

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Timothy Wu <twu@os.dhhs.gov> (Timothy Wu <twu@os.dhhs.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUL-2000 17:27:12.00

SUBJECT: This week

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca Aaron <RAaron@whf.gov> (Rebecca Aaron <RAaron@whf.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sonny Garg (CN=Sonny Garg/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Reynaldo Valencia (CN=Reynaldo Valencia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Melissa M. Goldstein (CN=Melissa M. Goldstein/OU=OVP/O=EOP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'gary hall' <gary.hall@do.treas.gov> ('gary hall' <gary.hall@do.treas.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'barrye price' <blprice@opm.gov> ('barrye price' <blprice@opm.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'juan garcia' <juan_garcia@ed.gov> ('juan garcia' <juan_garcia@ed.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'esther benjamin' <benjamin-esther@dol.gov> ('esther benjamin' <benjamin-esther@dol.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'chris moore' <christopher.m.moore@usdoj.gov> ('chris moore' <christopher.m.moore@usdoj.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: 'ariel zwang' <ariel_m._zwang@hud.gov> ('ariel zwang' <ariel_m._zwang@hud.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hey, all

I am off to London and Moscow with Secretary Shalala this evening, and as

a

result will miss all of our sessions this week. Have a great time, and ask a lot of probing "Don't ask, don't tell questions." (Pun intended?)

Tim

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUL-2000 09:52:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: guidance requests -- Lockhart briefing at 10 am

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

folks are working on these, but as you can tell, we won't meet a 10 am briefing -- is this a problem?

Jenni R. Engebretsen
07/19/2000 09:01:18 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP, Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: guidance requests -- Lockhart briefing at 10 am

dpc
education (nyt) -- POTUS plan a gamble? reckless? causing wider gaps
between rich and poor? conflict between higher standards and inadequate
resources at state level -- what can we do?
crime prevention (nyt, wp) -- proposed Gore amendment on victims rights --
similar to one POTUS opposed?
slave labor (wp) -- Watts/Lewis legis for a monument on Capitol grounds --
do we support?

dpc/nsc
Fort Campbell (nyt, wp) -- Army report: no climate of homophobia existed
-- impact on "don't ask, don't tell"?
Lackland AFB (wp) -- new policy of counseling, legal aid to reduce
discharges - Pentagon report this week?

AIDS/personnel
AIDS envoy (wp) -- why does post remain unfilled?

Message Sent

To: _____

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Sandra Thurman/OPD/EOP@EOP
Aaron DeCamp/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katherine A. Brown/NSC/EOP@EOP
David B. Stockwell/NSC/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUL-2000 09:01:22.00

SUBJECT: guidance requests -- Lockhart briefing at 10 am

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

dpc
education (nyt) -- POTUS plan a gamble? reckless? causing wider gaps
between rich and poor? conflict between higher standards and inadequate
resources at state level -- what can we do?
crime prevention (nyt, wp) -- proposed Gore amendment on victims rights --
similar to one POTUS opposed?
slave labor (wp) -- Watts/Lewis legis for a monument on Capitol grounds --
do we support?

dpc/nsc
Fort Campbell (nyt, wp) -- Army report: no climate of homophobia existed
-- impact on "don't ask, don't tell"?
Lackland AFB (wp) -- new policy of counseling, legal aid to reduce
discharges - Pentagon report this week?

AIDS/personnel
AIDS envoy (wp) -- why does post remain unfilled?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-JUL-2000 01:35:03.00

SUBJECT: CBS, Evening News with Dan Rather, July 17,2000

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/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: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/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: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/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: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/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: June Shih (CN=June Shih/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: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/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: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/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: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/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: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Marc I. Hurwitz (CN=Marc I. Hurwitz/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/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: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/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: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: David B. Stockwell (CN=David B. Stockwell/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: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:
CBS EVENING NEWS WITH DAN RATHER
July 17, 2000

High: With the GOP convention coming up fast, George W. Bush says his list of possible vice presidents is shrinking fast. A CBS poll finds naming a vice president who favors abortion rights could hurt Bush more than it helps.)

(Spec: George W. Bush; Politics; Elections)

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

BOB SCHIEFFER, CBS NEWS ANCHOR: They are neck-and-neck in the presidential race: a new poll gives Bush the narrowest of leads, and he tells us about his search for a running mate. Hillary Clinton defends herself against accusations of anti-Semitism. Outrage over a plan to slaughter hundreds of sheep to protect humans. And, forgotten heroes of World War II, fighting a new battle for justice.

ANNOUNCER: This is the CBS EVENING NEWS with Dan Rather.

SCHIEFFER: Good evening. Dan is off tonight. I'm Bob Schieffer.

The race to decide the next president of the United States is about as close as it could be. A CBS news poll out tonight finds George Bush leads Al Gore by just two points, 43 to 41 percent. That's well within the margin of error. Adding Pat Buchanan and Ralph Nader to the mix gives Bush a slightly bigger lead. Even though nine vice presidents have been called on to assume the presidency, eight out of 10 Americans in our poll say the choice of a running mate doesn't matter.

