Hope we'll hear from you again down the line.

VENTURA: Thank you. Appreciate it.

SCHIEFFER: Thank you, sir.

VENTURA: Have a great day.

SCHIEFFER: All right.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER: Incidentally, we recorded that interview on Friday. You saw it unedited and in its entirety.

Back with a final word in just a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: And a final word today. So Mrs. Clinton is moving to New York to run for the Senate, and we're told she'll be putting that ahead of her first lady duties for a while.

Well, not to be rude, but what are the duties of the first lady? I couldn't find any when I checked the Constitution. Maybe that's because they're neither elected by the people nor confirmed by the Senate.

You wouldn't know that from modern first ladies. They have been supported by enough paid staff in recent years to operate major PR firms, which is what they've become.

Tax dollars pay for their chiefs of staff, speech writers, press secretaries, social secretaries, security details, limos and planes. The Clinton's took it another step. Mrs. Clinton was asked to shape federal policy. Many applauded when the president appointed her to overhaul health care, but management experts warned he was committing the ultimate management sin: hiring someone he couldn't fire. It didn't work. Just as it didn't work over the years when various Congressmen tried to make their-wives chiefs of staff. After all, who's going to tell the boss his wife is doing a rotten job?

And back to all that taxpayer-supported staff that sprung up for first and second ladies lately. Suppose Elizabeth Dole winds up on somebody's ticket and they're both elected? Will Bob Dole then get a press secretary and chief of staff? Tipper Gore has both and more.

So count me among those confident we can weather this crisis of getting along without a first lady for a while. I don't know just how we'll do it, but somehow we'll find a way.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 09:57:57.00

SUBJECT: Vice President Gore on NBC Today, January 10, 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 [UNKNOWN])
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:
NBC TODAY SHOW
JANUARY 10, 2000

SPEAKERS: VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE, DEMOCRATIC PARTY
PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
KATIE COURIC, ANCHOR

COURIC: On ``Close Up" this morning, Vice President Al Gore.
Mr. Gore's taking a few hours off from the campaign to stop in New York
this morning. He's here to chair a UN Security Council meeting.

Mr. Vice President, welcome back. Nice to see you.

GORE: Good morning, Katie. And belated Happy Birthday.

COURIC: Thank you very much. Let's dive right in and talk first
about gays in the military.

In a debate last Wednesday, you said you would require any
appointee to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to agree in advance to support a
policy that would allow gays to serve openly in the military. That was

widely criticized by many officers and military leaders who said that the real selection process should be based on experience and military expertise rather than views on a particular situation. So on Friday you back-pedaled, or you clarified your position, and said there would be no litmus test. So let me clarify your position yet again this morning. You would not require any appointee to the chief of staff to agree with your position on gays serving openly in the U.S. military?

Gore: I would agree, of course, as would any--I would require as would any commander in chief that military officers support the policies of the commander in chief and the country. And you know, one of the great things about our nation is that that should go without saying because our military has always done that.

I would never inquire into the personal political views of an officer in the military because following orders is a point of honor in our military.

The point I was trying to make, Katie--and I'll make it again here--is that I do think the time has come to end the unfair discrimination against these people who've been persecuted because they want to serve our country. And I think that a firmness and determination to widen the circle of human dignity is called for.

And I'll give you an example. In the late 1940s, when President Harry Truman said that African-Americans ought to be able to serve in our armed forces without discrimination, they ought to be fully integrated, there was some private resistance on the part of many in the military at that time. But you know, once the order was given, it was accomplished very quickly and very well.

And I think the time has come to push back the boundaries of discrimination again.

COURIC: So it sounds to me, Mr. Vice President, there would in essence be a litmus test, even though it would not...

Gore: No.

COURIC: ... perhaps be a formal one.

Gore: No. The--the--no. There's a difference between asking for support of policies that are set by our country--which ought to go without saying, and does--and on the other hand, asking in advance for one's personal views. If that's what you mean by litmus test, no, I would, of course, not do that.

COURIC: So if a--if a potential chairman of the joint chiefs said to you, "Mr. President, I don't feel comfortable with having gays serving openly in the military," would he or she disqualify himself or herself?

Gore: No, no. Because the follow-up question would be, "Well, tell me about your reservations, tell me what your opinions are." I encourage a full and open discussion about issues about this.

COURIC: What if they said...

Gore: And then ask--"give me the reassurance that of course you're going to do your best to implement it." And of course that goes without saying, because officers do that in our military.

COURIC: What if the person said it's against the U.S. code of military conduct to have gays serving openly in the military?

Gore: To the extent that congressional statutory changes need to be made, I would work for those. And of course, any order by the commander in chief has to be consistent with the laws of our land and with the statutory requirements that the military has to follow.

And it's true that there have to be changes in statute.

COURIC: How big a priority would this be in your administration?

GORE: Well, I think that civil rights always has to be right at the top of the list because that's who we are as Americans.

You know, when our nation was founded, women weren't allowed to vote, African-Americans were still slaves in most of America, but we grew as a nation in our understanding of what freedom is all about.

COURIC: What do you think of John McCain's comments that neither you nor Bill Bradley--given your position on this issue--are really qualified to serve as president?

GORE: Oh, I think--I think you chalk that up to politics within the Republican contest. I have a lot of respect for John McCain and I wish him well.

COURIC: Let's talk about your campaign manager, Donna Brazile's comment. She's the first African-American to manage a presidential campaign, and in a recent interview she said that Republicans use blacks like General Colin Powell--a former chairman, of course, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff--and Congressman J.W. Watts for photo-ops but don't really care about African-Americans.

Let me put on the screen exactly what she said: Republicans bring out Colin Powell and J.C. Watts because they have no program, no policy. They play the game because they have no love and no joy. They'd rather take pictures with black children than feed them.

Mr. Powell, I know--General Powell sent you a note saying he was offended and disappointed. He urged the campaign not to play the race card, saying it would hurt the cause of all children.

I know you spoke with General Powell. Did you apologize for those comments?

GORE: That was the spirit of the call. That word wasn't used. But I regretted the way he heard Donna's comments. She does a fantastic job.

COURIC: Do you agree with those comments?

GORE: Well, I agree that the Republican Party has not had an agenda that has been effective in lifting up the poor, the disadvantaged, and those who are African-American in our nation are disproportionately likely to be in those categories.

And I'm proud that my political party has always been in the forefront of trying to end discrimination, remove the barriers, and also to have an economic agenda that works.

But General Powell is an American hero, a personal friend.

And not only did I call him, Donna Brazile called him as well, and I have the highest respect for him.

COURIC: Do you regret her invoking the names of General Powell and J.C. Watts to get this point across?

GORE: I think that the point is a valid one, that there's a big difference between the agenda of the Democratic Party and the agenda of the Republican Party.

But I think that General Powell has joy and love and a determination to help young people. In fact, I have worked with him in his efforts to try to focus volunteer efforts around America to life up children of all incomes.

COURIC: In your efforts to court blacks and gays, are you worried at all, Mr. Vice President, that perhaps you've been a little too

strident in your efforts, and in the process are turning off many potential voters--supporters?

GORE: No, I think our nation is prepared to continue unfolding the American dream in the lives of all of our people. We've always been a brave people, willing to do things that have astonished the rest of the world--giving women the right to vote, freeing slaves--and saying we're all equal, we hold these truths to be self-evident.

And we understand their deeper number with more force and authority in each succeeding generation, and at the beginning of this ear it is time to move forward, and on that foundation, address major problems like the AIDS epidemic, which the United Nations Security Council is going to address for the very first time today.

COURIC: And that's something you're going to be talking about extensively, aren't you?

GORE: Yes, indeed. More people are predicted to die of the AIDS epidemic in the first decade of this new century than all of the people who were killed as soldiers in wars during all of the decades of the 20th century.

I'm going to be talking about a new security agenda to protect life and lift up the quality of life.

COURIC: Let's--speaking of foreign policy--talk for a moment about Elian Gonzalez, that 6-year-old Cuban boy. As you know, the INS has ruled that he should be returned to his father in Cuba. Would you like to see Janet Reno overturn that decision?

GORE: I'd like to see the dispute adjudicated in our courts where traditionally questions like ``what is best for this child" are decided.

COURIC: Hasn't the INS--hasn't the INS, though, Mr. Vice President, considered that as it's made its decision?

GORE: Well, not clear to me--not clear to me that they have the experience and expertise to really address a question like that.

And due process--which is one of our most basic principles--I think requires that a question like this be adjudicated by those who have the body of law that applies, those who have the experience in such cases.

And remember this, that this child's mother died in an effort to get her child freedom. And remember as well that the child's father has demonstrators paid by Castro chanting outside of his window.

And there's no evidence that he is expressing a sincere, genuine feeling about what is in his child's best interest. So here's how we should resolve it: Let him come to a place where he can speak freely and settle the matter.

That's what I--and in the absence of such a clear statement, then I think that the normal procedure for asking the central question--what is in the best interest of the child--should be followed.

COURIC: Do you think that it was appropriate to subpoena the 6-year-old boy to testify before Congress?

GORE: I'm not going to get into the business of the Congress. It's a co-equal branch of government and I just don't know what their prerogatives are. I'm interested in seeing this matter handled according to due process.

And nobody is saying that, you know, eventually the custody ought not go to the father. But let's do that according to a way that respects our laws and respects the guarantees of freedom. That's what's at

stake here.

COURIC: And quickly, Mr. Vice President, how will you get the United States or the people in this country to care deeply about the situation regarding AIDS in Africa?

GORE: It is a horrendous tragedy that is not only creating 10 million orphans but it is now sweeping across borders and threatening the security of entire nations.

And as we begin this new millennium, new century, with U.S. leadership of the world, we have an obligation to think about security, not just in terms of wars and the kind of conflicts that dominated the last century--that's still central to our concerns--but we have to look at the new security agenda, including these diseases.

And not only AIDS. Some of the new bacteria are defying antibiotics.

We have to look at the global environmental challenges, and we have to look at the problem of terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

And I think that it's a start that after 4,000 meetings of the UN Security Council, this is the first one that addresses a health issue and an issue on the new security agenda that I'll be putting forward at the UN today.

COURIC: All right. Vice President Al Gore.

Mr. Vice President, again, thanks so much for coming by.

GORE: My pleasure.

COURIC: Appreciate it.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric P. Liu (CN=Eric P. Liu/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 13:29:51.00

SUBJECT: Re: School Safety announcement

TO: Bethany Little (CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

no problem. apparently vp was getting hit hard on the gays in the military question, so it would have been hard to get it out. that's what you were calling about yesterday, right? (i have to steal away 40 winks whenever olivia has a weekend nap)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> (Slate Magazine <delivery_morning@slate.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 07:53:29.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

TO: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

--today's papers: Grunts' Groans

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.
<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Grunts' Groans

By Scott Shuger

USAT leads with the Clinton administration's proposal for establishing a nationwide computer system for rapidly tracking the course of infectious diseases like the flu and hepatitis C. The NYT lead also connects medicine and cyberspace with a report that the rise of Americans' online pharmaceutical purchases via foreign-based Web sites has led to record levels of illegal drug imports, judging from the latest figures on Customs Service seizures of imported drugs in 1999, which ran about 4.5 times higher than 1998. The LAT leads with good news about Medicare: the implementation of the DOJ's campaign against fraudulent claims, combined with the low inflation rate, has kept spending in the 25-year-old program to its lowest growth rate ever. The WP goes with a private study of the attitudes of members of the U.S. military. Main findings of the worldwide survey of 12,000: the

service members feel overworked and underpaid, feel that they don't have enough resources to carry out their assignments, and lack confidence in their leaders. But according to the survey, they still have a deep commitment to military service. By the way, the Post reports that the issue of gays in the military was hardly ever mentioned by the service members. The military study is the off-lead at USAT and is fronted at the LAT. It runs inside at the NYT. (To see that the U.S. military isn't the only one with big problems, check out <http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>.)

The USAT lead explains the need to replace the current patchwork paper-and-pencil-and-phone disease reporting system: 35 new infectious diseases have been identified since 1973, while some older ones have been reincarnated as drug-resistant superbugs.

The NYT lead points out that the FDA advises consumers not to purchase meds from foreign sites because they will generally be illegal (because, for instance, they're not labeled properly or don't meet purity standards), but adds that usually the government doesn't bother folks ordering small amounts (up to 3 months' worth) for their own use.

The LAT puts the Medicare news in perspective by stating that the cost of health care spending by business and individuals was up 6.9%. An inside WP AP dispatch has that figure and the Medicare one. But the story also states, in contrast to the fiscal optimism expressed high up by the LAT, that Medicare costs are not expected to continue to drop, once boomers begin to attain eligibility in large numbers.

A wild but true crime tale unfolds in the NYT's off-lead. Somebody has tried to extort \$100,000 from online music retailer CD Universe by threatening to release some of the company's more than 300,000 customer credit card files. Because the company wouldn't comply, says the Times, the intruder has released some of the card numbers on the Internet and claims to have used some for himself. The paper points out that the episode is apt to rekindle consumer concerns about online credit card security. Also, since the jerkball's email trail leads to Eastern Europe, the case stands to highlight the freedom online criminals have to operate beyond U.S. jurisdiction.

The NYT and WSJ report that on Sunday, General Motors announced an alliance with AOL and Ford announced one with Yahoo. Both deals will allow car buyers and owners to register to receive model-specific email from the manufacturers and dealers covering everything from oil changes to rebates. The Journal account adds that the deals are intended to include Internet access for owners from their cars as well.

Citing a report in London's Sunday Times, inside stories at the WP and NYT report that British officials say they've caught Libya trying to smuggle Scud missile parts through London's Gatwick airport. The contretemps comes just after the two countries

reestablished diplomatic relations.

The WSJ fronts a detailed feature about a type of worker increasingly common in the modern office: a company Internet snoop, who spends his days checking to see where other workers go on the Web. The story shows one such snoop reading the (deleted) emails of a former employee. At the company in question, online access to sites with any nudity is barred, but those about racism, extremism, violence and profanity, and sports are okay. Other types of URLs frowned upon are music downloading sites and online investment services. The story never questions the fundamental assumption of the snoopers: namely that companies should be able to control their employees' Web access. Now clearly, they have the right to, but the story might have considered whether this is wise from a productivity point of view. It's the wage-slave mentality that judges workplace performance by input, by the number of hours worked, say. The enlightened view of how to manage people is to judge them by their *output* instead. So why should a company care where an employee surfs as long as he/she is productive? Who knows--maybe those "irrelevant" visits stimulate the creativity that's behind the employee's next big idea.

A letter to the WP makes a gimlet observation about the recent upward economic drift of journalism. The missive notes that the paper recently characterized Hillary Clinton's recent move into her new house "as a seemingly typical move on a seemingly typical day, except for the 10 TV cameras...." The writer goes on to point out that ahem, this was a \$1.7 million home HRC was moving into. Typical perhaps for a Post editor or executive but...

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>

Saint Boris

<http://www.slate.com/InterNatPapers/00-01-07/InterNatPapers.asp>

The Russian Military

<http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>

McCain Knocks Himself Out

http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-07_68393.asp

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is GOP presidential politics, including John McCain's FCC letter and Bush's tax plan. Issue 2 is Democratic presidential politics, including Al Gore and Bill Bradley's promise to allow open gays in the military.

Most pundits agree that the revelation of John McCain's influence-peddling letter to the FCC has hurt his campaign, although several--including Paul Gigot (PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) and Tucker Carlson (CNN's Late Edition)--think that McCain is just defending his constituents, as he was elected to do. Pundits disagree on Bush's sweeping tax-cut proposal. Joe Klein (NBC's Meet the Press) notes that the cut is bigger than the Congressional GOP's (doomed) proposal last fall, and Al Hunt (CNN's Capital Gang) and David Broder (PBS's Washington Week in Review) think that New Hampshire voters care more about schools and health care than taxes. Mark Shields (NewsHour) remarks that Jack Kemp's aggressive tax-cutting campaign strategy didn't work in the 1988 GOP primary, but his colleague, Gigot, responds that McCain's moderate tax apes the failed electoral strategies of George Bush (in 1980) and Bob Dole (in 1988). Appearing on Meet the Press, Rep. Lindsey Graham, R.-S.C., a McCain supporter, thinks that McCain's critique that Bush's tax plan as too large is not working. John McLaughlin, Lawrence Kudlow, and Jim Warren (all of PBS's McLaughlin Group) enthuse over Bush's recent debate performances.

Many pundits--including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)--think that Gore's aggressive stance on gays-in-the-military will hurt him in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to the issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive order that overturns "don't ask-don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

Miscellany: John McLaughlin, Jim Warren, and Eleanor Clift (all of

the McLaughlin Group) call the new rule barring presidential candidates with less-than-15-percent support from general-election debates "undemocratic," and argue that any party qualifying for federal matching funds should get to participate. Appearing on Fox, Bill Bradley also voices disagreement with the new rule, saying that the Reform Party has a "strong case" that it should be included in the debates. Appearing on CBS's Face the Nation, Gov. Jesse Ventura, Ref.-Minn., notes that he had only 10-percent support when he debated Minnesota's Democratic and Republican candidates for governor; six weeks later he won the election with 37 percent. ? Appearing on Friday's Larry King Live (CNN), both Bob and Elizabeth Dole say that the general election will be close, and not a blowout by Bush. Appearing with his wife again on This Week, Bob Dole predicts that Bush will win the nomination (although he still will not endorse him). Steve Roberts opines that although Mrs. Dole has proved to be an awful presidential campaigner, her popularity among women will be hard for Bush to resist when he selects his running mate. ? When Elizabeth Dole praises Bush's "executive experience" on This Week, Sam Donaldson points out that her own husband had no such experience when he ran for president.