But the poll also finds naming a vice president who favors abortion rights could hurt Bush more than it helps. With that in mind, Bill Whitaker looks tonight at how Bush is making his selection.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BILL WHITAKER, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):

With the GOP convention coming up fast, George W. Bush says his list of possible vice presidents is shrinking fast.

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Issues matter, but so does where the person is from. See the thing is Bill, I haven't made up my mind yet who the person is--truly have not made up my mind yet.

WHITAKER: Possibly only the selection of the pope is more secretive. Bush and his VP searcher-in-chief, former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney (ph), have made it their number-one job to find the perfect number two. In an interview with CBS News today, Bush said there is no litmus test.

BUSH: I'm going to make up my mind though, based on what I think is right. And what I think is right is can the person be the president? Can we get along? Those are the two and most important criteria.

WHITAKER: We do know who won't go along. For seriousness with sizzle, they approached party heavyweight Colin Powell. They also asked Missouri Senator John Danforth and Bush's primary challenger, Arizona Senator John McCain--all declined.

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R), ARIZONA: And I ask that I not be considered for vice president of the United States.

WHITAKER: Now the GOP is buzzing about a list that ranges from big names like Elizabeth Dole to not-so-big-names like Orange County Congressman Christopher Cox. The hottest names: Governor Frank Keating from neighboring Oklahoma; Nebraska Senator Chuck Hagel, a Vietnam vet and foreign affairs expert, who originally supported John McCain; Ohio representative and budget maven, John Kasich; and Bush friend and political soul mate, Governor Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania.

Each has his strengths and weaknesses. Ridge, for example, could bring a big state, but the pro-choice Catholic could turn off the big anti-abortion bloc. Still Bush said today Ridge and the other pro-choice, northeast governors remain in the running, even though the CBS poll shows a pro-choice VP would hurt Bush badly with the party faithful.

(on camera): And are you truly considering people like Governor Pataki, Governor Ridge, Governor Whitman?

BUSH: I am truly considering those. Those people are my friends. I know them well.

ED GOEAS, GOP POLLSTER: The only danger is that you don't want someone that brings, in the first couple of days, some negative stories about who they are and what they've done in the past.

WHITAKER (voice-over): Like the elder Bush's VP selection, Dan Quayle.

(on camera): Bush insists he hasn't yet decided when to announce his running mate--at the convention, the traditional way or several days earlier, as key staffers urge, so the team can make a triumphal entry into Philadelphia.

Bill Whitaker, CBS News, Little Rock.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER: One of the big issues this election year is how to use the huge federal budget surplus expected over the next 10 years. And it just got bigger. The Congressional Budget Office today more than doubled its surplus projection to well over two trillion dollars. That is a \$300 billion increase over the latest White House forecast.

High: Hillary Clinton was working hard to repair whatever damage may have been done by a new book that claims she once used an anti-Jewish slur.>

SCHIEFFER: In the U.S. Senate race here in New York, Hillary Clinton was working hard today to repair whatever damage may have been done by a new book that claims she once used an anti-Jewish slur.

Diana Olick has that story.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DIANA OLICK, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): In a defiant pose, Hillary Clinton stood on Ellis Island, America's monument to its diverse ethnicity, and defended herself against accusations of anti-Semitism.

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (D), NY SENATORIAL CANDIDATE: I can only state unequivocally it did not happen.

OLICK: The charge stems from a new book on the Clintons by a former reporter for the "National Enquirer." It details an alleged confrontation 26 years ago between Mrs. Clinton and Paul Fray, who worked on Bill Clinton's failed Congressional bid in 1974. Fray claims, after the vote, Mrs. Clinton verbally attacked him, using this unspeakable ethnic slur.

PAUL FRAY, FORMER CAMPAIGN AIDE: We're talking about something that occurred 26 years ago, but here again it's indicative of her style of approach that she's going to deny until it's proven otherwise.

OLICK: The Clinton campaign quickly offered proof, a 1997 letter from Fray to Mrs. Clinton, apologizing for his behavior in the '74 campaign. "I ask for your forgiveness," he wrote "because I did say things against you and called you names. I would say things without thinking, without factual foundation."

H. CLINTON: You're darn right it's not true. It's absolutely false, and I am just tired of this kind of politics.

OLICK: And as she has done so often for him, the president jumped to his wife's defense, saying the slur did not happen.

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: Obviously the president probably has more experience than any living human being about how deep in the gutter some people can go.

OLICK: Mrs. Clinton's Senate opponent, Congressman Rick Lazio, quickly made it a campaign issue.

REP. RICK LAZIO (R-NY), NY SENATORIAL CANDIDATE: I don't think New Yorkers know who to believe and therein lies a good deal of the problem.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

OLICK: One thing they can be sure of is this will continue to be a nasty, personal fight. Today Mrs. Clinton herself predicted it will get worse. "After all," she said, "it's only July"--Bob.

SCHIEFFER: Thank you Diana.

High: The Pentagon has completed its investigation of one of the U.S.

Army's worst cases of anti-gay violence. The conclusions are not likely to satisfy the military's critics.)