Last Word

"Look, I've always had two principles. One is make bureaucracies react on behalf of the taxpayers, and second, do whatever I can to increase competition and lower costs in telecommunications. Those are the guiding principles I've had. Today, we are asking the federal government to release all correspondence that I've had with every government agency. But finally, let me remind you, I'm the chairman of the committee that is designated by the Congress to oversight [sic] the FCC. And it's my responsibility to try to see and make them act. And so I believe that the record will be clear that I've done that on behalf of the consumer."

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

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_afternoon@slate.com> (Slate Magazine <delivery_afternoon@slate.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 15:24:02.00

SUBJECT: SLATE POLITICS: frame game--Question the Question; pundit central--McCain's Glass House

TO: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE POLITICS: Tues, Jan. 11, 2000

--frame game: Question the Question

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

frame game

Question the Question

By William Saletan

In the first five minutes of Friday's Republican presidential debate in South Carolina, three of the six candidates refused to answer questions as posed. They rephrased queries, rejected scenarios, and chose options other than those offered by the moderators. When politicians revise questions this way, as they do with increasing frequency, journalists accuse them of "ducking." But if someone swings a bottle at your head, what's wrong with ducking? If the answer is fair game for scrutiny and dispute, why isn't the question?

Think about how politicians manipulate discussions of issues. They insert hidden assumptions to rig the dialogue in their favor. They narrow the range of options under discussion to force their opponents into embarrassing dilemmas. They frame lopsided yes/no questions and squelch attempts to articulate a middle ground. When reporters use these tactics, why shouldn't they, too, be called to account? That's what the Republicans did Friday. For every artfully framed question, they demonstrated a way to escape and counterframe it.

1. Reject the premise. The first question of the debate went to Alan Keyes. "If you had a choice between eight more years of a Democratic president or eight years of a pro-choice Republican," asked co-moderator David Stanton of WIS-TV, "which would you choose?" Keyes replied, "I don't think that has to be our choice. ?

We have to choose to stand forthrightly for the pro-life position.
? So your hypothetical is of no matter to me. We will not face that alternative."

A hypothetical question is no more important than the likelihood of the scenario it assumes. Imagine that Al Gore were asked to choose between a Republican president and a pro-life Democrat who had pledged to appoint Supreme Court justices who would overturn *Roe vs. Wade*. Since no leading Democratic presidential candidate is pro-life, Gore could reasonably dismiss the question, arguing that the Democratic Party is too principled to nominate a pro-lifer. Why can't Keyes make the converse argument about the GOP?

2. Add an option. The third question of the debate went to Gary Bauer. Stanton asked, "If someone in your family was raped and became pregnant and wanted an abortion, and at the discussion with you they were adamant in their decision to have an abortion, would you support that decision? Or would you try to prevent it?" Bauer replied, "If my daughter or somebody that I loved was raped, that would be the most horrible thing. ? I would comfort her. I would pray with her. I would explain to her that she couldn't make right the terrible thing that had happened to her by taking the life of her innocent unborn child. But the most important thing, sir, is not what I would do under those circumstances, but what I would do as president. And as president I would throw rapists in jail for a long time so America's women wouldn't have to worry about it."

The question is designed to make Bauer choose between two terrible answers: hypocrisy (he'd allow the abortion because the woman is in his family) or cruelty (he'd force the victim to suffer the lifelong consequences of her rape). In his answer, Bauer begins by amending what he deems the less awful of the two options: He wouldn't just "prevent" the abortion, he would "comfort" and counsel the woman. Then Bauer steps outside the two-option scenario forced on him and argues for a third option, which he claims would prevent the scenario. The efficacy of the third option can be debated. But until Bauer enlarged the question, this option wasn't even on the table.

3. Choose a process, not a position. The fourth question went to George W. Bush. "A few blocks from here, on top of the state Capitol building, the Confederate flag flies with the state flag and the U.S. flag," said co-moderator Brian Williams of NBC. "The question is: Does the flag offend you personally?" Bush replied, "What you're trying to get me to do is to express the will of the people of South Carolina." Williams persisted, "No, I'm asking you about your personal opinion." Bush elaborated, "I don't believe it's the role of someone from outside South Carolina ? to come into this state and tell the people of South Carolina what to do with their business when it comes to the flag." Williams repeated, "As an American citizen, do you have a visceral reaction to seeing the Confederate flag?" And Bush concluded, "As an American citizen, I trust the people of South Carolina to make the decision for South Carolina."

The prolonged exchange made Bush look evasive, and he was criticized afterward for dodging the question. But why is Williams' formulation of the issue better than Bush's? Suppose Williams were to ask Bill Bradley, "A few blocks from here, women are walking into a clinic every day and receiving abortions. Does abortion offend you personally?" And suppose Bradley were to reply, "I don't believe it's the role of a politician to go into that clinic and tell those women what to do with their bodies. I trust the women of South Carolina to make that decision." Most people would agree that the process Bradley is endorsing (let the woman decide) is more relevant than his "visceral reaction" as to whether abortion "offends him personally." Why can't Bush make the same argument?

4. Insert a caveat. Halfway through the debate, Williams announced "a brief phase of short questions and rapid-fire answers. ? We will settle for one to two sentences in length, if you must. ? All gentlemen will answer this first question. Has affirmative action made America a better nation?" McCain answered first: "Yes, but quotas have made it worse." Bauer answered second: "The idea behind affirmative action was legitimate and decent. But when you start counting by race, you divide America, you don't bring it together." Bush answered third: "Only if affirmative action means equal opportunity for everybody."

The question seems to demand a yes/no answer. Instead, the candidates reply with "but" and "only if." This kind of qualification is often ridiculed as evasiveness by those who demand "no ifs, ands, or buts." But why is a policy of ifs and buts worse than a policy of no ifs and buts? Most people prefer a morality of ifs and buts, and most real-life laws and regulations are riddled with ifs and buts. Affirmative action in particular cries out for such moral and legal nuance. What voters really needed from the candidates on this question were longer answers, not shorter ones. For example, what does Bush mean by "equal opportunity"?

5. Change the question. By the time the affirmative action question got to the sixth candidate, Keyes, it was being completely rewritten. "It may be more important to ask whether it's helped the people it was supposed to help," he began. "And I think it has actually hurt them by damaging the reputation of many minorities in this country and not giving them credit for their real achievements."

Keyes' answer didn't precisely address the question, but which was more interesting and enlightening? When the question is more specific than the answer, a candidate can be accused of evasion. But what's wrong with an answer that's more specific than the question? Keyes wasn't ducking the pitch. He was tossing back a weak, hanging slider and demanding a fastball so he could hit it harder.

6. Reject the topic. A few minutes later, Stephanie Trotter, a local NBC reporter, asked the candidates, "Gentlemen, I'm curious.

As an adult, what is the biggest mistake that you've made, and what lesson did you learn from it?" The crowd booed, and when Trotter was asked to repeat the question, she rephrased it: "Our viewers are curious. On a personal note, what is the biggest mistake you made as an adult, and what lesson did you learn from it?"

Others answered the question, but Keyes stuffed it. "The biggest mistake I might make as an adult would be to treat that as if it's a question that is appropriate to be asked," he said. "There ought to be in our public life a certain decorum, a certain dignity. There are things that I'll tell my priest in the confessional that I will not tell you or any other American." However, Keyes added, "In terms of what I think we believe to be relevant for the purposes of running for president ? maybe the biggest mistake I had made in my public life ? was not to have spoken out on the issue of the right of the unborn before I did."

Keyes overreacted, but his answer illustrated three lessons. First, sometimes the propriety or significance of a question is a more important and instructive topic than the question itself. Whether the question was improper can be debated--as it turned out, Keyes' comments about his "mistake" on abortion were more interesting than his comments about the question--but viewers benefited from considering both.

Second, challenging questions is a healthy way to hold the press accountable. Questions are instruments of power. Who gets to choose them? Notice how Trotter changed her question after the crowd booed her. First she said, "I'm curious." Then she said, "Our viewers are curious." Obligated to account for her question, she appealed to the notion of a popular mandate. Whether her station's viewers wanted her to ask that question can be checked. What questions should be asked, why they should be asked, and who gets to choose them are now open subjects for scrutiny.

Third, even if the question was really about Keyes' public life, he ended up answering it. Believing that it was framed too personally, he didn't just dismiss it. He reframed it the way he thought it should have been asked, and he answered it. Questions don't have to be answered with a yes or no. Neither does the question of whether to answer them.

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said: http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-10_68641.asp

Also in today's Slate <http://www.slate.com>

Free Jim Cramer!

<http://www.slate.com/code/PressBox/PressBox.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4348>

Debate Cocktail Chatter

The Politics of Masochism

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is GOP presidential politics, including John McCain's FCC letter and Bush's tax-cut plan. Issue 2 is Democratic presidential politics, including Al Gore and Bill Bradley's promise to allow open gays in the military.

Most pundits agree that the revelation of John McCain's influence-peddling letter to the FCC has hurt his campaign, although several--including Paul Gigot (PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) and Tucker Carlson (CNN's Late Edition)--think that McCain is just defending his constituents, as he was elected to do. Pundits disagree on Bush's sweeping tax-cut proposal. Joe Klein (NBC's Meet the Press) notes that the cut is bigger than the congressional GOP's (doomed) proposal last fall, and Al Hunt (CNN's Capital Gang) and David Broder (PBS's Washington Week in Review) think that New Hampshire voters care more about schools and health care than taxes. Mark Shields (NewsHour) remarks that Jack Kemp's aggressive tax-cutting campaign strategy didn't work in the 1988 GOP primary, but his colleague, Gigot, responds that McCain's emphasis on tax-cut moderation apes the failed electoral strategies of George Bush (in 1980) and Bob Dole (in 1988). On Meet the Press, Rep. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a McCain supporter, thinks that McCain's critique that Bush's tax plan as too large is not working. John McLaughlin, Lawrence Kudlow, and Jim Warren (all of PBS's McLaughlin Group) enthuse over Bush's recent debate performances.

Many pundits--including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)--think that Gore's and Bradley's outspoken advocacy of gays in the military will hurt them in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to this issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive order that overturns "don't ask, don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and

condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the Democratic nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

Miscellany: John McLaughlin, Jim Warren, and Eleanor Clift (of the McLaughlin Group) call the new criterion for participating in general-election presidential debates "undemocratic." (A participant must have at least 15 percent support in five national polls.) They argue that any party qualifying for federal matching funds should get to participate. On Fox News Sunday, Bill Bradley also voices disagreement with the rule, saying that the Reform Party has a "strong case" that it should be included in the debates, even without 15 percent support. On CBS's Face the Nation, Gov. Jesse Ventura, Ref.-Minn., notes that he had only 10 percent support when he debated Minnesota's Democratic and Republican candidates for governor; six weeks later he won the election with 37 percent. ... On Friday's Larry King Live (CNN), both Bob and Elizabeth Dole say that the general election will be close, not a blowout by Bush. Appearing with his wife again on This Week, Bob Dole predicts that Bush will win the nomination (although he still will not endorse him). Steve Roberts opines that although Mrs. Dole has proved to be an awful presidential campaigner, her popularity among women will be hard for Bush to resist when he selects his running mate. ... When Elizabeth Dole praises Bush's "executive experience" on This Week, Sam Donaldson points out that her own husband had no such experience when he ran for president.

Last Word

Look, I've always had two principles. One is make bureaucracies react on behalf of the taxpayers, and second, do whatever I can to increase competition and lower costs in telecommunications. Those are the guiding principles I've had. Today, we are asking the federal government to release all correspondence that I've had with every government agency. But finally, let me remind you, I'm the chairman of the committee that is designated by the Congress to oversight [sic] the FCC. And it's my responsibility to try to see and make them act. And so I believe that the record will be clear that I've done that on behalf of the consumer.

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

Highlights from the Fray:

1. Was I the only one who found Bob Shrum defending Al Gore on Meet the Press an absolute disaster? Schrum looked like he'd just left a barroom brawl and wanted to continue the fisticuffs with Russert and poor Congressman Nadler.
2. John McCain will probably now be called "former" media darling. The FCC flap put a bit of blood in the water. Defenders of McCain's actions sounded tepid and now other McCain policy weaknesses are

suddenly being talked about.

3. If This Week thinks that dropping Bill Kristol is helping their show, they need to think again. Even though they never gave him much airtime, he was an insightful, dispassionate observer. Of all the former active political partisans turned talking head, Republican and Democrat alike, Kristol seemed to have the best understanding of the "other" party's internal mechanics. He never seemed to color his opinions about Democrats to fit a pro-Republican agenda. I hope he resurfaces somewhere. Yesterday's This Week panel discussion was absolutely vacuous.

--Will

Will,

I agree about Bob Shrum--he looked idiotic, not just because he was trying to make $1+1=3$, but because he was so insistent about such a minor goof. (See "Kausfiles" for more on Shrum's Sunday appearance.)

I agree about Kristol, too. I think This Week just didn't want two conservatives on the show, and George F. Will had seniority.

--Michael Brus

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said:

<http://www.slate.com/Code/PunditCentral/PunditCentral.asp?Show=1/9/00&idMes sage=4338>

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 09:40:05.00

SUBJECT: CNN Crossfire, January 10, 2000

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

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 [UNKNOWN])
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 10, 2000 - 5:00 p.m. ET

McCain Strengthens Talk on Taxes; Early Primaries Likely
to Shape Voter Expectations; Moderators Usurp Spotlights
at Presidential Debates

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE:
Perhaps we need to, say, quote Regis to Senator McCain

and say, Mr.

Senator, is this your final tax plan?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

as the
FRANK SESNO, CNN ANCHOR: The McCain tax plan is in play
Republican version of "who wants to be president?" moves
to Michigan.

Also ahead...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

Gore!
UNIDENTIFIED MALE: One, two, three, four, we love Al

(END VIDEO CLIP)

the Democratic
SESNO: Candidates in the corn -- we'll have an update on
race in Iowa and the expectations game there.

Plus...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

flurry
HOWARD KURTZ, CNN MEDIA ANALYST (voice-over): In the
of debates in recent weeks, the personality of the
moderator has often
shaped the tone of the encounter.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

real stars of
SESNO: Media reporter Howard Kurtz wonders who are the
the presidential debates.

with Judy
ANNOUNCER: From Washington, this is INSIDE POLITICS,
Woodruff and Bernard Shaw.

sitting in today
SESNO: Thanks very much for joining us. I'm Frank Sesno,
for Bernie and Judy.

and what
We begin with the presidential battleground of Michigan
Republicans hope to gain during their debate there
tonight. State GOP
leaders are billing the February 22 primary as the one
that "clinches the
nomination or blows the race wide open." At the very
least, Michigan is a
state where George W. Bush may be feeling less secure
about his lead.

That is because, as CNN's Bruce Morton reports, John McCain has been coming on somewhat stronger in the polls and on the subject of taxes.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: On the issue of tax cuts, lower and middle-income Americans deserve tax returns breaks. They deserve to get a lot more money back.

BRUCE MORTON, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): John McCain, at a town meeting in Holland, Michigan, talked taxes, a subject he and George W. Bush disagree about, a subject on which McCain plans a major speech this week. The Arizona senator trails here partly because popular three-term Governor John Engler has endorsed Bush. State chair Betsy De Vos says Engler's endorsement matters.

BETSY DE VOS, MICHIGAN GOP CHAIRWOMAN: He has clearly been a very strong leader and will leave his mark in many, many ways beyond his term as governor. So his support for a candidate or for an issue is particularly influential.

MORTON: Still, McCain has gained some ground on Bush.

ED GOLDER, POLITICAL REPORTER, "GRAND RAPIDS PRESS": He has been way ahead in the polls, but there is an insurgent McCain coming up on him quickly, and I think that's one of the reasons that Governor Bush decided to attend this debate after weeks of saying that he wouldn't.

MORTON: Both McCain and Bush are running TV ads here.

DE VOS: I probably have seen four of the Bush ads to one of the McCain ads so far.

MORTON: Down the road in Wyoming, Michigan, Steve Forbes got a warm reception from an audience of home-schooled children and their parents.

STEVE FORBES (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Life, I believe, begins at conception and should end only at natural death.

(APPLAUSE)

GOLDER: There is a Forbes campaign, and it's -- it hasn't done an awful lot of good. I mean, he's got an organization in Michigan, but he hasn't done very well.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

MORTON: Is Michigan a battleground? Well, that depends on what happens in the earlier states. Texas Governor Bush arrived here not very long ago and a reporter asked him, "Is this a fire wall for you if you do badly in the early states in New Hampshire and South Carolina?" Bush said, "I don't accept that premise. I'm going to do well in those states." In fact, were Bush to win decisive victories in New Hampshire, South Carolina, it would probably be all over by the time it gets here. If John McCain wins, or holds them close, then Michigan becomes a very important battleground -- Frank.

SESNO: Bruce Morton in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

In the Democratic race, Bill Bradley continued to campaign in Iowa today, following his debate there with Al Gore over the weekend.

CNN's Jonathan Karl has the latest on Bradley's bid to gain more ground in Iowa exactly two weeks before the caucuses there.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JONATHAN KARL, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): For Bill Bradley, the full-court press is on. It's not quite a sprint, but he is working his way through cities and towns throughout Iowa.

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I'm running against somebody called Al Gore. You ever hear of Al Gore?

KARL: Monday's theme is education. Bradley stopped by schools in the towns of Atlantic, Exira and Carroll.

BRADLEY: And for me the most important thing to put a great, qualified teacher in every classroom in this country. And so what I am suggesting is that we put 600,000 great new teachers in classrooms across this country.