SCHIEFFER: The Pentagon has completed its investigation of one of the U.S. Army's worst cases of anti-gay violence, and will release the report later this week. The conclusions are not likely to satisfy the military's critics.

David Martin has this exclusive report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID MARTIN, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): A year ago Army Private Barry Winchell was taunted for being gay, and then murdered. CBS News has learned an investigation by the army's inspector general has cleared all the officers at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, from the commanding general on down, of any blame. That will come as a shock to members of Congress who wrote Defense Secretary Cohen demanding action against those responsible for condoning an anti-gay climate at the base, and it will confirm the fear Winchell's mother voiced months ago.

PAT KUTTELES, BARRY WINCHELL'S MOTHER: There has been no accountability. There's been nobody that has been held accountable for the army's part in the harassment and the lack of safety.

MARTIN: Two soldiers were convicted of Winchell's murder, but the grisly case prompted even President Clinton to say that the policy of "don't ask, don't tell," in which gays in the military are not supposed to be harassed, is not working. Another gay soldier at Fort Campbell told "60 MINUTES" his entire platoon chanted an anti-gay slogan on their daily run.

JAVIER TORRES, FORMER SOLDIER: It was pretty much, from what I can remember, "Faggot, faggot down the street, shoot him, shoot him, till he retreats."

MARTIN: But sources say the army's investigation confirmed the claim of the general who commanded Fort Campbell at the time.

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT CLARK, FORMER FORT CAMPBELL COMMANDER: There is not, nor has there ever been during my time here, a climate of homophobia on post. The climate here is one that promotes just the opposite, respect for all.

MARTIN (on camera): The investigation blamed Winchell's first sergeant, who has since been relieved of his duties, for allowing the harassment to go unchecked. It also blamed a lack of training on what the "don't ask, don't tell" policy means. That, however, was not a problem just at Fort Campbell, but throughout the army.

David Martin, CBS News, the Pentagon.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER: And coming up next on the CBS EVENING NEWS, they don't look mad, but fear of a deadly brain disease dooms the whole flock.

And later, she fled the pampered life of a Middle Eastern royalty princess to be a U.S. Marines' wife.

END

High: Dr. Larry Faillace owns 120 of the sheep, condemned; not because they do have mad cow disease, but because tests show they could.>

SCHIEFFER: In tonight's CBS "Healthwatch," the debate over

whether some sheep pose a health threat to Americans. The government is set to destroy three flocks. The farmers who tend them say the sheep are pure as snow, and the government has gone mad.

Jim Axelrod has our report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JIM AXELROD, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):

The farm's in Vermont, not Britain. The animals are sheep, not cows. But the fear of the U.S. government is familiar; so worried about a sheep-version of mad cow disease, it wants to destroy this flock.

DR. LARRY FAILLACE, FAILLACE FAMILY FARM: It makes us feel obviously outraged, upset, let down, like you really can't depend on the government at all.

AXELROD: Dr. Larry Faillace owns 120 of the sheep, condemned; not because they do have mad cow disease, but because tests show they could.

DR. LINDA DETWILER, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: I realize it's a very emotional thing to the owners. While we're really sympathetic to the owners, we've got to look at this big picture.

AXELROD: The big picture was painted five years ago in England, where cows started turning up sick with a neurological disease. More than 50 human deaths were traced to meat from the cows. Now the worry is that these sheep ate feed made from sick cows.

FAILLACE: Killing a flock of perfectly healthy and valuable sheep is not the way to protect the American public, and they know it.

AXELROD (on camera): Faillace imported the sheep from Belgium for their extraordinary milk capacity. His tests show his sheep are clean. Slaughtering the sheep, he says, is the government's pay back for European Union restrictions on American cattle imports.

FAILLACE: This is a form of retaliation against the EU, and it's not going to be some foreign disease that's going to kill our sheep. It's going to be politics.

AXELROD (voice-over): The government wants to slaughter by Friday, and is promising fair market value for the sheep.

DETWILER: We're charged with keeping our livestock healthy, so to take that risk to introduce it into the livestock, and subsequently, the public. I think in this case, this action is very warranted.

AXELROD: But for this Vermont farm family, it's not about money. Once again in America, a rural community feels strong-armed by the federal government, and tonight, it seems there's nothing Larry Faillace can do to save his flock.

Jim Axelrod, CBS News, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER: Republican Senator Paul Coverdell of Georgia had surgery today to repair a brain hemorrhage. He is 61. His doctors say the operation was a success, but it's too soon to predict his chances for recovery.

On the CBS "MARKETWATCH," stock prices closed mixed today as investors await the latest read on inflation, due out tomorrow. The Dow lost eight points. The NASDAQ was up 28.

Next up on the CBS EVENING NEWS, a peace puzzle: Israeli settlers and Palestinian refugees calling the same land home.

END

Head: Palestinian Refugees and Israeli Settlers Lay Claim to one Land,

SCHIEFFER: A jetliner on a domestic flight in India crashed into a housing project today, killing at least 55 people. Witnesses say one of the Boeing 737's engines was on fire as it tried to land in a city 650 miles southeast of New Delhi. It came down a mile short of the runway. Seven of the 58 people on the plane survived. Four victims were on the ground.