KARL: On education, Bradley sounds a lot like his rival Al Gore. Both emphasize early childhood development and after-school programs and the need for more teachers. Both want to dip into the surplus to spend about \$100 billion on new initiatives.

Agriculture, though, is emerging as the battleground issue in Iowa, as Bradley is relentlessly hammered by Al Gore on his voting record on farm issues in the Senate. Over the weekend, Bradley started firing back.

BRADLEY: There is no credibility for Al Gore to come to Iowa and say, I'll help family farmers. Because the last seven years, there's been zero help for family farmers from this administration.

KARL: Bradley thinks Gore is especially vulnerable on agriculture. The campaign is citing government statistics to show how Iowa farmers have suffered under the Clinton-Gore administration, as commodity prices and farm income have plummeted. Bradley blames Gore for the collapse of the farm economy, even as he says the vice president deserves no credit for the economic boom elsewhere.

(on camera): But if he doesn't deserve credit for the economy, why does he deserve blame for what has happened to the family farmers? BRADLEY: Because you tell me one suggestion he made since 1992 or since 1996 to provide a safety net for family farmers, just one suggestion and you know, you won't find any.

KARL (voice-over): Speaking in Des Moines, Iowa, Senator and Gore supporter Tom Harkin shot back.

SEN. TOM HARKIN (D), IOWA: When it comes to things that matter economically to farmers and the rural people of Iowa, Al Gore has always been there with us, and quite frankly Senator Bradley has a pattern of voting against those interests.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

KARL: The same polls that show Al Gore with a commanding double-digit lead here in Iowa show that more than half of likely Democratic caucus-goers say they could change their minds, and that's a potential opening for Bill Bradley -- Frank.

SESNO: Jonathan, we heard Bill Bradley there being very critical of the Bush -- sorry -- of the Clinton administration on the subject of agricultural support. What exactly does Bradley himself offer by way of a program?

KARL: Well, Bradley talks about a fundamental shift in agriculture policy. Taking money, federal aid away from big corporate farms and moving it toward smaller family farms. His proposals, though, are a little bit short on specifics over exactly how he would accomplish that -- Frank.

SESNO: Or the price tag?

KARL: Or the price tag.

SESNO: All right. John Karl, more details to follow, thanks very much.

In New Hampshire, the Democratic contest is much closer. A new "Boston Globe" survey of likely Democratic primary voters shows Bradley and Gore still neck and neck. An American Research Group survey shows Bradley with a slight lead. On the Republican side, "The Boston Globe" survey shows Bush three points behind McCain. But McCain has

lost some ground
since last month. The American Research Group poll also
suggests
McCain's surge in New Hampshire has stalled.

Polls from the states that hold early primary season
contests are helping to
shape expectations in campaign 2000. So are pundits,
such as our Bill
Schneider.

Bill, shame on you.

(LAUGHTER)

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL ANALYST:
Well, Frank, we're going to talk about "great
expectations," even though this
is not "Masterpiece Theater." Every race includes a
phantom contender
called expected.

It's not enough for a candidate to win. The candidate
has to do better than
expected. If the candidate wins, but does worse than
expected, it's a
setback. Now, who defines what's expected? The polls,
the pundits and the
talking heads. The campaigns try to influence
expectations by low-balling
them. That way, anything they get is better than
expected.

Now, with the early contests just a few weeks away, it's
now time to play
the expectations game.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

SCHNEIDER (voice-over): First, the Democrats. What's
expected in Iowa
on January 24? A solid win for Gore. What if Bradley
comes in a close
second? Then Bradley has done better than expected and
gets a boost going
into New Hampshire. How close is close? A five- point
victory for Gore is
close. A 20 point victory is not. In between can be spun
either way. And in
New Hampshire, February 1? Listen to the Democrats try
to spin
expectation.

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: In New

Hampshire, the polls say that you are ahead. I'm asking people to give me a come from behind upset victory here.

BRADLEY: Your underdog pitch brings tears to my eyes.

(LAUGHTER)

Gore: Well, I hope that my upset victory brings tears to your eyes on February 1.

SCHNEIDER: What's actually expected for the Democrats in New Hampshire? Bradley wins, then he becomes a contender, he's beaten the vice president at least in one state. The race goes on. What if Gore wins? The race is over. The empire has struck back. If Bradley can't win New Hampshire, where he's campaigned the hardest and where conditions are most favorable, he's out.

Now the Republicans. What's expected in Iowa? A solid win for Bush with Steve Forbes second and John McCain, who's not campaigning in Iowa, way back. What if Bush wins narrowly in Iowa, say, 10 points or less? That's a setback for the front-runner, trouble going into New Hampshire. If Forbes is a close second to Bush, he gets a big boost out of Iowa and suddenly becomes a serious contender. What if McCain beats the odds and comes in second or third in Iowa with no campaign? Then he gets the big mow.

What's expected in New Hampshire? McCain wins, same deal as for Bradley. McCain becomes a contender and the race goes on.

What if Bush wins New Hampshire? McCain is out. But Bush may not be home-free, because the Republicans have other contenders. If Forbes or Bauer runs a decent second to Bush in New Hampshire, then Bush may still have to fend off a serious challenge from the right. The race goes on. (END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHNEIDER: Outsiders like Bradley and McCain are expected to do well in New Hampshire. You know, this is the state that gave us Eugene McCarthy. Jimmy Carter, Gary Hart, Pat Buchanan. New Hampshire is the political equivalent of Roswell, New Mexico. Aliens land there. The question is can they survive anywhere else. California is the next big test for both parties on March 7th, and Californians have always been attracted to aliens.

But first, McCain will have to survive some tough tests in South Carolina, where he's depending on the veterans' vote, and in Arizona, where his own constituents could finish him off.

SESNO: All of a sudden the expectations are going to have to track with you next time. We'll see how you do.

Hey, what are the expectations for Gary Bauer and Steve Forbes, to take two particulars?

SCHNEIDER: Well, Frank, Forbes is expected to do better right now than Bauer because he has more money. Remember what happened when Pat Buchanan beat Phil Gramm in Iowa in 1996? Gramm was out and Buchanan became the champion of social conservatives. Same thing would happen this time if Gary Bauer beats Forbes in Iowa. Then Forbes is finished and Bauer becomes the champion of social conservatives. And so what? The right is not expected to be a major force in this campaign. Ah-hah. That means expectation for Bauer and Forbes are very low in New Hampshire. If either one of them does better than expected, the right suddenly becomes a force.

SESNO: Makes perfect sense. Bill Schneider, thanks very much -- appreciate it.

Well, we're going to talk some more about expectations and the early contests in Iowa and New Hampshire.

For that we bring in David Nyhan of "The Boston Globe"
and David Yepsen
of "The Des Moines Register."

Gentlemen, welcome to you both.

DAVID YEPSSEN, "THE DES MOINES REGISTER": Hi, Frank.

SESNO: Great to see you.

David Nyhan, let's start with you.

Expectations from ground zero where you are? First the
Republicans?

DAVID NYHAN, "THE BOSTON GLOBE": McCain has to win New
Hampshire to stay alive with any chance for the
nomination. He has been
ahead of Bush marginally up here until recently. Both
Bradley and McCain
were ahead here, but the institutional organizations of
Senator Judd Gregg
on behalf of Bush and on Governor Jeanne Shaheen on
behalf of Gore I
think make it a little tougher for the two challengers.

SESNO: Well, let's talk Republicans for just a minute.
Do you feel things
changing there? Do you see them changing? We mentioned
some of those
polls.

NYHAN: Yes, Bush had his best week in New Hampshire last
week. He
had a strong performance in the Manchester Republican
debate. Things are
coming together for him. And John McCain has been set
back a little, been
on the defensive because of the furor over the letters
that he wrote as the
Senate Commerce Committee chairman on behalf of
contributors.

SESNO: So that's actually had some impact where you are?

NYHAN: I think so. And I think you just get the feeling
that the Bush
momentum, which is so overwhelming elsewhere, is
starting to kick in New
Hampshire as well.

SESNO: David Yepsen, different calculus where you are
because of

McCain's lack of meaningful organization and competition where you are.

But do you see any dynamic shifting here?

YEPSEN: Well, we're only a couple of weeks away -- it's always easy to say it's too early -- but Governor Bush is way ahead here. He's got a lot of the institutional pieces of the Republican Party out here who are with him, and the polls show he's way ahead. But his people are worried about complacency, they're worried about getting people out on caucus night to go vote. When you're way ahead in the polls, then your people start to sit on their hands. So I could tell you that the Bush campaign is worried about getting some of the grassroots work done.

The second thing, the dynamic that's at work here is in the Forbes campaign. Iowa is really do or die for Steve Forbes. He's got nothing going in the polls in New Hampshire. He's in second place here in Iowa. He hasn't been here much. He's planning to come back later this week to do a big bus tour to try to gin something up here in the end. So we're keeping an eye on Steve Forbes to see whether he can rekindle some of the sparks that he had earlier in the campaign.

SESNO: David Nyhan, what about Steve Forbes in New Hampshire?

NYHAN: If he does well, if he does a reasonably strong second in Iowa, that will help him in New Hampshire and it will hurt John McCain, I think. Forbes has not been a factor, even though he's been running ads lately in New Hampshire criticizing Bush on the tax front. Interestingly, the Bush people tried a preemptive strike, and for three weeks they've been running an ad daily in New Hampshire in which Bush promises tax cuts. So they think they've inoculated themselves. The Bush people think they've inoculated themselves against this. But if Forbes does well out in "Yepsen country," which is what we call it here, in Iowa, then

that will help Forbes in
New Hampshire.

SESNO: Well let's go back out to Yepsen country for a
minute -- you're on
the railroads, too, I guess, David. That's not bad.

YEPSEN: Right, right.

SESNO: The agricultural issues seem to be some of the
issues around which
the Democratic campaigns are crystallizing their debate.
What's the impact
there?

YEPSEN: Well, I think it has some impact. The Bradley
campaign is trying
to capitalize on the world of hurt that exists in rural
America. The rest of the
country's in an economic boom, Frank, but they're not in
rural America, and
so Senator Bradley is out here in small Iowa towns today
campaigning hard.

His people are trying to develop something of a rural
strategy to pick up
some votes against Al Gore, arguing that it's the
Clinton-Gore administration
who's been there for seven years. And, as Senator
Bradley asked in the
debate, are you better off today than you were seven
years ago? I tell you,
it's got the Gore people a little bit worried.

SESNO: But the Gore people are also striking back. And
the Gore people
are saying that what's Bill Bradley going to do for
agriculture? Any traction
to that?

YEPSEN: That's right, and there may be some. I mean,
Senator Bradley
comes from an urban state. He doesn't have the greatest
voting record on ag
issues. Frankly, Frank, maybe too much is being made out
of this ag
business out here. If you look at who these caucus-goers
are -- I know
Iowa is a farm state -- but the most Democratic
caucus-goers are not in
agriculture or have jobs tied to agriculture. They're
doing other things. And
so while we're having this little spat right now over
here over agriculture, I
think a lot of other dynamics and factors are going to

be at work in the
outcome on caucus night.

SESNO: OK, from Yepsen country back to Nyhan country for
a minute,
what is developing on the right there in New Hampshire?
We heard David
talking a moment ago about Gary Bauer and Steve Forbes
and the
conservative right. What about in New Hampshire?

NYHAN: Well, the absence of Pat Buchanan as a factor --
remember,
Frank, Buchanan won here four years ago -- and the
decline of the
"Manchester Union Leader" as the right-wing trend setter
or standard bearer
in the journalism scene means that the conservatives
have less going for them
in New Hampshire than in any previous primary I can
recall. Their issues --
guns, crimes -- are not big issues here. And the fact
that we have a
moderate Democratic governor in Jeanne Shaheen and a
relatively moderate
congressional delegation -- if you take out Senator Bob
Smith, who was
himself briefly a candidate and then went off the
right-wing edge somewhere
-- means that this is -- it's going to be a moderate
year in the Republican
primary. And that helps Bush tremendously.

SESNO: David Nyhan, David Yepsen, both of you from your
respective
countries, we thank you very much for your time today.
Appreciate it, great
to see you both as always.

YEPSEN: Thanks, Frank.

SESNO: Thank you. And later on INSIDE POLITICS, Al Gore
at the
United Nations. Was his announcement there a campaign
pitch, too?

And up next:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JOHN KING, CNN WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):
Between prayers and hymns, many pastors work in a little
plug for politics.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: John King on the influence of Christian conservatives in the Iowa caucuses.

This is INSIDE POLITICS.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SESNO: In Iowa, especially in the weeks before the presidential caucuses, it can sometimes be difficult to tell the difference between a Sunday church service and a campaign event.

CNN's John King looks at the role of Christian conservatives in the Iowa contest and the GOP candidates who are trying to win them over.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KING (voice-over): The special guest is presidential hopeful Gary Bauer, here not for an endorsement, but a blessing.

REV. NOEL WILCOX, MOLINE GOSPEL TEMPLE: But our prayer as a church today is that he, wherever he goes, will continue to hold up Your name as the solution to our nation.

KING: Church-going Christian conservatives are a major force in the Iowa caucuses, their support critical to Bauer's underdog campaign.

GARY BAUER (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: We're living at a time when we can't pray in the schools, 1 1/2 million of our children are thrown away every year, and we're on the verge of redefining marriage to be between two men or two women.

Ladies and gentlemen, this country desperately needs you.

KING: In exit polls four years ago, nearly 40 percent of Republican caucus-goers described themselves as Christian conservatives. So with this year's caucuses now just two weeks away, competition for their support is fierce.

REV. DAVID MILLER: We pray that You would honor him as
he has
honored You. We pray that Your blessing will be on him
throughout this
campaign. KING: Some rivals criticize Texas Governor
George W. Bush for
refusing to make opposition to abortion a litmus test
for Supreme Court
nominees, but Bush has deep support among Iowa's social
conservative
activists.

HUGH WINEBRENNER, DUKE UNIVERSITY: As they mature, they
become more pluralistic, they become more interested in
winning than simply
making a statement. And that's what is happening with
the Christian right in
Iowa.

KING: Steve Forbes hopes a weekend Christian Coalition
straw poll
victory in Georgia translates into more support here in
Iowa.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm really, really pleased. We have
-- I mean, we
have dozens of pastors who have come on board now.

KING: Church-based networks are critical to candidates
short on cash.

LARRY BOECKMANN, KEYES PRECINCT LEADER: The Christian
Coalition and the Promise Keepers, the different church
groups -- the
different people who have the same values as the
candidate that you are
backing. Otherwise it's not going to work.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Labels and stuffing and typing.

More envelopes?

KING: Inviting pastors to lunch is part of the Bauer
campaign's effort, and
the presidential race is increasingly the subject of
Sunday conversation.

REV. RAY CORLEW, WESTSIDE ASSEMBLY OF GOD: I don't ever
try to tell them who to vote for. But I tell them to be
very careful at looking
at all the platforms and then voting their consciences.

KING: Bauer shrugs off those who say Republicans are

wrong to mix
politics and religion.

BAUER: I mean, I don't recall anybody criticizing Martin Luther King when he built an entire civil rights movement around the African-American churches in our country, and thank God that he did.

KING: So between prayers and hymns, many pastors work in a little plug for politics.

WILCOX: Would you agree that it's important that we not be spectators, but we be participators and prayers that God will guide each one of us individually to do what God wants us to do. Would you say amen?

Give the Lord a hand if you believe...

KING: John King, CNN, Davenport, Iowa.

(END VIDEOTAPE) SESNO: Up next on INSIDE POLITICS, John McCain prepares to lay out his position on taxes. Will it help him make his case against George W. Bush? We'll talk taxes with McCain campaign manager Rick Davis when we come back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH: I look forward to having -- to hear what version two is. And perhaps we need to say, quote Regis to Senator McCain and say, "Mr. Senator, is this your final tax plan?"

(LAUGHTER)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: George W. Bush told reporters in New Hampshire this morning that he thought John McCain had already unveiled his tax plan, and he questioned exactly what McCain plans to unveil tomorrow. McCain aides say, yes, the senator talked taxes last year in conjunction with the congressional debate going on at the time. But tomorrow

he'll lay out his
official presidential campaign stance on the issue.

McCain's speech comes as taxes take center stage in the
Republican race,
particularly in the leadoff primary state.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(voice-over): Another record day for the booming U.S.
economy, and
beyond Wall Street, prosperity has affected the bottom
line on the signature
issue in the New Hampshire GOP primary: taxes.

Swimming against current Republican orthodoxy, John
McCain argues we
should not use the projected windfall primarily to cut
taxes. Most of it, he
says, should go toward shoring up Social Security,
Medicare and buying
down the national debt.

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: It's
fiscally irresponsible to promise a huge tax cut that is
based on a surplus that
we may not have.

SESNO: It's an argument Democrats have used in the past
against proposed
Republican tax cuts. Now, McCain is using it against
George W. Bush,
whose \$483 billion package of cuts is twice as big as
McCain's. Bush
responds in a new ad.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, BUSH CAMPAIGN AD)

BUSH: There may be an increase in the surplus by \$800
billion more than
anticipated. That makes the idea of having a paltry tax
cut even more risky.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: The ad never mentions McCain by name, but it's
clearly an attempt
to undercut his fiscal responsibility argument.

With Bush to the right of McCain, Steve Forbes is trying
to position himself
to the right of Bush in the first true attack ad of
2000.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, FORBES CAMPAIGN AD)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's something you need to know about George W. Bush. In 1994, he signed a pledge with my organization that he would not support sales tax or business tax increases. In 1997, unfortunately he broke this pledge. He proposed an increase in the business tax and sales taxes.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: Governor Bush did support an increase in business and sales taxes, but it was offset by a \$3 billion cut in property taxes. Bush says he stands firmly for tax cuts.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

So let's talk taxes now and campaign 2000 and John McCain with McCain campaign manager Rick Davis. He joins us from Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Good to see you. Thanks for joining us.