They are trying to beat the clock at the Middle East peace summit at Camp David. Time runs out on Wednesday when President Clinton leaves for an economic conference, and he is pressing hard for a deal. But an Israeli official says Prime Minister Barak is not optimistic about making it, and Mr. Clinton says the negotiations are the hardest he has ever seen. The dispute of course is over land, land that two peoples claim as home.

David Hawkins has a report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID HAWKINS, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):

In Jelazun, a Palestinian refugee camp on the West Bank, many dream of one day returning home.

"There are families here from 34 villages," explains Jamil Saafi. He's been in exile since he was 11 years old. Millions of Palestinians were uprooted from their homes when Israel became a state. They live on the West Bank and in neighboring Arab countries. Now, negotiators at Camp David are talking about letting some refugees return. The rest might receive financial compensation.

"It's not right," says Saaifi. "It's the land of our forefathers. All the money in the world will not be enough."

Sarah Frankel is one of about 150,000 Jewish settlers living on the West Bank.

SHERI LERNER, WEST BANK SETTLER: First off from a religious point of view, this is part of our homeland. It's just out of question.

HAWKINS: If Israel agrees to hand over the territory to the Palestinians, she and others could be forced out, or surrounded by a new Palestinian state.

LERNER: If somebody came to your neighborhood in the states or wherever you live and said that you have 10 days either to get out or we're going to be surrounding your house--how would you like it?

HAWKINS: Sheri Lerner, like many Israeli settlers on the West Bank, fears the talks at Camp David will threaten her way of life.

LERNER: They're talking about a peace treaty and this is not going to be peace. This is going to be war.

HAWKINS: Most Israelis, though, are tired of war. A majority favor a deal with the Palestinians. And many Palestinian refugees are willing to trade their half-century-old claims for peace with Israel.

"Peace is the most important thing now," says Ansaf Rumane. She says she's given up all hope of ever going back.

In any peace deal, the sacrifices won't just be measured in square miles or percentages, but in people's lost hopes and

shattered dreams.

(on camera): The refugees want to return to their old homes. The settlers want to stay in their new ones. As different as they are, they've got one thing in common: they're both bargaining chips on the table at Camp David.

David Hawkins, CBS News, the West Bank.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHIEFFER: Defeated, abandoned, enslaved: survivors of the Bataan death march, now fighting a new battle--that's next.

END

Head: March of Bataan Survivors Fight for Reparations, CBS

High: In the smelting plants and coal mines of Japan, their slave labor made wartime profits for Japanese companies that today are rich and prosperous. So the men of Bataan are fighting again--suing those Japanese companies.)

(Spec: Japan; War; Death; Military)

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

SCHIEFFER: Germany and thousands of German companies today created a nearly \$5 billion fund to compensate Nazi-era slave laborers. The U.S., Russia, and other countries, plus Jewish groups, also signed the agreement in Berlin. More than a million people enslaved by the Nazis, and others used in medical experiments, could receive payments from the fund.

Germany was not the only country that used slave labor during World War II, as some American veterans know all too well.

CBS' Barry Petersen begins tonight a two-part series on the forgotten heroes of Bataan.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BARRY PETERSEN, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):

In a lonely part of the Philippines, a new memorial rose this year, paid for not by the American government, but by survivors who remember friends who died--Phillip Scott and Robert Scruby, Joseph Coates and Carl Cobb, and 1,600 more, sacrificed, they say, when America turned its back.

LEROY BECRAFT, BATAAN SURVIVOR: I think they finally decided they couldn't salvage us, so they let us go down.

PETERSEN: It was the first days World War II. Japan invaded the Philippines, driving the yanks to the Bataan Peninsula. For three months they fought overwhelming odds.

RICHARD GORDON, BATAAN SURVIVOR: You had ammunition that was ancient. You had weapons that were ancient.

PETERSEN: But promised help from America never came; supplies were instead sent to Europe. When they realized they'd been abandoned, the Americans surrendered in April, 1942. But worse was to come. Look into these faces. How many would not survive the 60-mile death march after the surrender of Bataan? Richard Gordon was a sergeant at the time, and remembers the march as if it were yesterday.

GORDON: My personal observation was to see men shot because they went for water, or men being bayoneted because they broke ranks of those marches and went for water. And then men even beheaded for doing the very same thing.

PETERSEN: Those who lived through the march faced new atrocities. At the prison camp, they were beaten and killed at the whim of their guards, the living forced to bury their friends in unmarked, mass graves. They called it the daily procession of death.

GORDON: If it rained, it was a horrendous job because you couldn't dig too deep. So many of those prisoners were lying in very shallow graves, and oftentimes you would see part of their arm or leg protruding above the ground.

PETERSEN: And then, a new torture: turned into slave laborers for the war machine and shipped to Japan.