RICK DAVIS, MCCAIN CAMPAIGN MANAGER: Thank you, Frank.

SESNO: Let us start then with the McCain program that we're going to hear tomorrow. As our briefings lay it out, it will be about \$240 billion worth of tax cuts over five years. Most of it, about 62 percent of it, to be precise, would go to shoring up Social Security, 10 percent to fix Medicare, 5 percent for debt reduction, and as I said, about 240 billion for tax cuts.

What do you say to those critics who say, hey, this sounds something like -- something like that would come right out of the Clinton playbook?

DAVIS: Well, I'd have to say that there's nothing more conservative than what John McCain is embarking upon to lay out tomorrow. The basic rockbed of conservative values of saving Social Security have always been strong. And we start out with a major commitment to do

that. We're the only
candidate who's actually going to present a program by
which we make a
commitment to preserving Social Security in the future
and giving people
who are in the Social Security system a chance to be
able to set aside
private accounts. Besides that...

SESNO: Mr. Davis -- go ahead. Sorry to...

DAVIS: Besides that, Frank, the tax cut at \$240 billion
is a very healthy tax
cut.

SESNO: McCain has criticized -- McCain has criticized
George Bush for
not doing enough to help low-income Americans through
his tax-cut plan
while still cutting too much. Yet, in McCain's plan, as
I understand it, that 15
percent tax bracket is not going to be reduced -- that
is to say low- and
moderate-income earners are not going to pay less tax --
but the upper end
of the income bracket, of the income earners -- up to
\$70,000 -- will go into
the 15 percent bracket. So what is John McCain doing for
low and
moderate income taxpayers?

DAVIS: Well, we have a number of important incentives
for savings for low-
and moderate-income brackets. And I'd have to say too
that the -- the
moving up of the 15 percent bracket will take millions
of current taxpayers
off the rolls for the purposes of the lower income
threshold. So it's real
progress.

SESNO: But true or false -- but true -- true or false:
that low- and
moderate-income Americans will not get a tax cut or see
their rates reduced
under John McCain's tax plan?

DAVIS: Oh, absolutely false: 70 percent of our tax cut
will be below 70
percent threshold, or \$70,000 taxpayers.

SESNO: Yes, but what about the family earning -- what
about the family
earning \$40,000.

DAVIS: Oh, absolutely. In fact, I think you'll find tonight that as details start coming out about our plan, and certainly in tomorrow's speech, I think not only do we compete with George Bush at the \$40,000 threshold for his families that he's mentioned, but we actually do better than he does.

SESNO: Take a single person, no children, who's earning \$45,000: Do they get a tax cut under John McCain's plan?

DAVIS: Absolutely.

SESNO: Where?

DAVIS: They not only get a tax cut -- because there are expanded IRAs. They have the personal savings accounts where they can put \$3,000 a year into a personal savings account that allows them to save that money much like an IRA. All they've got to do is hold it in savings for one year and then they are able to use that money for anything that they need, family emergencies, medical emergencies, education, whatever they want to do. Just with that tax cut alone moves them into an area where they create a more productive economy by encouraging savings.

SESNO: How significant a role is the subject of taxes playing in New Hampshire and Iowa?

DAVIS: Well, taxes are always important to the Republican primary voters, and that's why we've made it one of the central elements of our four-point program. But we have sided on trying to take a more responsible and conservative approach to it by also taking a surplus which is not available every year and putting some of the money aside to pay down that debt, help encourage Medicare to stay afloat, and to take the time to actually set something aside for Social Security, so that the next generation isn't in the middle of a real jam.

SESNO: Before I let you go, I want to touch quickly on the question of what Senator John McCain has done to help constituents, some of them donors, a subject that has been bandied about quite publicly lately. Just exactly how many letters did Senator John McCain send to the FCC on behalf of non-corporate interests?

DAVIS: We released over 500 letters the other day, Frank, and it was in an effort to try and disclose as much as we possibly could. We've even asked the FCC in a full request to release whatever records they might have between the two, and the idea there is to show that the overwhelming majority, the correspondents that exist, 99 percent is simply helping constituents and those consumers who have had a gripe with the FCC.

SESNO: All right. Rick Davis, we thank you very much for your time. John McCain's speech on taxes, his policy on taxes laid out in more detail tomorrow. Appreciate it. Thank you.

DAVIS: Thank you, Frank.

SESNO: And there is much more ahead on INSIDE POLITICS.

Up next...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GORE: Today in sight of all the world we are putting the AIDS crisis at the top of the world's security agenda.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: An announcement that may help Al Gore win over some people who protested his campaign early on.

Plus, the latest and legal political twists in the case of the 6- year-old Cuban boy ordered back home to his homeland. Even Hillary Clinton is weighing in on that, as well as a campaign flap over soft money. That and more still ahead.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SESNO: We will have more of the day's political news coming up, but now a look at some of the other top stories we're following today.

Only days after U.S. immigration officials ruled on the fate of Elian Gonzalez, a Miami judge just moments ago also weighed in on the case of the 6-year-old Cuban boy. To Miami now and CNN's Mark Potter, with details on the judge's ruling announced late this afternoon -- Mark.

MARK POTTER, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, Frank, this is a major victory for Elian Gonzalez's family in Miami and for the Cuban-American community here. The ruling gives temporary custody of the boy to his great uncle in Miami, Lazaro Gonzalez, and orders the boy to stay in Miami until a hearing on the matter can be held on March 6. This flies in the face of an INS order that he be returned to Cuba Friday to be with his father. In asking for temporary custody of the boy, the families' lawyers argue that if Elian went back to Cuba he would be harmed physically and mentally because of the conditions there. In announcing her ruling, Judge Rosa Rodriguez agreed that at least at this stage a case was made.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JUDGE ROSA RODRIGUEZ, MIAMI-DADE CIRCUIT COURT: Petition for interim order as well as the petition for temporary custody contains sufficient verified allegation that if emergency relief is not granted and Elian is returned to Cuba he would be subject to imminent and irreparable harm, including loss of due process rights and harm to his physical and mental health and emotional well being.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

POTTER: The judge also ruled that the boy's father in Cuba Juan Miguel

Gonzalez should come to Miami for the hearing, be notified and be brought here. Now he has said, of course, that he's not coming to Miami. The judge said that if he doesn't show up it could hurt his case. The lawyers for the family here in Miami are ecstatic, of course. With this ruling, they got everything they wanted.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SPENCER EIG, FAMILY ATTORNEY: Today is a great day for Elian Gonzalez, and a great day for the Constitution of the United States. Today's order by the court which granted emergency temporary custody to Lazaro Gonzalez and the Gonzalez family, a family which is taking very good care of Elian here, will permit Elian Gonzalez his day in court.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

POTTER: The question now is how will the U.S. government respond? Will it honor or ignore the state judge's ruling? Some lawyers have said that federal authorities are not bound by a ruling from a state court. But if this judge here in Miami has her way, Elian's case will be on hold until now at least until March 6 and the family in Miami will finally get its day in court.

Mark Potter, CNN, reporting live from Miami.

SESNO: And we will tell you that we'll be having more on the reaction from Washington on the Elian Gonzalez story in just a few minutes, when we'll talk with our White House correspondent Kelly Wallace, who's been tracking the story from the capital city here.

And a program note: The Gonzalez custody battle is the topic of tonight's "LARRY KING LIVE." Representative Dan Burton will be Larry's guest tonight, 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

To some other news now. America Online and Time-Warner, parent company of CNN, agreed to tie the knot, creating the

biggest corporate
merger in history. The deal is valued at \$350 billion,
and it shows just how
dominant the Internet and the digital landscape have
become in the media
world. AOL's Steve Case would take over as the new
company's chairman,
while Time-Warner chair, Gerald Levin, would be chief
executive officer

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

STEVE CASE, CHMN. & CEO, AMERICA ONLINE: We're kicking
off
the Internet century with a unique company with
unparalleled assets and
unprecedented ability to accelerate the next Internet
revolution and an
unsurpassed opportunity to have a positive impact on
society.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: Ted Turner, CNN founder and vice chairman of
Time-Warner,
maintains his title in the new AOL-Time-Warner company.
The deal still
needs government approval. And for more on the
AOL-Time-Warner
merger and how it may affect you, join us for a special
edition of
"MONEYLINE," that'll air at 6:30 p.m. Eastern Time right
here on CNN.

And when INSIDE POLITICS returns: Al Gore's efforts to
win gay and
lesbian support. Might he help himself in the primary,
but hurt himself in the
fall?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SESNO: Republicans are pressing ahead with their attack
against Vice
President Al Gore's recent comments on gays in the
military. The
controversy followed the vice president to the United
Nations today, where
he pledged another \$100 million to fight the worldwide
AIDS epidemic.

CNN's Jeanne Meserve reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KOFI ANNAN, U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL: Welcome, Mr. Vice President. Or perhaps I should say, Mr. President.

(APPLAUSE)

ANNAN: ... of the Security Council.

(LAUGHTER)

GORE: I'm working on it.

JEANNE MESERVE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Working on it even with this appearance. In one stroke, Gore underscored his international policy credentials and highlighted an issue of importance to two key Democratic constituencies, gays and blacks, committing more resources to battling AIDS in Africa.

GORE: The budget the Clinton-Gore administration will send to our Congress next month will include an additional increase of another \$100 million for a total of \$325 million to fund our worldwide fight against AIDS.

MESERVE: It is an interesting twist to see Al Gore taking up this cause. At the outset of his campaign, Gore was dogged by disruptive AIDS activists, who accused him of siding with big pharmaceutical companies and obstructing Africans' access to inexpensive AIDS drugs. The administration modified its policies, and now some of those same demonstrators are in the vice president's corner.

ERIC SAWYER, ACT UP: Bradley, who is also running for the campaign, has refused to meet with us and refused to issue a statement about AIDS in general.

MESERVE: Though Gore has backed off his requirement that appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff would have to pass a litmus test agreeing that gays should serve openly in the military, the backpedaling has not apparently hurt his standing with gays and lesbians.

WINNIE STACHELBERG, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN: I don't see that there is any retreat on the part of the gay community or others from supporting him. In fact, it was just a clarification of his policy.

MESERVE: Despite Gore's clarification, the Republicans sense a soft spot and are ripping into Gore with a new television ad set to air later this week in Iowa, New Hampshire and South Carolina.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, RNC TV AD)

ANNOUNCER: General Colin Powell couldn't pass Al Gore's litmus test. Neither could Norman Schwarzkopf. Schwarzkopf and Powell, the heroes of Desert Storm.

Call Al Gore. Tell him the only litmus test ought to be patriotism.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MESERVE: Republican candidate Senator John McCain said, with their stands on gays and the military, both Bradley and Gore have proven that they are not qualified to be commander in chief.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

MESERVE: But right now, Al Gore is worried about winning the Democratic nomination, and gays and lesbians figure into his calculations.

His campaign estimates that in the key states of New York and California, gays and lesbians make up 10 to 15 percent of the primary electorate -- Frank.

SESNO: Jeanne Meserve, thanks.

And turning back again to the controversy over the Elian Gonzalez, as we reported earlier, a family court judge in Miami ruled today that 6-year-old Elian should remain in the United States under temporary custody of his great-uncle until a hearing can be held in March. Earlier today, Vice President Gore questioned last week's decision by the Immigration and

Naturalization Service that Elian should be returned to his father in Cuba.

Now we want to bring you up to date on exactly what the administration is saying with our White House correspondent Kelly Wallace -- Kelly.

KELLY WALLACE, CNN WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT: Well, Frank, the White House says the Justice Department will have to decide if today's ruling by a Florida judge affects the INS decision.

The Justice Department, which has jurisdiction over the INS is withholding comment until it can see the actual ruling. But meantime, Republican Congressman Dan Burton, who caused quite a stir by issuing a congressional subpoena for the 6-year-old, is applauding today's developments.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

REP. DAN BURTON (R-IN), GOVERNMENT REFORM CHAIRMAN: I'm happy that the court's agreed to hear the case. It makes it clear that the boy is not going to be immediately sent back to Cuba, and I think that's good. All the issues ought to be aired completely in the court, and they should make a decision on what's best for the boy.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WALLACE: Now Congressman Burton says he will still go ahead with his subpoena, although he says he does not expect it will ever come down to the little boy appearing before his House committee in February.

Earlier today, President Clinton refused to comment about whether or not it was appropriate for Congressman Burton to issue a subpoena for Elian. The president also refused to criticize his vice president, who appears to be at odds with his boss's handling of the Gonzalez case. Last week and again today, Democratic presidential candidate Al Gore said the fate of little Elian

should be decided by the courts. The president said his vice president is free to disagree.

OK, and Mr. Clinton pretty much says that anyone who disagrees is free to express their opinion, but he said he's trying to do whatever he can to not have this matter politicized, and anyone who wants to challenge it should challenge it through the legal process.

But for now, Frank, the focus in Washington is on the Justice Department to see how it will decide whether the state court ruling affects the INS decision for the little boy to be reunited with his father in Cuba by this Friday -- Frank.

SESNO: Kelly, the president may be saying he doesn't want to see this politicized, but the fact of the matter is this is a highly politicized issue right now. And aside from saying this all belongs to working through the Justice Department and all the rest, what else is the administration doing to turn the temperature down on this? What can it do?

WALLACE: Well, you know, they're really trying to stay clear of it. And that's the thing. They are trying to say that they are not involved in this, that it is a legal matter. They're referring all questions to the Justice Department, and they're trying to say that anyone who has any -- who wants to challenge this should go to the courts. But clearly they're concerned. And in terms of the vice president, some political analysts think he could benefit politically by the remarks he's making, especially when it comes to winning the state of Florida in a presidential election. Cuban-Americans, these political analysts think, could very well vote on this issue. And it could cost the vice president, if he became the Democratic nominee, the state of Florida -- Frank.

SESNO: Kelly Wallace at the White House watching this closely -- thanks.

First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton today expressed support for the INS ruling, but speaking to reporters in New York, where she's running for the United States Senate, Mrs. Clinton also said she understands those who want to challenge the decision in court.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, FIRST LADY: The INS made the decision, but there is a right for parties to go into the court to challenge that decision, which is what's going on now. My plea is that it get resolved quickly and that the best interest of the child be the determining factor and that this child not be used as a political football to advance certain political or ideological points of view.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SESNO: Mrs. Clinton also commented on reports that her expected opponent in the Senate race, New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, has received soft money from two little-known political committees. According to "The New York Times," the two committees have taken in and spent almost \$1 million for Giuliani's political operation since 1998. Recently, the mayor has criticized Mrs. Clinton for collecting more than \$350,000 from a special Democratic Party national committee that can legally accept unlimited donations. Aides to Giuliani say the money he received is above board and that the Federal Election Commission has not questioned the donations.

Still to come on INSIDE POLITICS, campaign debates. Who is in the spotlight, the presidential candidates or the network anchors?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SESNO: It has happened frequently in the presidential debates of campaign 2000, the moderator more or less stealing the thunder and some media attention from those fighting to become the next person

to occupy the Oval
Office.

Howard Kurtz of CNN's "RELIABLE SOURCES" reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ALAN KEYES (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Gary, Gary, the
one problem...

TIM RUSSERT, MODERATOR: We've all -- we've all agreed
that the candidates could have...

GARY BAUER (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Listen to the
moderator, Alan.

RUSSERT: We've all agreed the candidates would have a
chance to question one another, just for the record, Mr. Bauer, if
nothing is done,
benefits must be reduced by a third or the tax is
doubled in the year 2035.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ (voice-over): There were seven important people at
the Republican presidential debate in New Hampshire last week: six
candidates and NBC's
Tim Russert.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Would you appoint someone to the Joint Chiefs
of Staff who openly advocated openly allowing gays to serve in the
military?

BUSH: No.

RUSSERT: Would you appoint...

BUSH: I would appoint...

RUSSERT: Would you appoint an openly gay person to a
senior staff or
Cabinet position?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: Russert's aggressive questioning even drew a rejoinder from Alan Keyes.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KEYES: ... and I begin to wonder when Mr. Russert will declare his candidacy.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ (on camera): In the flurry of debates in recent weeks, the personality of the moderator has often shaped the tone of the encounter.

These are, after all, network extravaganzas, complete with big-shot anchors more prominent than some of the White House wannabes. And sometimes they can't help drawing attention to themselves, as NBC's Tom Brokaw did in Iowa.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

TOM BROKAW, MODERATOR: Senator Hatch, why not have means testing for Medicare? Why should someone who earns my kind of income, for example, pay and get the same kind of coverage as a school teacher or someone who works on a farm here in Iowa?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: ABC's Peter Jennings took a more self-effacing approach last week in New Hampshire, often keeping his questions short and to the point.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

PETER JENNINGS, ABC ANCHOR: Mr. Gore, in this campaign, there have been some questions on occasion on who you are.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: Other moderators have used subtlety to drive home a point. Fox's

Brit Hume didn't ask George W. Bush about the chatter that he lacks the intellectual capacity to be president. Instead, Hume took this approach in

New Hampshire.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRIT HUME, FOX NEWS: Can you tell us, sir, what do you read every day?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: And sometimes the audience just plain doesn't like the questions.