(on camera): The Americans were loaded onto the Japanese freighters here at Manila Harbor--the men simply stuffed into the cargo holds where they would be kept for weeks. The Yanks had a grim name for their transports. They called them the hell ships.

(voice-over): In the smelting plants and coal mines of Japan, their slave labor made wartime profits for Japanese companies that today are rich and prosperous. So the men of Bataan are fighting again--suing those Japanese companies. But their own government is trying to stop them, claiming the peace treaty with Japan took away their right to sue. As they testified last month before Congress, they feel abandoned by Uncle Sam once more.

DR. LESTER TUNNEY, BATAAN DEATH MARCH SURVIVOR: We would like to recapture our honor and our dignity that was taken away from us. And at the very least our country should do is not stand in the way by compounding our servitude.

PETERSEN: Tomorrow, why the men of Bataan are rallying to win their last battle of World War II.

Barry Petersen, CBS News, Capas, the Philippines.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JUL-2000 06:42:02.00

SUBJECT: ABC, This Week, July 23, 2000

TO: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/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: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/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: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/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: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/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: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/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: June Shih (CN=June Shih/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: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/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: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/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: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/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: Stephen N. Boyd (CN=Stephen N. Boyd/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Marc I. Hurwitz (CN=Marc I. Hurwitz/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/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: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/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: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: David B. Stockwell (CN=David B. Stockwell/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: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:
ABC'S ``THIS WEEK"
JULY 23, 2000

SPEAKERS: SAM DONALDSON, HOST, ABC THIS WEEK
COKIE ROBERTS, HOST, ABC THIS WEEK
GEORGE WILL, WASHINGTON POST
JOHN PODESTA, WHITE HOUSE CHIEF OF STAFF
KARL ROVE, CHIEF BUSH CAMPAIGN STRATEGIST
MARK FABIANI, GORE 2000 DEPUTY CAMPAIGN MANAGER
(COMMUNICATIONS)
CHARLES MOSKOS, AUTHOR, ``DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"
PAT KUTTELES, MOTHER OF ARMY PFC BARRY WINCHELL
JIM MCKAY, ABC SPORTS

DONALDSON: This week, Campaign 2000 heats up. As Republicans prepare for their convention, the big question is, Who will Bush choose as his running mate? Could it be his own adviser Dick Cheney or perhaps the controversial but popular John McCain? Who else is on the short list?

ROBERTS: And where does this leave the Gore campaign? We'll ask strategists from both camps. Karl Rove from the Bush campaign and Mark Fabiani from Gore 2000.

DONALDSON: Also this week, President Clinton leaves the G8 summit to return home to press for a Mideast peace.

And Republicans pressure him to sign several new tax breaks. We'll get the latest from White House chief of staff John Podesta.

ROBERTS: Plus, gays in the military. After one of the U.S. Army's worst cases of anti-gay violence, the Pentagon issues a harsh report. Is the ``don't ask, don't tell" policy working? We'll ask the mother of Private Barry Winchell (ph) and a leading expert.

Plus, our roundtable with Wall Street Journal columnist Paul Gigot.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

ROBERTS: Welcome to our program. Washington is rife with

speculation about George W. Bush's number two pick--lots of names coming up, and Linda Douglass from ABC has been tracking it. Linda, what's today's news?

LINDA DOUGLASS, ABC REPORTER: Well, today's news is sort of holding steady, Cokie, and that is that the leading candidate, according to sources, appears to be the man who has been heading the team that is searching for a running mate for George W. Bush, and that is former defense secretary Dick Cheney.

Sources have told ABC NEWS that Cheney is a favorite choice of Bush's father, former President Bush. He was former President Bush's secretary of defense. He served in Congress for the state of Wyoming. He's served a number of Republican presidents. He's considered an old guard Republican, very conservative, though, but a man who gets along with moderates, so there's a lot of talk, a lot of enthusiasm among Republicans for Cheney.

However, the Bush campaign did let his name surface. That is unusual, and they did it just hours after these reports that John McCain might be willing to take the job, and so there is some speculation that Cheney's name surfaced simply to squelch that talk about McCain. There have been no overtures to McCain by the Bush campaign, by the way. That offer was not jumped upon by the Bush campaign.

Another name, too, has surfaced, and that is the name of former Missouri Senator John Danforth. He's an Episcopalian minister, a man with a reputation for integrity. He'd taken himself out of the running, but there are reports that his wife's opposition to all of this now has softened. And ABC NEWS did learn that Cheney and Bush and Danforth and his wife had a top-secret meeting in Chicago last Tuesday to talk about the running mate position, Cokie.

ROBERTS: So it's getting close now, Linda. Do you have some indication of when this announcement's going to come?

DOUGLASS: We are told that Bush is going to make his decision by the end of today. The question is, whether he's going to start calling the various candidates and letting them know what his decision is because as soon as he does that, of course, it's going to leak. But we should hear who the running mate is by as early as tomorrow, or more likely on Tuesday, Cokie.

ROBERTS: Okay, well, thanks, Linda; that will put them and us out of our misery.

Sam.

DONALDSON: Cokie, the other big story we're covering this morning is phenomenon Tiger Woods. He's about to tee off at Saint Andrews in Scotland, British Open. If he wins, and he's ahead, of course, he will have swept four big tournaments at the age of 24--never been done before. Our Jim McKay is right there ready to cover everything.

Jim, is it all over but the shouting?

JIM MCKAY, ABC REPORTER: No, it isn't all over. It's never all over, as you know, "never say never." Yogi Berra's line they had about the same subject. It's not over, but Tiger Woods has a six-shot lead going into the final 18 holes, and he has been winning championships here, as you've seen, by margins unseen before, even by the great Jack Nicklaus. He won the Masters by 12 strokes when he was 21 years old.

This year, of course, he won the U.S. Open by 15 shots--totally unheard of. Here's a kid who had a golf club put in his hand when he was six months old by his father--appeared on "Good Morning America" when he

was three years old. At that time, a lot of people thought it was a kind of a show-business stunt. All through his life, he's been aimed for this one thing, to be the greatest golfer in the world, and right now, he is.

DONALDSON: Well, Jim, let me ask you about that. He putts better than anyone else. He drives better than anybody else. He comes out of the sand traps better than anyone else.

What's to argue that he isn't the greatest golfer of all time?

MCKAY: Well, first of all to me, you haven't named the biggest ingredient. The biggest ingredient is right up here. He's the best thinker on the golf course today. And in that, he is very much like Jack Nicklaus.

MCKAY: He never seems to make the wrong decision. He is unflappable. He's pleasant walking down the fairway. These days, he has a caddy with whom he gets along extremely well, Steve Williams from New Zealand.

But he's not the greatest golfer, because he's 24 years old. If he will win 18 major championships, as Jack Nicklaus did, do things like that, perhaps win 11 tournaments in a row as Byron Nelson did, or 18 in one year as Byron also did, then he will join legitimately the greats of the game of all time. But even now, he's making history that they will be talking about in 100 years. Can you imagine what it is to win the U.S....

DONALDSON: Well, Jim, I just wanted to say that you said, He uses it up here; he thinks. He also practices, doesn't he?

MCKAY: Yes.

DONALDSON: I saw the other day that, again, his putts are terrific. But he said, I don't like the way the ball is rolling and just kept practicing and kept practicing.

MCKAY: I know. After the third round yesterday with a six-shot lead, he did a couple of interviews, then said, excuse me, and went to the practice tee. But somebody also asked him yesterday, they said, what do you think about all this hype? What do you think about all the history that you're making?

And he said, I don't really think anything about it. He said, I can't. I have to concentrate so hard on every single shot that I--I can't have any outside distractions.

That, once again, is the brain.

DONALDSON: Thanks very much. We're going to be watching today as you bring us all of what's going to happen at St. Andrews, and we'll see if the Tiger collapses or whether in fact he wins. Thanks very much, Jim McKay, from St. Andrews, Scotland.

Folks, there's a third story we want to talk about this morning. It's not going to be resolved today but in the weeks ahead.

It has to do with money, money that you may get back in a tax cut, or maybe not. There's a big fight between Congress and administration over the size of tax cuts: spend, tax and how much should there be.

And the man who can tell us about the administration's view is with us this morning, John Podesta, the chief of staff at the White House.

PODESTA: How are you?

DONALDSON: Mr. Podesta, nice to see you.

By the way, do you think it's going to be Dick Cheney? Who do you pick on the Bush side?

PODESTA: I think the Dick Cheney thing is an elaborate head fake to get the press off of looking at John McCain. But we'll see. I guess we'll know in a couple days.

DONALDSON: So you think John McCain is in it?

PODESTA: No, I don't think McCain is in it. I think the Bush campaign probably didn't want to have a debate between McCain and Bush over the course of the four or five days leading up to the announcement, so they needed to get another story going. I think they've done that.

DONALDSON: OK, let's talk about money. The president has threatened to veto the elimination of the marriage penalty. He's threatened to veto the elimination of estate taxes. He's threatened to veto a large, general tax cut. The Republicans, of course, counter by using these figures; let me just show them to you. You know them by heart, of course.

The Congressional Budget Office projects there will be a \$2.2 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. That's \$1.3 trillion more than the January estimate. And the Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, says, I quote, "I find it fiscally responsible to let hard-working folks keep more of their own money."

What's wrong with that?

PODESTA: Well, the problem is that the Republicans in this Congress have spent that entire amount of money, if you account for taking the Medicare--the portion of that surplus that comes from Medicare tax receipts off-budget, which they said at least that they're willing to do. That would leave about \$1.8 trillion. If you add all the tax cuts, they've put together on this tax-cutting binge they've been on, it would equal that \$1.8 trillion, even under the more rosy CBO estimates. Our estimates are that the surplus is somewhat less than that.

We think it should be dealt with in a balanced program that leaves something for Medicare and Social Security and education and the other important priorities. The president is for tax cuts, Sam. He's for targeted middle-class tax cuts and hopefully, by the end of this Congress, maybe we can come together and put the partisanship aside and see if we can work something out.

DONALDSON: In a letter to you this week, the speaker said, We have cut \$24 billion from the president's budget request.