That's what happened at Friday's GOP debate in South Carolina when

MSNBC's Brian Williams asked Bush about the Confederate flag flying over the state capitol.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRIAN WILLIAMS, MSNBC ANCHOR: It is, as you can hear from the reaction of tonight's crowd of 3,000 people from South Carolina, a hot-button issue here. The question is: Does the flag offend you personally?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: No moderator worth his anchor-hair wants a boring debate. But

Russert's dominating performance drew fire from "The Manchester Union

Leader," which is backing Steve Forbes. The paper apologized for

co-sponsoring the debate, saying Russert gave too much time to Bush and

John McCain, though the air time turned out to be roughly even.

Russert makes no apologies for challenging the candidates, telling CNN:

"You can have a staged infomercial if you like where each of the candidates

can offer their canned responses and consultant- driven replies, you can

have a journalistic even where you ask follow- up questions. It's imperative

that we fulfill our role as journalists and press for specific answers."

There's nothing new about Major League network anchors firing provocative, controversial questions at candidates.

CNN's Bernard Shaw
did it to Michael Dukakis in a pivotal moment in a 1988
presidential debate.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, OCTOBER 13, 1988)

BERNARD SHAW, CNN ANCHOR: Governor, if Kitty Dukakis were
raped and murdered, would you favor an irrevocable death
penalty for the
killer?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: And some local anchors serving as questioners are
ready for their
close-up.

At Friday's GOP debate in South Carolina, David Stanton
of the local NBC
affiliate tried the melodramatic approach with Gary
Bauer.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

DAVID STANTON, WIS-TV ANCHOR: Mr. Bauer, if someone in
your
family was raped and became pregnant and wanted an
abortion, and after
discussion with you they were adamant in their decision
to have an abortion,
would you support that decision or would you try to
prevent it?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ: In case you haven't had your fill, there's yet
another Republican
debate tonight in Michigan, hosted by Tim Russert.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSET: I paid for this microphone, Mister.

SEN. ORRIN HATCH (R-UT), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Well,
let me tell you something...

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KURTZ (on camera): In theory, at least, the debates are
supposed to be
about the candidates, but they are also television
shows, with television stars
and would-be stars trying to enhance their own
reputation. Running for

millionaire president these days means getting into the ring with anchors who pack a rhetorical punch.

This is Howard Kurtz of CNN's "RELIABLE SOURCES."

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: And when we return, a four-time governor of Louisiana on trial for the third time in a very controversial career.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK) SESNO: Former Louisiana Governor Edwin Edwards went on trial today. The four-time governor is charged with manipulating the riverboat casino licensing process and accepting payoffs from friends and cronies seeking casino licenses. If found guilty, the 72-year-old Edwards could be sentenced to life in prison.

Edwards was tried twice on federal racketeering charges in the 1980s. The first trial ended in a hung jury; the second, in acquittal.

Nackey Loeb, who helped guide New Hampshire's largest newspapers, has died. Mrs. Loeb and her husband, William, bought "The Manchester Union Leader" and "New Hampshire Sunday News" back in the 1940s and turned them into two of the nation's most conservative newspapers. Mrs. Loeb dies Saturday with her family at her side. She was 75.

And that's all for this edition of INSIDE POLITICS. We'll see you again tomorrow when Candy Crowley will have a live report from New Hampshire, where John McCain will be outlining his tax plan.

And you can go online at -- all the time, rather, at CNN's allpolitics.com for the very latest, and more, from the candidates and their campaigns.

I'm Frank Sesno. "WORLDVIEW" is next.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 09:29:09.00

SUBJECT: Some interesting reading when you get some time

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: '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 [OPD])
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: '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

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

TO: 'Pete Najera' <pnajera@ustr.gov> ('Pete 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: "Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> ("Garcia, Juan" <Juan_Garcia@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: 'Jackie Blumenthal' <jblumenthal@whf.gov> ('Jackie Blumenthal' <jblumenthal@whf.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Rebecca Aaron <RAaron@whf.gov> (Rebecca Aaron <RAaron@whf.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To all-

Below is an Op-Ed piece from Sunday's Post that I send for two reasons:
First, I believe a straight line can be drawn from Zumwalt's policies and Khalid's description last night of his feelings as he embarked aboard the USS Silversides for the first time. Second, as per our ongoing class conversation, how would Zumwalt handle the "gays in the military" question if he was CNO today?

Finally, two notes of interesting trivia:

1) In a modern day Greek tragedy, it was Zumwalt, after watching American casualties and deaths mount in the jungles of Vietnam, who ordered the "de-foliation" of those jungles with the chemical Agent Orange. Soon thereafter, his son, a newly commissioned officer just arriving in Vietnam, contracted Agent Orange-based cancer and died a young man, leaving behind his son, born after the war with severe birth complications, also suspected to be a byproduct of the chemical. Through his death this weekend, Admiral Zumwalt stood by his decision to employ Agent Orange, convinced that its use

saved thousands of American lives.

2) A personal note: One of my younger brothers bears the middle name "Zumwalt," so-named after the Admiral granted our dad a special dispensation

to leave the war temporarily and be present for his birth in the States, his

first child for he which he was able to do so.

See you at lunch,

Juan

Adm. Zumwalt Changed My Life
By Rosemary Mariner

Sunday, January 9, 2000; Page B07

Tomorrow Adm. Elmo Zumwalt will be laid to rest at the Naval Academy. In late 1972, as the Chief of Naval Operations, this remarkable man changed my life and untold others forever. More important, he changed the Navy, and hence the nation, for the better.

As part of a concerted effort to adjust to the end of conscription and to major societal changes, Adm. Zumwalt decided to open Navy pilot training to women. My mother, a World War II Navy nurse, sent me a newspaper article announcing the Navy was looking for qualified female candidates. As a 19-year-old undergraduate and pilot, I could hardly believe my eyes. I

decided I was not going to miss this historic opportunity.

With the help of many people, I managed to graduate from college early, and in January 1973 was one of the first eight women selected to enter naval flight training. I had no intention of staying in uniform past my obligated time. I ended up retiring after 24 years of exciting, challenging and gratifying service.

It is hard to remember, let alone imagine, for someone who didn't experience it, how anti-military this country was coming out of the Vietnam War. Growing up in the ultimate Navy town of San Diego, I had high school memories that included the sight of a blimp flying over the city with a message demanding that the aircraft carrier USS Kitty Hawk "Stay Home." There were reports of race riots aboard Navy ships, high desertion rates, criminal conduct and generally low morale. Retention bottomed out at 9 percent. Even on Purdue University's conservative campus, my joining the Navy equated to becoming a "baby killer" in the eyes of some classmates.

After reporting for officer candidate school, I began to realize how controversial Adm. Zumwalt was. Like most of my peers drawn from civilian schools, I knew nothing about Navy life, let alone service politics. The whole institution seemed stuck in a time and cultural warp.

Yet it was clear this CNO faced both an age and seniority gap: He was seemingly despised by the most senior officers and respected by the most junior ones; hated by chief petty officers who were known for handling disciplinary problems with their fists, but loved by newly empowered sailors.

His unambiguous leadership in improving the Navy's lousy race relations was a source of discontent among the good old white boys. The "Z-grams"--directives sent to the entire Navy from the CNO himself rather than through the admirals--that made my presence in flight training possible were the subject of open derision and were actively opposed by some serving officers. Their behavior was unprofessional, shameful and contrary to Navy tradition.

Adm. Zumwalt retired in June 1974, shortly after I earned my gold wings. While in flight training, I had no time for anything other than learning the ways of naval aviation, so I missed most of what he was doing during the year our service overlapped. A true professional, in retirement he refrained from "laying a hand on the rudder from the grave"; he shared his opinions with serving naval leadership only behind closed doors, not in the press.

It wasn't until I became a middle-grade officer that I fully appreciated just what he had achieved and at what tremendous personal cost. While I personally benefited from his decision to use more women, Adm. Zumwalt's most significant accomplishments lay in forcing the naval aristocracy to control rampant racial discrimination while preparing the Navy to "fight" the Cold War under harsh post-Vietnam fiscal constraints and the realities

of an all-volunteer force.

Years ago I found a cartoon titled "Old Guard Bar and Grill." Sitting at the bar were two admirals crying in their beer above the caption, "If God had wanted women at the Naval Academy, he would have made them men!" Like Adm. Zumwalt, other naval reformers have faced similar intellectually shallow opposition in their attempts to improve the lot of sailors, revolutionize shipboard gunnery, adopt the aircraft carrier and herald the nuclear fleet.

Like many wonderful but human institutions, the Navy would never have altered course toward racial equality nor manned the fleet with the best-qualified male and female citizen-sailors under its own momentum. Adm. Zumwalt's methods, however unpopular, were the only way to cast off old lines and allow the Navy to steam into the future. In my mind's eye, I see the always dignified admiral elbowing up to a heavenly Old Guard Bar and taking his seat as one of history's truly great Americans and naval leaders.

Cheers and thanks, Admiral.

Capt. Rosemary Mariner, a retired naval aviator, is a visiting scholar at the University of Tennessee's Center for the Study of War and Society.

, Copyright 2000 The Washington Post Company

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

> From: Jackie Blumenthal [SMTP:jblumenthal@whf.gov]

> Sent: Monday, January 10, 2000 4:05 PM

> To: 'Ariel Zwang'; 'Barrye Price'; 'Chris Moore'; 'Dan Feldman';
'Esther

> Benjamin'; 'Gary Hall'; 'Jackie Lain'; 'JB Buxton'; 'Juan Garcia';
'Khalid

> Azim'; 'Lance Wyatt'; 'Melissa Goldstein'; 'Pete Najera'; 'Rey Valencia';

> 'Sonny Garg'; 'Tim Wu'

> Cc: Rebecca Aaron

> Subject: Presidential Box Tickets

>

> We have been offered the opportunity to use six tickets to the National
> Symphony for Thursday night (1/13). First priority goes to anyone who
> has not yet been seated in the Presidential Box for a performance. You
> may ask for two tickets.

>

> Please email back if you want tickets. Please do not email back if you
> have already had your turn. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 13:15:38.00

SUBJECT: 1/11 NSC Press Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Dan J. Taylor (CN=Dan J. Taylor/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Mark C. Sheppard (CN=Mark C. Sheppard/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: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/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: Ralph Alswang (CN=Ralph Alswang/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: Heather M. Riley (CN=Heather M. Riley/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: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/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: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/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: 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: Brian S. Mason (CN=Brian S. Mason/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: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Emily Karcher (CN=Emily Karcher/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: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/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: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Lane (CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brenda B. Costello (CN=Brenda B. Costello/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: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/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: Stephanie A. Cutter (CN=Stephanie A. Cutter/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: Francisco J. Sanchez (CN=Francisco J. Sanchez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Shawn J. Johnson (CN=Shawn J. Johnson/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: Beth Nolan (CN=Beth Nolan/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: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (CN=Margaret M. Suntum/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: Sharon K. Gill (CN=Sharon K. Gill/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: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/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: Julia M. Payne (CN=Julia M. Payne/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: Anne M. Edwards (CN=Anne M. Edwards/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:
Press Guidance
January 11, 2000

- Foreign
1. Colombia Assistance Rollout (DRAFT)
 2. Ecuador/Dollarization (new)
 3. Cuban Boy (updated)
 4. Panama/Unexploded Ordnance
 5. Mexico/Drug Traffickers
 6. War Criminal
 7. Russia/Politics (updated)
 8. Russia/Chechnya (updated)
 9. Russia/Embassy Shooting (new)
 10. Palestinian Authority/Corruption (new)
 11. China NTR
 12. China/Military-to-Military Relations
 13. Don't Ask/Don't Tell
 14. CSIS Military Culture Study
 15. Institute for Information Infrastructure Protection

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D74]ARMS296872024.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

January 11, 2000

INTER-AMERICAN/MULTILATERAL

Colombia Assistance Rollout (DRAFT)

Ecuador/Dollarization (new)

Cuban Boy (updated)

Panama/Unexploded Ordnance

Mexico/Drug Traffickers

EUROPE

War Criminal

RUSSIA/NIS

Russia/Politics (updated)

Russia/Chechnya (updated)

Russia/Embassy Shooting (new)

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

Palestinian Authority/Corruption (new)

ASIA

China NTR

China/Military-to-Military Relations

DEFENSE/INTELL

Don't Ask/Don't Tell

CSIS Military Culture Study

TRANSNATIONAL/OSTP

**Institute for Information Infrastructure
Protection**

DRAFT
COLOMBIA ASSISTANCE ROLLOUT
January 11, 2000

TOPICS: ASSISTANCE PACKAGE AND UNDERLYING RATIONALE...

What is in the proposed package of increased assistance for Colombia announced by the President?

- The proposal is a two-year, \$1.6 billion request to Congress for funding to enhance our bilateral assistance programs for Colombia.
- The assistance would be directed to counter-drug efforts and for other critical programs to help President Pastrana deepen democracy and promote peace and prosperity.

What is the increased assistance intended to accomplish?

- The primary focus of the proposed increased USG assistance to Colombia is to continue countering the production and trafficking of illicit drugs, both to protect counter-drug successes elsewhere in the region and to reduce the overall amount of drugs entering the United States.
- The increased assistance should also enable the GOC to make substantial additional progress in the realm of alternative development and extending effective governance throughout the country.

Why is it in our interest to provide such substantial assistance?

- The global drug problem is truly an increasing threat shared by all nations. The extensive drug production and trafficking imperils Colombia's security and fuels both addiction and violence in other countries, including ours.
- As the President has made clear, strengthening stability and democracy in Colombia, and fighting the drug trade there, is the right thing to do, and it is very much in America's own national interest.

How does this significant funding fit into the USG's overall drug policy? Why isn't the USG doing more to address the demand for drugs in the United States that drives Andean drug production in the first place?

- This package is perfectly in line with our National Drug Control Strategy – a strategy that represents a comprehensive approach that focusing on: educating children, decreasing the addict population, breaking the cycle of drugs and crime, securing our borders, and reducing the supply of drugs.

- Our effort to support Plan Colombia directly supports goal five of the National Strategy: Break foreign and domestic drug sources of supply.
- Funds used for overseas supply reduction still represent a small percentage of our entire National Drug Control budget. For example, in FY 99, USG funding by counter-drug activity was broken down as follows:
 - Demand reduction activities (e.g., treatment, prevention, research) accounted for 33% of the National Drug Control budget (\$5.4 billion).
 - Domestic law enforcement accounted for 53% of that budget (\$8.6 billion).
 - In contrast, our international efforts were a mere 3% of the budget (\$500 million), while interdiction activities accounted for the remaining 10% (\$1.6 billion).
- To deal effectively with the overall drug problem, we need to deal simultaneously with drug supply reduction, transportation, distribution, and abuses issues that have a complex interrelation. The Colombia package will make an important addition to this fight.

What effect is this package likely to have on the troubled Colombian economy?

- The emergency supplemental package will have a positive effect on the normally vigorous Colombian economy by addressing the serious security concerns business people face and by enhancing investor confidence.
- It must be remembered that additional resources, such as the \$2.7 billion IMF Extended Fund Facility and large social and infrastructural projects supported by loans from the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, will directly contribute to the revitalization of the Colombian economy.

TOPICS: PLAN COLOMBIA AND U.S. ROLE IN ITS DEVELOPMENT...

What is Plan Colombia?

- Plan Colombia is an integrated, comprehensive strategy developed by the GOC to address their many interrelated problems.
- The strategy addressed four critical areas: (1) the peace process and diplomacy; (2) counter-drug efforts, military reform, and the judicial system; (3) social development and democracy; and (4) economic development.

What is your reaction to the new strategy that the Colombian government has proposed?

- We think that President Pastrana and his government have developed a good, comprehensive, integrated approach to dealing with the considerable problems facing Colombia.

- With assistance from the United States and other donors, the GOC should be able to effectively implement this new strategy. We expect to see progress with respect to all of the interrelated challenges that confront Colombia, including fighting drug production and trafficking, and jumpstarting the economic recovery and the peace process.

What was U.S. role in developing Plan Colombia?

- Plan Colombia was developed by, was approved by, and will be implemented by the GOC.
- The GOC did consult extensively with the USG as it developed and refined its strategy.
- We have worked closely with all other countries committed to combating the illicit drug trade through robust domestic programs and international cooperation.

Is the United States seeking to impose a security and counter-drug strategy on Colombia?

- No. The Colombian Government and the USG have been discussing the increasing problems in Colombia on a continuing basis for more than a year. This dialogue intensified in August when Under Secretary of State Pickering traveled to Bogota.
- We assisted the Colombian Government in developing a comprehensive, integrated strategy to deal with the major challenges confronting Colombia, including drug trafficking, the economic slump, and the slow progress of the peace talks. The strategy that emerged from this process, however, was developed by, and approved by, the GOC.
- The strategy deals with four critical themes: (1) the peace process and diplomacy; (2) counter-drug efforts, military reform, and the judicial system; (3) social development and democracy; and (4) economic development.

Has the support package been coordinated with the GOC?

- Of course! The package is designed to support the GOC's own Plan Colombia.

How much is the GOC contributing to the implementation of its Plan Colombia?

- President Pastrana has pledged to commit \$4 billion in support of Plan Colombia.
- In addition, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank have committed hundreds of millions of dollars in loans to support primarily social, humanitarian, and infrastructure development, as well as economic revitalization. The International Monetary Fund has given Colombia a \$2.7 billion Extended Fund Facility that should assist its macroeconomic recovery.

What policy reforms do you believe the Colombians need to carry out to make effective use of this package? Are other international donors also providing assistance?

- An emergency supplemental for Colombia would reinforce the determined actions of President Pastrana to continue second-stage democratic reforms. These include: improving and modernizing the judicial system to end impunity and ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability; further professionalizing and restructuring the Colombian military; and breaking irretrievably any remaining links between members of the security forces and illegal armed groups.

TOPICS: POTENTIAL CRITICISMS OF PACKAGE...

Why is this an emergency supplemental? Why is it being done now instead of last fall during the regular 2000 budget cycle?

- President Clinton announced last fall that he would present Congress with a package to support Plan Colombia early this year; this is that package.
- Plan Colombia is a comprehensive and detailed plan, and it required a thoughtful and comprehensive and well-integrated support package.

Why has it taken so long to finalize this package?

- We first conducted a comprehensive policy review, and consulted extensively with the GOC, to ensure the most effective strategy for reaching our policy objectives.
- That process took longer than expected, but we believe that the investment in time was essential. We now have a well-conceived plan that implements the strategy and should provide the GOC with the critical additional assistance needed.

What about reports that U.S. support for Colombia will move beyond counter-drug cooperation to assistance for the counter-insurgency effort?

- The USG will not provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC. Increased support to the Colombian military will continue to be focused on the common counter-drug objective and will be provided only after a full human rights vetting.
- Intimations that U.S. policy will shift from cooperating with the Colombians on the regional counter-drug fight to assisting their counter-insurgency efforts are ill-informed. As President Clinton has stated clearly, our policy in Colombia is to support President Pastrana's efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the country's longstanding civil conflict and to work with the Colombians – along with our other regional partners – on fighting illicit drugs.
- Finally, I would remind you that a military solution is simply not possible for Colombia. We continue to call on the FARC to honor its commitments and enter into good faith negotiations with the Colombian Government.

Is there concern about possible retaliatory violence by the drug traffickers following these arrests, especially given the prospect of extradition to face U.S. justice?

- All law enforcement operations against dangerous criminals involve a measure of risk, including the possibility of retaliation against law enforcement personnel or other targets.
- This concern is certainly relevant in the present context, especially given drug traffickers' well-documented willingness to use violence to achieve their ends.
- All of the governments involved in this operation are aware of this risk and are taking appropriate security measures. I might add that USG-supported counter-drug operations have been regularly attacked in Colombia, by guerrillas as well as narcos.
- We have and will continue to take the protection of U.S. citizens in Colombia, both official and unofficial, very seriously. One of our preventative measures is the publication here in this country of appropriate advisories for U.S. nationals abroad. For further information on these advisories, please contact Consular Affairs at the Department of State.
- Perhaps most importantly, I would note that our ongoing law enforcement operations will not be deterred by the threat of violence. We will remain steadfast in our commitment to ensure that drug traffickers are brought to justice, whether in the United States or other countries.

If the drug trade is a problem throughout the Andes, why is the package so heavily weighted towards Colombia?

- This package is a response to President Pastrana's Plan Colombia. Assistance is heavily weighted toward Colombia because Colombia is the source of most of the cocaine used in the United States. Counter-drug programs in Peru and Bolivia have significantly reduced coca leaf cultivation and cocaine production. One side-effect of this reduction has been an increase in leaf cultivation and cocaine production in Colombia.
- In addition, counter-drug efforts in Colombia have been complicated by the participation in the drug trade of well-armed guerrillas and paramilitaries, who protect narco-traffickers across a broad swath of southern Colombia.
- These factors, along with the effects of a recent devastating economic recession, have hampered the ability of the GOC to effectively deal with the narcotics trafficking problem.
- That said, we are recommending additional resources for existing programs in neighboring countries to assist them as they turn from drug production. Further, we are requesting funding in support of construction at a Forward Operating Location in Manta, Ecuador, to allow for more effective regional efforts against drug trafficking by air. These two programs taken together will help to counter the potential move of drug cultivation and production back out of Colombia.

What makes you think this new support package will work when previous USG support to Colombia seems to have had little effect on the drug flows?

- As our success in Peru and Bolivia demonstrates, it is possible to combat narcotics production in the Andean region using a comprehensive and balanced approach. An unfortunate side-effect of this success in Peru and Bolivia was a shift of coca cultivation and cocaine production to Colombia. Because of this, we have concluded that a comprehensive attack against illicit drug production and trafficking in Colombia is essential.
- This package is our response. It will enable the GOC's counter-drug program to move into the southern departments of Caqueta and Putumayo, where the narcos have found a safe-haven under guerrilla and paramilitary protection.

A significant portion of this package is focused on military assistance. Are you short-changing other components of Plan Colombia, such as alternative development, anti-corruption, etc.?

- We are committing \$240 million over the next two years to alternative development, enhancing good governance, judicial reform, and human rights protection. This is in addition to some \$4 billion that the GOC is committing to Plan Colombia from its own resources.
- Other donors, including the International Financial Institutions, are providing billions of dollars in loans aimed primarily at social, humanitarian, and infrastructure development, as well as economic revitalization.

Why are the CNP receiving so much less than the Colombian military when the police have the primary counter-drug responsibility?

- The Colombian National Police have no stronger supporters than the members of this administration. Not only will they receive some \$95 million in direct counter-drug support in this package, but they also were the primary GOC recipients of the FY 99 counter-drug emergency supplemental – receiving at least \$158 million in that package.
- It must be understood that assistance to the Colombian military is designed specifically to support the Colombian National Police law enforcement efforts by providing the Police with protection from attacks by illegal armed groups – whether guerrillas, paramilitaries, or the traffickers themselves – so that they can complete their mission.
- We have been impressed with the way in which the Colombian military and national Police have begun to work together more effectively. General Tapias and General Serrano are committed to work hand-in-glove as they enter the new, more dangerous zones.
- We believe that our assistance package is well-tailored to support the counter-drug strategy that we and the Colombians believe will be much more effective and secure for both the police and the military.

TOPIC: HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS...

What assurance do we have that this increased USG assistance will not lead to increased human rights abuses?

- In accordance with the Leahy Amendment, all U.S. assistance to the Colombian security forces is contingent upon human rights screening. No USG assistance can be provided to any unit of the Colombian security forces against which there is evidence of gross human rights violations.
- In addition, the USG has and will continue to provide support to strengthen the human rights offices of the GOC as well as human rights organizations.

What about allegations that the Colombian military is supporting paramilitary groups that have engaged in human rights abuses?

- We commend the Colombian government's efforts to investigate cases of human rights abuse, by paramilitary groups and others, and to prosecute the human rights abusers.
- We encourage the Colombian government to redouble these efforts. Bringing to an end the impunity enjoyed by those who abuse human rights is a critical component of the peace process.

What is the USG doing to ensure that increased assistance to the Colombian military will not go to those who abuse human rights?

- U.S. law prohibits the provision of assistance or training to units of the Colombian military against whom there are credible allegations of human rights abuses.
- Consistent with the law, the Administration carefully vets the recipients of all U.S. military assistance and training to ensure that our aid is not provided to human rights abusers.
- We note that the Colombian military has one of the longest unbroken records of support for democracy and civilian government in the hemisphere.

Any response to recent reports of the danger faced by human rights advocates working in Colombia?

- The human rights stance of the government and military has improved, but human rights workers are more vulnerable than ever to the guerrillas and paramilitaries. We continue to call on the paramilitaries, the FARC, and other guerrilla groups to respect international human rights norms and to cease the practice of kidnapping.
- A key element of our Colombia policy is strict adherence to Leahy and other human-rights-related provisions governing our security assistance.

- We are also actively promoting and assisting the development of a national human rights policy, working with the Colombian Vice President's Office, as well as providing human rights-related training and assistance to the Colombian military and the human rights ombudsman. We also support enhanced protection for human rights monitors in Colombia.
- Our support for the Colombian peace process is in part premised on the idea that a negotiated settlement is ultimately the best guarantee for human rights.

TOPIC: PEACE PROCESS...

What impact will this package likely have on the Colombian peace process?

- This package will provide support to help train GOC negotiators and advisors on managing conflict and negotiations. Training will draw on the lessons learned in Northern Ireland, the Middle East, and Central America. The training will also examine the techniques for reintegrating ex-combatants into civil society. A public diplomacy campaign will engage civil society and seek their support for all aspects of Plan Colombia.
- Also important, the package will send a strong message to Colombia's guerrillas that meaningful negotiations offer the best hope for peace and social justice. They can hope to win neither military victory nor political advantage through violence.
- Finally, we believe that to the extent that Plan Colombia reinvigorates the Colombian economy, enhances GOC governing capability, discourages human rights abuses, and reduces the money available to guerrillas and paramilitaries from involvement in drug trafficking, it will encourage the peace process.

How is the Colombia peace process going?

- Progress remains slow, but this important initiative is continuing.
- We strongly support President Pastrana's efforts to broker a negotiated settlement to end Colombia's civil conflict. He was elected on a peace platform and won by the widest margin of victory in recent Colombian history. We believe the peace process is the best way to end Colombia's long-running conflict.
- We also remain convinced that the peace process is also integral to long-run prospects for fighting narcotics trafficking, reducing kidnappings, restoring respect for human rights, and putting the Colombian economy back on a sustainable, high-growth trajectory.
- We never expected that a peace settlement with the guerrilla groups could be achieved quickly. Lessons from similar disputes elsewhere suggest that the start-up phase of talks is particularly prone to violence as groups position themselves for the negotiations.

What about criticisms that Pastrana is pursuing a mistaken peace strategy and giving up too much to the FARC for too little?

- We remain convinced that a negotiated settlement is the best way to end Colombia's long-running conflict. A purely military solution is simply not viable, given Colombia's vast size, the limited infrastructure in its interior, and the complex factors that have allowed a guerrilla presence for two generations.
- However, for the peace process to succeed, all parties must participate fully and in good faith. We regret that the FARC engages in attacks that result in civilian casualties.
- The GOC has worked hard to find formulations acceptable to both sides. In our view, the peace process in Colombia has to be broader than the issue of talking with any single guerrilla group, however significant that group is. President Pastrana and his team have set the peace table with a generous scope for negotiations. We encourage the FARC to sit down at that table and partake in a serious search for peace.
- Starting a peace process in a country that has suffered 40 years of civil conflict and over 35,000 dead in the past decade alone is not easy. We do not expect the Colombian government will achieve a peace settlement with the guerrilla groups quickly. Lessons from similar disputes elsewhere suggest that the start-up phase of talks is particularly prone to lengthy delays and setbacks – and sometimes by unexpected breakthroughs.

TOPICS: INSURGENCY, PARAMILITARY & U.S. INTERVENTION CONCERNS...

Are we moving to support of GOC counter-insurgency efforts?

- No. U.S. policy is not shifting from cooperating with the Colombians on the regional counter-drug fight to assisting their counter-insurgency efforts. As President Clinton has stated clearly, our policy in Colombia is to support President Pastrana's efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the country's longstanding civil conflict and to work with the Colombians – along with our other regional partners – on fighting illicit drugs.
- A military solution is simply not possible for Colombia. We continue to call on the FARC to honor its commitments and enter into good faith negotiations with the Colombian Government.

What about fears that the FARC's strength is growing militarily?

- The insurgency has been going on for 40 years. We see no evidence that either side has the wherewithal to settle the civil conflict militarily.
- That is why we continue to believe that the best way to promote our interest in a stable Colombia is to back President Pastrana's efforts to reach a negotiated settlement.

Will you intervene militarily if things continue to deteriorate - this country at least is in our hemisphere?

- We are aggressively supporting the GOC in its fight against drugs. In addition to providing financial assistance, we are trained special counter-drug military units to enhance Colombia's ability to conduct eradication and lab destruction operations.
- As for the insurgency, again let's remember that it has been going on for 40 years and there is no expedient military solution. We believe that the best way to promote our interest in a stable Colombia is to back President Pastrana's efforts to reach a negotiated settlement.
- Let me also reiterate the distinction between counter-drug and counter-insurgency assistance. The USG does not intend to provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC. Any support to the Colombian military will continue to be focused on the common counter-drug objective and will be given only to units that have been vetted to ensure that they have not been responsible for human rights abuses.
- Greater progress is necessary in countering the production and distribution of illicit drugs in Colombia, both to diminish the revenue available to the guerrillas and to protect counter-drug successes elsewhere in the region. However, there is a distinction between counter-drug and counter-insurgency, and the USG does not intend to provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC.

What assurances will we have that the paramilitaries do not become the ultimate beneficiaries of the increased USG assistance to the Colombian military?

- In accordance with U.S. law, all assistance to the Colombian armed forces is contingent upon human rights screening. No USG assistance is being provided to any unit of the Colombian military for which there is credible evidence of gross human rights violations by its members. None will be provided to such units, unless, as required by U.S. law, the Secretary of State determines that the GOC is taking steps to bring those responsible for gross human rights violations to justice.
- The Colombian military has markedly improved its human rights performance in recent years. Unfortunately, at the same time, the number of abuses committed by the guerrillas and, particularly, by the paramilitaries has increased markedly.
- We have urged the GOC to take effective steps to end abuses and impunity within the armed forces. We welcomed President Pastrana's decisions in 1999 to retire four generals linked to paramilitary groups, and statements by President Pastrana and top military officials that they would not tolerate collaboration with the paramilitaries.

Is any component of this package designed to help the Colombian military go after the paramilitaries?

- This package is aimed at enhancing the GOC's ability to combat both drug trafficking and human rights abuses. It will reduce the abilities of the paramilitaries to engage in these illegal activities.

TOPIC: OPERATION MILLENIUM...

Did Operation Millennium play a role in the U.S. decision to increase support for GOC?

- We are very pleased and encouraged by the results from Operation Millennium.
- This was a recent large-scale international operation in which law enforcement authorities in Colombia, Mexico and the United States worked closely together to identify and then arrest major cocaine traffickers centered in Colombia who have been shipping huge quantities of illicit drugs to the United States.
- We believe the operation is a model for the kind of multilateral cooperation, including the possibility of appropriate extraditions, that will be increasingly essential if responsible governments everywhere are to make substantial further progress against illicit drug trafficking.
- While Operation Millennium was not the trigger for the U.S. decision to increase assistance, the initiative did demonstrate what the GOC is capable of achieving against the drug traffickers with appropriate USG assistance.

TALKING POINTS ON COLOMBIA PACKAGE

- Want to brief you on our Colombia proposal, which we are now ready to present to the Hill.
- We have been concerned with the drug explosion in Colombia for some time and have worked with the Government of Colombia to understand their strategy and plans for dealing with it.
- In the GOC's view, and our own, the promotion of job creation, peace, and rule of law generally in Colombia could reinforce counter-drug efforts – as well as being desirable goals on their account.
- We believe our proposal provides important support in all these areas in parallel to the much larger financial commitment by Colombia.
- As the President promised, our package is substantial, integrated, comprehensive, and balanced. It includes \$1.6 billion over two years, including an emergency FY 2000 supplemental of \$954 million, additional FY 2001 funding of \$318 million, and current

support of approximately \$150 million each for FY 2000 and FY. Its elements include:

- Equipment and training to help facilitate a coordinated police-military push into the coca-growing strongholds in southern Colombia;
 - Enhanced air, maritime, and riverine interdiction of illicit drugs;
 - Other Colombian National Police counter-drug initiatives;
 - Major increases in alternative development programs, including both resettlement and job-generation activities;
 - Enhanced GOC governing capacity, especially in the areas of human rights, stronger judicial institutions, and training in support of the peace process.
- Our efforts to strengthen the Colombian Army will be for counter-drug activities, not for counter-insurgency, and we will, of course, adhere to the Congressional legislation prohibiting assistance to individuals and units known to have committed human rights abuses.
 - The push into southern Colombia, involving security units, eradication, and alternative development, follows a tested strategy that has worked in Peru and Bolivia. The air interdiction approach has been enormously successful in Peru and has been tested in Colombia on the north coast.
 - That said, we and the GOC want to do this in the context of the rule of law, ensuring that human rights are protected and democracy is supported.
 - Another objective is to encourage the peace process with the goal of ending multiple insurgencies by negotiation. How soon this will happen will depend on the willingness of the multiple insurgent groups to negotiate.
 - Likewise, we want to work with the GOC to rebuild Colombia's economy, once the envy of the rest of Latin America.
 - You should know that our effort, together with Colombia's, will also be supported in the international community. The World Bank and Inter-American Development funding are considering hundreds of millions in loans for Colombia next year, and IMF has approved a \$2.7B program. And we will now begin to push hard for other donors.
 - Finally, this package is not devoted exclusively to Colombia. There are also modest amounts of additional assistance for Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela in the areas of both interdiction and alternative development. This assistance is needed to ensure that stronger counter-drug pressure in Colombia does not simply displace the drug problem to its neighbors.

- In association with this phone call, we will begin briefing Congressional staffs on details. If you wish to receive the briefing personally, we would be pleased to provide it.

DRAFT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 11, 2000

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Today I am sending an urgently-needed, two-year \$1.3 billion request to Congress for additional funding to assist Colombia in vital counter-drug efforts aimed at keeping illegal drugs off our shores. It will also help Colombia promote peace and prosperity and deepen its democracy. Consistent with funds already appropriated by Congress, our resulting support over this year and next would total nearly \$1.6 billion.

President Pastrana's inauguration in August 1998 brought to Colombia a new spirit of hope -- for stronger democracy, for broader prosperity, for an end to that country's long civil conflict. But increased drug production and trafficking, coupled with a serious economic recession and sustained violence throughout much of the country, have put that progress in peril.

President Pastrana has responded with a bold agenda -- Plan Colombia. It provides a solid, multifaceted strategy that the United States should support with substantial assistance. We have a compelling national interest in reducing the flow of cocaine and heroin to our shores, and in promoting peace, democracy and economic growth in Colombia and the region. Given the magnitude of the drug trafficking problem and their current economic difficulties, neither the Government of Colombia nor its neighbors can carry the full burden alone.

In Fiscal Year 2000, much of our support will be focused on a one-time infusion of funds to help boost Colombia's interdiction and eradication capabilities, particularly in the south. The package will also include assistance for economic development, protection of human rights, and judicial reform.