Isn't that true?

PODESTA: Well, they've added a lot of money to the president's budget request, as you know, as well, in pork-barrel projects and increased spending on things that we don't see as priorities. But what we're still remaining--fighting about, we're talking about it over the weekend, are important priorities especially in the education area, where they haven't funded our program to put more teachers in the classroom.

They haven't funded our program to repair crumbling schools. They haven't funded our program to demand more accountability from schools, to increase teacher standards, to provide after-school and summer school care.

So I think those are priorities that we intend to fight for. They've spent money on other things that they think are priorities. Maybe we can come together and reach a compromise on this.

PODESTA: But we're going to insist that the important priorities the president's laid out are adequately funded.

DONALDSON: Maybe you can come together. In the last 48 hours, the House Republicans have said they'll put back \$6 billion in that \$24 billion.

What's the figure? Where's the compromise?

PODESTA: Well again, I think that they've put money into their priorities which, you know, we can accept. But they have to--we have, I think that depending on which bill, the House or the Senate bill, we need to see adequate resources devoted to the priorities I just mentioned in that bill.

And I think that number that you're talking about is--it depends precisely on what they want to spend their money on, and we want to sit down, that's what we're doing over the weekend at a staff level, and I think that Jack Lew, the director of the Office of Management and Budget will be sitting down with the congressional appropriators during the course of the early part of this week to see if we can reach accommodation.

But if they're going to fund their priorities, we think that--which we think are of kind of a lesser value to the American public, we want to see these important priorities for education, the environment and health care.

DONALDSON: Excuse me, I mean, it sounds like the Israelis and the Palestinians. I mean someone's got to give; there's got to be compromise. You say (OFF-MIKE); we won't veto it all.

PODESTA: Well, we've been able to work things--we've been able to work things out. We did it last year through some direct conversation between the president and the speaker. And again, putting those teachers in the classroom and moving them forward on other critical needs of the American people were finally resolved when we sat down.

There's a lot of other work to do. We should pass a patients' bill of rights. We ought to raise the minimum wage. We ought to provide prescription drug benefit in Medicare, a real Medicare benefit for prescription drugs and hopefully before this session is over, we'll see some progress because not very much has been done during this session of Congress.

DONALDSON: Let's talk about the marriage penalty. The president thinks it's unfair. Republicans think it's unfair basically that people who are married have to pay more than two people who are living together without holy matrimony would have to pay. And yet when the Republicans have passed the married penalty repeal now, the president said he's going to veto to it.

Why?

PODESTA: Well, a good deal of that--of the bill that they passed doesn't go to people who pay the marriage penalty; it goes to people who get actually a bonus from being married, but we think that targeted marriage penalty relief along with tax relief in the form of making college tuition tax-deductible, having a tax credit for long term care, having a sustainable savings accounts is a good thing to do and we ought (OFF-MIKE) Republican to do it. But their bill is untargeted; it's too big. It's part of an overall strategy that will leave nothing for Medicare, nothing for Social Security, nothing for prescription drugs and nothing for education, and that's the wrong set of priorities.

DONALDSON: OK--nothing for education.

PODESTA: And...

DONALDSON: When you say targeted, you don't mean targeted just toward the middle class or lower class.

I mean, if the marriage penalty is unfair, it's unfair for everyone, isn't it?

PODESTA: We think that we can come up with a provision and a

bill that meets the needs of the American people and, again, deals with the marriage penalty for those who pay it and is targeted at the people who need it the most. And it's part of an overall balanced program that, as the president said, will help us pay off the debt by the year 2012. If we go down their path, we will never pay off the debt.

DONALDSON: OK, let me ask you about two or three things very quickly and see if you can give me brief answers on it. The Senate, as you know, has agreed to lift a ban on the importation of prescription drugs.

President for that?

PODESTA: I think that we're taking a look at the provision that passed this week, and it's somewhat different than the provision that passed the House, and we're interested in it. I think that as long as it maintains the safety of drugs, we think it might be something that we could support.

DONALDSON: OK. The House votes to lift the limits on sale of food and medicine to Cuba and also to allow Americans to travel to Cuba freely.

You for that?

PODESTA: Well, again the president's plan has been to try to create more people-to-people contacts between the people of Cuba, provide for food and medicine going directly to the people of Cuba without supporting the Castro government, and these are steps in that direction.

We want to try to work with Congress to see if we can implement that policy of creating, again, more people-to-people contacts which the travel amendment goes to and to provide food and medicine to the people of Cuba. But we want to do it in a way that doesn't support the Castro government. So I think we can work something out.

DONALDSON: OK, and the Senate appropriations committee has backed an amendment to stop the White House from giving a preference to Smith & Wesson because of the gun deal.

PODESTA: Well, we've threatened to veto that. I think that it's part of the overall strategy of protecting the gun industry and the National Rifle Association and the people in the gun industry who don't want to do the right thing as Smith & Wesson has agreed to do to provide child safety locks, to create new safer guns. This Congress is kind of locked in the grip of the NRA. We think we ought to be protecting children, not the National Rifle Association, so the president has threatened to veto it if that...