Our bilateral aid to Colombia will be supplemented by multilateral agencies. The World Bank and Inter-American

Development Bank are considering hundreds of millions of dollars in loans for Colombia next year. The IMF has already pledged a \$2.7 billion Extended Fund facility to help jumpstart the economy. And we will also continue to encourage our allies to assist Colombia.

The obstacles to a better future for Colombia are substantial. We expect it will require years before the full benefits of Plan Colombia are felt. But I believe that with our support and that of other donors, Plan Colombia can soon accelerate Colombia's nascent economic recovery. Over the longer haul, we can expect to see more effective drug eradication and increased interdiction of illicit drug shipments.

Strengthening stability and democracy in Colombia, and fighting the drug trade there, is in our fundamental national interest. So, with President Pastrana and with our Congress, we must and we will intensify this vital work.

#

DRAFT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 11, 2000

FACT SHEET

Colombia Assistance Package

Colombia and its democratically elected government are facing an urgent crisis that has narcotics, military and economic dimensions. Narco traffickers in Colombia now supply about 80 percent of the cocaine used in the United States.

Colombian President Andres Pastrana, who took office in August 1998, has developed a comprehensive, integrated approach to addressing Colombia's problems. Plan Colombia would strengthen the Colombian economy and democracy, and fight narcotics trafficking. The Colombian government estimates that Plan Colombia will cost \$7.5 billion and is dedicating \$4 billion of its own resources. It has also asked for the participation and help of the United States and other nations.

The United States has a vital interest in the success of this plan. For this reason, the President is sending to Congress a \$1.3 request for additional funding for an expanded comprehensive program. Consistent with funds already appropriated by Congress, U.S. support over this year and next would total nearly \$1.6 billion.

The five major components of U.S. assistance are:

- Helping the Colombian Government push into the coca-growing regions of the southern Colombia, which are now dominated by insurgent guerillas. Funds will help train special counter-narcotics battalions, purchase 30 Blackhawk and 33 Huey helicopters, and provide other support.

- Upgrading Colombian capability to aggressively interdict cocaine and cocaine traffickers. Funds will be used for radar, aircraft and airfield upgrades, and improved anti-narcotics intelligence gathering.
- Increasing coca crop eradication. The Administration will propose \$96 million to purchase equipment that will enable the Colombian National Police to eradicate more coca and poppy fields.
- Creating alternative paths for development. The Administration will propose \$145 million over the next two years to provide economic alternatives for Colombian farmers who now grow coca and poppy plants.
- Increasing protection of human rights, expanding the rule of law, and promoting the peace process. The Administration will propose \$93 million for new programs that will help the judicial system, and crack down on money laundering.

This initiative will be submitted as part of the President's Budget. It will add to our current support of approximately \$150 million each year an emergency FY 2000 supplemental of \$954 million and additional FY 2001 funding of \$318 million.

The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to help Colombia confront its current problems, while reducing the supply of drugs coming to the United States - to help both their national interest and our own.

#

ECUADOR: REACTION TO DOLLARIZATION ANNOUNCEMENT
January 11, 2000

CONTEXT: President Mahuad announced on Sunday that Ecuador will move to dollarize its economy in reaction to its economic and political crisis .

What are your views on Ecuador's decision to adopt the dollar as its currency?

- We are closely watching developments in Ecuador following the GOE's announcement that it will dollarize. We have been in contact with Ecuadorian authorities and the IMF.
- Strong underlying economic policies, including policies to ensure a sound banking sector and sound public finances, will be essential for Ecuador to achieve economic and financial confidence and stability going forward.
- We encourage the GOE to consult with the IMF on its monetary and exchange rate arrangements in the context of its overall economic program.
- We encourage all Ecuadorian political leaders to put national interests ahead of party politics and avoid a more serious economic and institutional crisis.
- Above all, it is important that the constitutional order be respected.

CUBAN BOY
January 11, 2000

CONTEXT: *On January 10, the Miami Dade Circuit Court awarded emergency temporary custody of Elian Gonzalez to his great uncle, Lazaro Gonzalez, pending a full hearing on the great uncle's petition for temporary custody on March 6. The court also ruled that Elian may not be removed from the jurisdiction and gave the great uncle such limited legal authority as necessary to preserve the status quo and prevent his removal, including the authority to speak on behalf of Elian in immigration matters. Late January 7, Representative Dan Burton (R-IN) issued a subpoena for Elian to appear before the House Government Reform Committee on 10 February. In subsequent interviews, Burton claimed that his intent was not to have Elian testify but to keep him in the United States past the INS declared January 14 deadline. He added that his intent was to ensure that the case would be decided by a Florida court and that he would respect the decision of that court with regard to custody of Elian. A delegation from Miami, --the Mayors of Miami and Dade County, along with a lawyer for the boy and a representative from the Cuban American National Foundation--met with the Attorney General on January 7 to register their objections to the INS decision. Senator Bob Smith (R-NH) visited Elian on January 8 and announced his intention to ask the Attorney General to drop the Friday deadline.*

What is the INS decision in the Elian Gonzalez case?

- INS determined that Elian's father, Juan Gonzalez, has sole authority to speak on his son's behalf regarding his immigration status in this case. Mr. Gonzalez has asked that his son be returned to Cuba.

Now that a Florida court has awarded temporary custody to Elian's great uncle, will INS be able to carry out its decision?

- The Justice Department is currently reviewing this issue and I would refer you to them for response.

Do you expect that the father will come to the United States to contest custody?

- We hope that he will, but that decision is up to the father, Mr. Gonzalez. The State Department has offered to facilitate the issuance of a visa for the child's father should he wish to travel here, and we continue to believe that it would be helpful in resolving this matter expeditiously.

Gov. Bush of Florida is appealing to the President to overturn the INS decision. Will he do that?

- As the President has said, this was a legal, not a political decision. The decision was made by the appropriate legal authority within the U.S. government – the INS. INS followed the law and its procedures in determining that the boy's father speaks for the boy in immigration matters.

Was the decision to return Elian Gonzalez made so to appease Castro as reported in the January 6 edition of the New York Times?

- Let me repeat what the President has said. This decision was a non-political decision made by the relevant officials at the Immigration and Naturalization Service in consultation with the Department of Justice based on the facts of the case and in conformity with the law and with INS rules and procedures.

Were the political implications of the decision discussed at the senior levels?

- White House officials did not seek to, nor did they, influence the outcome of this decision, which, let me reiterate, was made solely by the responsible authorities following the law and INS rules and procedures.

Are U.S. officials concerned about the reaction of the Cuban American community in Miami?

- We understand that for many this is an emotional issue, but it is our hope that the Miami community will remain peaceful in order to allow the legal process to work its course in this matter.

Representative Dan Burton (R-IN) has issued a subpoena for Elian to appear before the House Government Reform Committee on 10 February. Will that prevent Elian from returning to his father by the INS deadline of January 14?

- The Department of Justice is reviewing this matter, and I refer you to them on this question.

PANAMA: UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE ON FORMER U.S. FIRING RANGES
January 10, 2000

CONTEXT: *The Washington Post reported today on allegations by the Government of Panama (GOP) that the U.S. has not met its treaty obligations regarding the clean up of unexploded ordnance (UXO) on former firing ranges in the Canal Zone in Panama. In the article, the Post notes that the GOP has presented photographs, taken by a private consultant, of alleged UXO at various sites within the former ranges. In previous public statements, the Departments of State and Defense have stated that the U.S. had fulfilled its obligations under the Panama Canal Treaty to remove UXO "insofar as practicable." Until a USG inspection is conducted, it is impossible to say with certainty if this new evidence belies these statements or not. We have notified the GOP of our desire to inspect the sites of alleged UXO and have assured the GOP of our commitment to live up to our treaty obligations. We hope to send a team of experts to Panama to inspect the sites in the near future. The GOP is anxious for this team to come, and has agreed that such a visit should be low key. During a December 26 television interview, Panamanian Foreign Minister Aleman claimed that the USG now recognizes that the ranges were not cleaned up properly.*

Any comment on the allegation that the U.S. has not met its treaty obligations regarding UXO on former firing ranges in Panama?

- The Panama Canal Treaty requires the U.S. to remove unexploded ordnance to the extent "practicable." Most – 84 percent – of the areas of former ranges has been restored to full use. However, a small portion of the former ranges (14 percent of the ranges and 2 percent of the former Canal Zone) must remain off limits to human access because complete removal of all unexploded ordnance for these areas is not practicable, given current technology, difficulties imposed by the terrain, and the need to preserve forested areas that protect vital Canal watershed and provide habitat for numerous endangered plants and animals.

Are you saying that the U.S. has complied with the treaty?

- We believe we have complied with the terms of the treaty. We informed the Government of Panama when the ranges were transferred that there were areas that would have to remain off limits. We provided it with a complete range management plan, including equipment and training, to manage those areas at the time. We are willing to continue to provide assistance to the Government of Panama in managing those areas.

But what about reports of photographs of unexploded ordnance?

- Representatives of the Government of Panama recently briefed the Department of State about purported unexploded ordnance on former U.S. firing ranges. We are looking into the matter

and will work with the Government of Panama in a cooperative spirit to determine the facts and resolve any outstanding issues.

But Foreign Minister Aleman said the Department of State has recognized that the clean up was not adequate. Is this not true?

- I am not going to get into characterizing what the Foreign Minister said. The important point is that we are looking into the matter and will work with the Government of Panama to resolve any outstanding issues.

Will the U.S. send a team of experts to Panama to examine the evidence?

- I have nothing to say at this time about any specific plans.

MEXICO: ARELLANO DRUG TRAFFICKERS STILL AT LARGE IN MEXICO

January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: In a front-page NYT article on January 10th, Tim Golden describes the still-at-large Arellano brothers and their close drug trafficking associates as “glaring symbols of the failure of the American and Mexican governments even to disrupt the powerful gangs that control Mexico’s drug trade.” Golden bases his assessment on the simple fact that, despite a sustained and costly effort to bring the Arellanos to justice, they remain at large and very much at work moving illicit drugs north into the United States. Golden goes further to assert that the “most basic obstacle remains the corruption that pervades Mexican law enforcement.” Most of Golden’s key points are valid, but his article fails to provide sufficient context relating to the overall counter-drug effort in Mexico. While the Arellanos are still at large, and there is certainly significant corruption in Mexican law enforcement, GOM has made progress in its ongoing counter-drug campaign, and the fact that the Arellanos remain active traffickers today doesn’t mean that ongoing law enforcement initiatives won’t prove successful against them in the future, as such initiatives have against other major traffickers in Mexico and elsewhere.

- Both the U.S. and Mexican Governments share the frustration reflected in media reports and elsewhere that the Arellano cartel has not been dismantled.
- In addition, there is significant concern on the part of both governments about the way in which corruption often makes it much more difficult to carry out effective law enforcement operations against drug traffickers, wherever they may be found.
- That said, sustained efforts by the Government of Mexico against the Arellano cartel will continue and remain a primary focus of cooperation between our two governments. We’ve made progress against other major cartels, both in Mexico and elsewhere, and we will persevere for as long as necessary to succeed against the Arellano cartel as well.
- For any further reaction, I would refer you to the Department of Justice.

PROSECUTION OF WWII WAR CRIMINAL KONRADS KALEJS

January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: Konrads Kalejs, an Australian citizen since 1957, fled Britain yesterday bound for Australia. He was deported from the U.S. in 1994 and from Canada in 1997 for the murders and persecution of tens of thousands of Jews, Roma and others in Latvia during World War II. Kalejs was found to be a former company commander in the Arajs Kommando Unit of the security police in German-occupied Latvia. After a recent television news program found him living in Rugby, England, and his subsequent departure from England before deportation proceedings against him were initiated, Jewish leaders in Britain have said there will be protests upon his return to Australia.

Kalejs was previously investigated by the Australian government for war crimes, but was not prosecuted. Australian prosecutors have said they have reviewed evidence in the possession of the USG but have found it insufficient to bring forward a prosecution. Latvian government representatives have recently said that they would seek to extradite him back to Latvia if there was sufficient evidence for a prosecution.

Does the U.S. have a view on whether Konrads Kalejs should be prosecuted for war crimes?

- The U.S. wants to see Konrads Kalejs stand trial for war crimes in a country with criminal jurisdiction over him. Kalejs was found by a U.S. Immigration judge and a Court of Appeals judge to be responsible for the deaths and persecution of Jews, Roma and other civilians as a member of the "Arajs Kommando" Unit of the Security Police in German-occupied Latvia during 1941-1944. He was deported from the U.S. in 1994.
- We understand that Kalejs is returning to Australia. We have seen press reports that the Government of Latvia has indicated its possible willingness to seek extradition, though they have not formally done so at this time.
- The U.S. has already shared evidence with authorities in several countries. DOJ prosecutors are prepared to meet here in Washington with prosecutors from other countries to review the evidence in our possession.
- This evidence was sufficient to convince several U.S. judges to deport Kalejs. Although deportation under U.S. law is a civil proceeding rather than a criminal one, the Government's burden of proof is the same, and we believe the evidence deserves a fresh review by prosecutors. The USG is prepared to assist in this effort.

What was the reason that DOJ did not prosecute Kalejs for war crimes when he was in the U.S.?

- The USG can not bring a prosecution for crimes committed outside the U.S. unless there is a statute specifically authorizing it to do so, and at the time when the alleged war crimes were committed by Kalejs in Latvia, U.S. law had not established jurisdiction over such crimes.
- (If pressed:) Even if Congress were to pass such a law today providing for the prosecution of war crimes committed by foreign nationals outside the U.S., it would be unconstitutional to apply that statute retroactively to crimes committed more than 50 years ago.

BACKGROUND: Acting President Putin promoted Finance Minister Mikhail Kasyanov to the key post of first deputy prime minister. Former First Deputy Prime Minister Aksyoneko remains Railway Minister. He also dismissed Kremlin business manager Pavel Borodin, who has been implicated in the Mabatex scandal. Putin promoted Emergencies Minister Shoigu to Deputy Prime Minister and reappointed Viktor Khristenko Deputy Prime Minister in charge of economy. Putin characterized reshuffle as temporary and "related to the pre-election situation."

Does Putin's appointment of Russian Finance Minister Kasyanov for the government's number two job signal the importance Putin places on relations with Western creditors?

- Personnel choices are Acting President Putin's to make; not helpful for us to speculate on the rationale behind specific personnel decisions.

What does the government reshuffle mean for economic reform and crime and corruption efforts?

- We welcome Putin's statements emphasizing the importance of democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution and right to private property. We look to Putin not only to oversee democratic transfer of power from first democratically elected President of Russia to the next, but also to pursue meaningful progress towards developing a law-based state.

Any reaction to new government changes? Is Acting President Putin cleaning house and throwing out members of the old guard in the Kremlin such as Pavel Borodin?

- Personnel choices are Acting President Putin's to make; not helpful for us to speculate on the rationale behind specific personnel decisions.
- Important that developments in Russia continue to unfold according to constitutional procedures; look now for Putin to oversee free and fair electoral process to select next democratically elected president of Russia.

Do you think that the head start Putin has received is healthy for Russian democracy and that the results aren't predetermined, because viable candidates simply do not have the resources and time to organize effective campaigns?

- Not for us to handicap Russian elections. That is a choice for the Russian people. There will be more developments over the coming days and weeks.
- Key point here is that procedures for electing a new president are laid out in Russian Constitution and those are being respected. Important that upcoming campaign be free and fair and that conduct of elections be consistent with international democratic norms.

- Note Acting President Putin's statements emphasizing the importance of free and fair elections, democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution, and freedom of speech and press.

Is the Administration worried that a Putin presidency will pursue more authoritarian approaches to domestic problems (such as crime and corruption) and greater nationalist adventurism abroad, leading to bloodshed?

- Yeltsin's place in history is marked by the steps he and the Russian people took to dismantle the communist system and create an enduring democratic process within a constitutional framework.
- Welcome Acting President Putin's initial statements emphasizing the importance of democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution, and commitment to protect freedom of speech, conscience and press and right to private property.
- Important that President Yeltsin's resignation occurred in accordance with Russian constitution. As Yeltsin said, his intent was to accelerate a competitive electoral process, not to circumvent it. Now look to Putin to oversee the democratic transfer of power from first democratically elected Russian president to the next.
- As Putin himself has suggested, both Russian and international opinion about Putin will be shaped by his actions and steps taken by the Russian government. Hope Putin will act on this opportunity to set a strong reform agenda and pursue it.

BACKGROUND: Russian soldiers lifted the suspension of air and artillery attacks on Grozny and resumed attacks in Chechnya after a lull to mark Orthodox Christmas and the end of Ramadan. Intense fighting continues in southern Chechnya, and Chechen fighters over the weekend staged attacks on Argun, Shali and Gudermes, all of which had been under the control of Russian forces. The two primary Russian combat commanders in Chechnya, Major Generals Troshev and Shamanov, were reassigned to other positions.

Any update on Chechnya, Russian resumption of attacks in Chechnya and lifting of suspension of bombardment of Grozny?

- Our position has been consistent: military solution not viable, will lead to the kind of cycle of violence we now see emerging, urge both sides to exercise restraint, avoid indiscriminate attacks, engage in political dialogue.
- Believe there needs to be immediate cease-fire across Chechnya, meaningful steps toward a political dialogue utilizing good offices of OSCE and durable political solution.

How do you respond to the criticism of President Clinton's characterization of Russia's campaign to "liberate" Grozny in his Time Magazine column on Boris Yeltsin?

- The President made two very strong points in the article.
- First, we have consistently recognized that there are terrorists in Chechnya, and that Russia has a right to combat terrorism. The President used the word "liberate" in this context. He also stressed that Russia's campaign in Chechnya is killing innocent civilians, and that we have a profound disagreement with the manner in which it is being conducted.
- Second, he stressed that the issue at stake is even larger than the humanitarian tragedy inside Chechnya itself. If Russia's conduct in Chechnya becomes a model for how to deal with the complex problems of separatism and terrorism, if it chooses to address those problems solely by violent means, that will have profound implications for our interest in seeing Russia emerge as a stable, open society governed by the rule of law.
- That's why the President has repeatedly urged Russian leaders -- President Yeltsin and Acting President Putin -- to resolve this crisis through dialogue.

Aren't you headed for a confrontation with Putin since he is the architect of Chechnya policy?

- We are deeply troubled about Chechnya, but hope that the reality of the situation will sink in and that Putin will see the importance of bringing this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as

quickly as possible. It is in the interests of Russia to do so as well as Putin's -- especially with elections looming in March.

- The ultimate test, however, will be Putin's leadership of Russia -- both in strengthening democracy and instituting difficult economic reforms. We'll need to wait and see how he defines and implements his agenda for Russia.
- Believe that both sides in conflict should implement immediate cease-fire throughout Chechnya and launch meaningful political dialogue to resolve the conflict. Russia has an ongoing obligation to stop indiscriminate use of force against civilians, to provide for the safety of all civilians affected by the conflict, and to ensure that people who want to flee the conflict can do so.
- We think Russians should seriously consider utilizing OSCE's good offices to help develop political dialogue. Also want to see reestablishment of OSCE permanent presence in region.

Some commentators note that Western complaints of Russia's actions have become an "empty ritual". Why not apply sanctions?

- International community has spoken with one voice that purely military solution to Chechnya conflict is not possible, indiscriminate use of force against civilians is unacceptable.
- Russia has heard our concern that its behavior is isolating it from the international community. Prime Minister Putin has acknowledged that Russia's integration with international community is a key national security concern for Russia.
- As we look at effective levers to help bring the conflict to an end, we also need to be realistic about what will not work and when certain actions would be counterproductive since our economic engagement with Russia is fundamentally rooted in our self-interest to help Russia complete the transition to a market economy and safeguard sensitive technologies.
- Russia has not yet met the conditions for IMF disbursements. If it does meet those conditions, we will make our decisions based on our national interests, including the impact on democracy and stability in Russia.
- Regarding our bilateral assistance, two thirds goes to programs such as dismantling warheads, destroying missiles and protecting fissile materials; the vast majority of the rest goes to build civil society and promote change outside of Moscow. We continue to support these goals.

RUSSIA: EMBASSY SHOOTING
January 11, 2000

BACKGROUND: An unidentified intruder in fatigues entered U.S. Embassy compound in an apparent attempt to steal vehicle. The intruder gained entry to Ambassador's empty car. He was shot by Marine guard after refusing to stop. The intruder was taken to hospital, where he is in intensive care. Moscow authorities said two drunken soldiers were involved and they have arrested second suspect.

Was there a terrorist attack on the US Embassy in Moscow on January 10? Can you provide details?

- At 18:50 Moscow time, a Russian-speaking intruder wearing military fatigues, apparently in his mid-twenties, gained unauthorized entry to the Embassy grounds, near the Chancery Building on Novinskiy Blvd. He was discovered by Embassy security personnel. He had gained access to an unlocked passenger automobile in the courtyard, seized it and began to ram other vehicles parked in the courtyard. He also tried to drive the car into pedestrians and guards, some of whom were forced to flee for safety behind barriers in the compound.
- During this period, while security personnel moved all Embassy employees out of danger, US Embassy security attempted to stop the intruder. They repeatedly ordered him to stop the car; they tried unsuccessfully to open the locked door of the car and break the windows of the vehicle. Ignoring all orders to stop, the intruder continued to threaten the lives of those in the courtyard. Security persons on the scene could not determine whether the intruder was armed or had explosives. After all alternative measures failed, guards fired on the vehicle, wounding the intruder. They were then able to apprehend him and determine that he had no firearms or explosives.
- The US Embassy immediately summoned the appropriate Russian investigatory team and called for Russian medical assistance and an ambulance. Until the ambulance arrived, US medical personnel provided emergency care tot he injured person, who remained conscious.
- The incident ended approximately 2000 hours, without any injury to American or Russian staff of the US Embassy or other individuals other than the wounded intruder.

How did the intruder get onto the Embassy grounds?

- We're still investigating how the intruder gained access. We can only confirm that he entered in an unauthorized manner.

Can you identify the intruder, why was he trying to get into the Embassy?

- The investigation of the incident is in the hands of the Russian authorities and is on-going. The US Embassy is cooperating as fully as possible with the Russian authorities, within the constraints of usual diplomatic practice. We would refer you to the Russian authorities.

Will the US Embassy be conducting its own investigation?

- Yes, Embassy investigation is already ongoing. In every case of an incident of this kind we think it's important to determine the facts, to insure that actions taken were appropriate, and to make recommendations for improvements, if needed, in procedures.

Some media reports say that two individuals entered the Embassy. Can you confirm that more than one person was involved?

- We have seen press reports that a second individual who apparently tried to gain access to the Embassy has been apprehended by Russian authorities.
- The Embassy has no independent information on this person and cannot confirm the report. This is one of the issues the ongoing Russian investigation will explore.

Do you believe that this is a terrorist incident or conspiracy? Has any group claimed responsibility?

- The Embassy has no evidence of any kind that this incident involved more than the one or two individuals involved. No one has claimed responsibility. The Russian investigation, of course, will look at these issues as well.

Are you satisfied with the Russian response, with Russian protection of the Embassy?

- The US Embassy wishes to express its appreciation for the professional assistance of the Russian authorities, both Federal and the City of Moscow. We will continue to work with these authorities to insure our security cooperation is as effective as possible.

CORRUPTION IN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY
January 10, 2000

Do you have any comment on an editorial in the January 10, 2000 Washington Times, which criticizes the Palestinian Authority for widespread corruption?

- We have seen these reports.
- As we have said before, the issue of corruption is one which we view with great concern and have consistently raised with Palestinian Authority officials on a variety of occasions.
- We have made clear to them that transparency and accountability are necessary in order to build civil society.

CHINA: NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS

January 11, 2000

Why has the Administration made a decision to sponsor a resolution on China at the UN Human Rights Commission?

- Since the last meeting of the Human Rights Commission the human rights situation in China has deteriorated. China has suppressed political dissent and breached fundamental rights such as freedom of conscience, assembly, and expression.
- Our goal in deciding to sponsor a resolution on China is to improve the human rights situation in China. Our hope is that the Chinese authorities will take tangible steps to bring their human rights practices into compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other international obligations.

Is this decision designed to help persuade the Congress to approve permanent Normal Trade Relations status for China in connection with the WTO bilateral accession deal that the U.S. and China recently concluded?

- The Human Rights Commission in Geneva is the appropriate international forum for bringing attention to bear on UN member countries' human rights situations. We decided to sponsor a resolution at the Commission based on deterioration in the human rights situation in China since last year.
- As the President said yesterday in the context of our effort to secure permanent NTR status for China, we continue to have serious disagreements with the PRC on human rights and we'll continue to press our views and protect our interests.
- Bringing China into the WTO will promote the right kind of change in China while at the same time serving the broad interests of the American people.
- It will promote China's integration into the global economy and benefit American businessmen, investors, farmers, workers, and consumers as China reduces barriers to free trade.
- WTO accession will encourage China to advance economic reform and deepen the rule of law.

CHINA: MILITARY-TO-MILITARY RELATIONS

January 6, 2000

Have US-PRC military-to-military relations resumed?

- Having concluded our discussions with the Chinese regarding the humanitarian and property payments associated with the tragic mistaken bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, we look forward to moving ahead comprehensively in our relationship with China.
- Refer you to the Pentagon for comment on next steps in military-to-military relations.

Are relations back on track with China?

- We have advanced many of our priority agenda items in U.S.-China relations, but have more work to do. We would like to see broader and deeper exchanges on human rights as well as nonproliferation and arms control, for example.

FORT CAMPBELL/DON'T ASK DON'T TELL
January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: The trial of Army Specialist Justin R. Fisher concluded this weekend at Fort Campbell. This is the second court martial stemming from the death of Private First Class Barry Winchell, who was allegedly killed because of his homosexuality. Private Calvin Glover was convicted of murder in a previous court martial. Specialist Fisher was the roommate of Private Winchell and has entered a guilty plea on the charges of obstructing justice, making false statements, and providing alcohol to a minor. [The family of Private Winchell has filed suit against the U.S. Army, accusing it of failing to protect... – DOD is checking, but this is unconfirmed]

What is your reaction to this weekend's verdict in the Ft. Campbell court marshal of Justin Fischer?

- This case is in the military justice system. Although there has been a guilty plea, the process is on-going and it is not appropriate for me to comment on the case.

This case raises questions about the safety of servicemen and women on U.S. bases. At Ft. Campbell, for example, underage drinking allegedly contributed to the violence that claimed Private Winchell's life. Are you concerned? If so, what are you willing to do to improve safety?

- Of course, the safety and security of our servicemen and women on our military installations is a paramount concern.
- The Army has committed to review compliance with policies and procedures that protect the health, safety, and security of its soldiers at Ft. Campbell . I strongly support any measures that improve the safety of our soldiers.

Doesn't this verdict further demonstrate that your "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding gays in the military does not work?

- As I have said before, our policy has not had a chance to work because it has not been fully implemented. I am committed to improving implementation of the existing policy rather than changing the statute passed by Congress in 1993. Secretary Cohen has already taken a number of steps to improve policy implementation, and I refer you to DOD for details.

CSIS STUDY OF MILITARY CULTURE
January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: The Washington Post, New York Times and Washington Times reported today on a just-published study by The Center for Strategic and International Studies on "American Military Culture in the 21st Century." The study, authored by retired Army Colonel Joseph Collins, reports survey results that found military personnel feel overworked and underpaid, lack the resources to carry out their missions, and lack confidence in their leaders (particularly in the senior military leadership of the services). It concludes that the leadership of the Armed Services – military as well as civilian – have not adjusted to significant changes in military demographics (large increase in married personnel and two-career families) and the impact of increased deployment rates in the post-Cold War world. That military personnel hold such views is well known in the Services and DOD, and strongly influenced recommendations the Joint Chiefs and Secretary of Defense made to the President regarding increases in pay and benefits. The Services have also made or initiated a number of changes in personnel assignment policies, the organization of operational units, and management of rotational deployments in order to better cope with the demands of the post-Cold War security environment.

Points to be Made

- First, would like to point out positive findings in the study that were not highlighted in this morning's articles. For example:
 - Peace operations and other small-scale contingencies are essential to the national interest and the study's findings do not argue against undertaking them.
 - Fundamental professional values are remarkably strong – military personnel today overwhelmingly subscribe to traditional military values such as self-sacrifice, discipline and obedience to lawful authority.
 - Quality and efficiency of joint operations have improved during the 1990s.
 - Services have made significant strides in more closely integrating plans and operations of their reserve and active forces.
 - Race relations in the armed forces are generally better than in the wider society.
- Study raised two important issues that have been top priorities over the past two years: the quality of life and job satisfaction concerns of military personnel.
- President cares deeply about the well being of men and women in uniform.

- He meets with them whenever he can, abroad as well as at home. He talks with them and listens to their concerns. Has done this in Bosnia and Kosovo, and many other locations around the world.
- He also meets with their families, as he did in Norfolk last year when he met with families of troops deployed to the Balkans. They do not hesitate to share their concerns with him.
- President has full and complete confidence in the leadership and judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and civilian leadership of the services. They are aware of the challenges they face and are pursuing a number of initiatives to address the concerns raised by the military personnel surveyed in the CSIS study.
- President meets regularly with the Joint Chiefs and Secretary of Defense to hear their views on readiness and personnel issues. When they expressed concerns about readiness and personnel, he took action.
- As study notes, defense resources are an important issue. President has often stated his commitment to ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to carry out their mission.
- President requested supplemental appropriations in fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and increased funding for readiness, personnel and other critical accounts by \$12 billion in fiscal year 2000.
- Over last six months, have seen encouraging signs that we are turning the corner on readiness. Although our Armed Forces still face readiness challenges, particularly in recruiting and retaining skilled individuals, Administration initiatives are helping us achieve our readiness goals.
- President's budget also projects continued increases in defense spending – over \$112 billion through fiscal year 2005 – the first sustained, long-term increase in a decade.
- Quality of life and job satisfaction concerns of military personnel are also being addressed.
- President requested and signed into law significant increases in pay and benefits in his fiscal year 2000 budget.
- Services are pursuing a number of initiatives to better manage the increase in peacetime deployments that have marked the post-Cold War world.
 - They are implementing improved personnel assignment and unit rotation policies, and are exploring further changes – including organizational changes – to better manage operational tempo and reduce the impact of deployments on military personnel.
 - I refer you to the Defense Department for details on those changes.
- Challenges remain, but these are important steps in the right direction.

- President is confident that America's Armed Forces are – and will continue to be – capable of carrying out our national strategy and meeting America's defense commitments around the world.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION

January 10, 2000

CONTEXT: In December 1998, the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) proposed to the President that the government establish a new institute to address pressing information infrastructure protection needs. In his response to PCAST, the President directed OSTP and NSC to further evaluate the proposal in close consultation with the private sector. The Administration's detailed review of the proposal, which included discussions with numerous experts in government, the private sector, and academia, concluded that there is a need for such an institute, and that existing entities are not conducting the research and other technical activities needed to protect our information infrastructure. In a capstone meeting, the Chief Technology Officers from 15 of the nation's leading information technology corporations unanimously agreed that such an institute is needed to develop key technologies for information infrastructure protection.

Today we announced that we will request \$50 million for the Institute in FY01. The Institute will be operated through the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and it will work directly with the private sector and academia on crucial problems such as intrusion and malicious code detection.

Why is such an Institute required?

- During the Administration's review of PCAST's proposal, we contacted well over 100 leaders and specialists in information technologies in the government, private sector, and academia. We were particularly concerned with whether existing institutes and laboratories, both inside and outside of government, were already satisfying requirements for information infrastructure protection research.
- The overwhelming response was that key research areas are not being adequately addressed by either government or the private sector. Furthermore, there is insufficient market demand to drive private sector research investments in these areas – even though they are vital to the protection of the nation's information infrastructure.

Isn't the Department of Defense currently funding considerable research in information security? Can't DoD's investments adequately protect the nation's information infrastructure?

- DoD is making substantial investments in information security programs. However, the focus of DoD's efforts are related to the agency's mission: national defense. Our current concern is broader than national defense—we must protect the entire national information infrastructure upon which our economic and national security rest.

- Furthermore, DoD does not have the mandate to protect the largely civilian owned- and operated information infrastructure. While it is important that DoD-funded and developed technologies are applied to protect our national information infrastructure to the maximum degree possible, defense technologies and investments cannot do it all.

**Why isn't private industry developing the technologies to protect its own infrastructures?
Is this a duplication of effort?**

- The private sector is investing substantially in advanced technologies to protect the information infrastructure and ensure its robust, reliable operation. This investment is essential as we move into an information-age economy. However, market forces alone will not motivate the private sector to invest in all the research and technology development needed to protect our nation's information systems.
- During our analysis of PCAST's proposal, the private sector's message was clear: the government must not duplicate existing R&D, but must fill the "gaps." These gaps are real and pressing.
- The reasons why private sector investments are insufficient are many: some of the needed technologies are very high risk or ill-defined; some will require substantial investments in time, personnel, and facilities; some may not lead immediately to products on the market; and others will not produce benefits that the investing firms can capture.

Can you give us some examples of programs in which the private sector is not willing to invest that would be right for the Institute?

- Intrusion detection and monitoring. While there are numerous intrusion detection products on the market, there are a number of fundamental intrusion detection research issues that are ideally suited for the Institute: detection on large scale networks, data fusion from multiple sources, frameworks and protocols that enable different products to "talk" to one another, interfaces with human operators, to name a few.
- Malicious code detection. Sorting through thousands or millions of lines of computer code to detect malicious code such as trapdoors and logic bombs is an extremely challenging technical problem. However, it is essential that we have an automated capability to detect and eliminate such code from our critical infrastructures.
- Interdependencies. The information infrastructure is a fabric that weaves together many of our nation's critical infrastructures. As one example, automatic control of electrical grids, which is particularly important in this era of deregulation, relies upon robust, secure, and continuous operation of information networks. However, very little government or private sector research is devoted to understanding these interdependencies among the infrastructures. Given the innumerable, crucial linkages and dependencies that permeate our infrastructures, interdependencies research is a prime candidate for the Institute.

- Large scale testbeds. Large scale testbeds for testing new, advanced technologies do not exist, and few network owners would be willing to test new technologies on “live” networks. The Institute could develop and operate testbeds in a “neutral environment” – similar to an Underwriters Laboratory.

How do you envision making an Institute in the government fully responsive to the needs of the private sector?

- The Institute will have multiple customers, including the private sector and government owners and operators of information networks. The Institute must be designed from the onset to be flexible, nimble, and responsive to each customer. The Institute will coordinate closely with and receive inputs and recommendations from the National Infrastructure Assurance Council, Sector Coordinators, and expert teams from the private sector. Furthermore, the Institute would continuously review its programs with these private sector experts to ensure the relevancy of its research agenda.

Will this Institute perform its own research or require a new laboratory facility?

- A key consideration for the Institute is that it engage the best and brightest minds in information security. Consequently, the Institute will consist of a small, expert core staff and will primarily support research done by the technology leaders, whether in industry, academia, or the government.