(CROSSTALK)

DONALDSON: Let's talk about the Senate race in New York. It was on our program, I think a long time ago, that you suggested Mrs. Clinton might actually be interested in that. Now there's a big flap over...

PODESTA: And I was right.

DONALDSON: You were right. Yes. Score one for Podesta.

There was a big flap over an alleged ethnic slur, religious slur that Mrs. Clinton is alleged to have made in 1974.

Will that affect this race?

PODESTA: I don't think so. I think that it was another example of cash for trash. I think that she obviously has denied it. I think everyone who knows her and has known her for all her life knows that she stands for tolerance, that she would never say something like that. And, I think, even people like Mayor Rudy Giuliani have said they don't believe it. Most of the press out there said they don't believe it. I don't think

the voters of New York are going to believe it. So I don't think it's going to have any impact.

DONALDSON: Now, let me ask you about something the president said. He called Mort Zuckerman, and I think someone else at the "Daily News" to talk about this.

Now I'm going to have to quote him directly, and I'm going to have to use one of the words in the alleged ethnic slur. I want to ask you about whether this was the right thing for the president to do.

He said, "She might have called him a bastard. I wouldn't rule that out. But I have never heard her tell a joke with an ethnic connotation."

Is that helpful?

PODESTA: Well, I think--I don't know whether it's helpful or not. I think what the president did was that he was placed at the scene of this alleged incident, and he wanted to set the record straight. And I think that this was an occasion on election night. But I think what he, first and foremost, wanted to say to the "Daily News" was that he's never heard his wife use expressions like that.

He's known her for 30-odd years, and he knows what she stands for. He knows that she stands for not--for a hint of bigotry, but for ethnic tolerance and racial and religious tolerance and that, I think, he wanted to get it off his chest, that he thought this was an outrageous comment being made by one of her accusers, and he wanted to get it off his chest.

DONALDSON: I suppose what I'm really asking and making certain that people understand--that the worst part of that wasn't said. She didn't use a religious slur.

In talking about the profanity, I just wonder whether that is something that you would have advised him to do?

PODESTA: Well, we didn't--I think he was trying to be honest, and he said what he said. But I think that the real charge there was the ethnic slur. And I don't believe it. I don't think anybody who knows her believes it, and I think that the voters of New York aren't going to believe it.

DONALDSON: Mr. Podesta, thanks very much. Thanks for being with us. Hope you'll come back.

PODESTA: Thank you, sir.

DONALDSON: We'll resolve the business about the taxes later this year.

PODESTA: All right.

DONALDSON: John Podesta, who is the white house chief of staff.

And when we come back, Campaign 2000. The vice presidential sweepstakes heat up. Who's leading the pack? We'll speak with representatives from both sides after this. And later, the Pentagon declares war on harassment of gays in the military. That's all ahead in a moment.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

ROBERTS: Joining us now from Austin, Texas, at the Bush campaign is Karl Rove, the chief strategist for the campaign.

Good morning, Mr. Rove. Thanks for being with us.

ROVE: Good morning.

ROBERTS: So John Podesta has just said that the whole business about Dick Cheney being a possible running mate was another--to get

another story going--get us all to stop talking about John McCain. And it worked.

Is that--was that your intention?

ROVE: No. This is--everybody reads a lot more into this process than they ought to. Governor Bush is going to make a decision today or tomorrow, and then he'll share the decision with the American people.

ROBERTS: Well, this race has tightened up. A lot of the national polls now show it neck-and-neck. John McCain clearly could make a difference in that.

Why not pick John McCain?

ROVE: Well, look. Lots of candidates--vice presidential running mates can make a difference. What matters is how they conduct themselves over the course of the fall campaign.

And Governor Bush is going to make a choice, and his choice is going to be somebody that he believes could be president, somebody that he thinks he could work well with, somebody who he thinks will bring added value to his administration and, over the course of the fall, the American people will see that and respond accordingly.

ROBERTS: That leaves out John McCain?

ROVE: No, it doesn't. I mean, it's--the governor is going to make a decision. He's got a list. Only he knows what that list is. He's thinking about it, and he'll make the decision.

ROBERTS: As you know, members of the House of Representatives have sent a letter to the governor saying that he should consider McCain. I have talked a lot of those members in the last few days. They think that it's really the difference between a huge win and maybe losing. Now if you have that kind of difference, why not go for that candidate?

ROVE: Well, a lot of people have a lot of thoughts about who ought to be the right person. We've heard from a lot of different people about a lot of different possibilities. And people feel strongly about their choices.

ROBERTS: Nobody has the same kind of excitement--the same following, has received the same number of votes as John McCain did. He's in a different category from all those other people.

ROVE: Well, Cokie, I'm not certain that excitement is felt only by one candidate. There are a lot of people who feel strongly about a lot of different candidates. And, again, Governor Bush is going to think about this long and hard. He's going to--he's talked to a lot of people. He's asked for a lot of advice. He's asked others to collect advice for him, and he's going to make a good decision.

ROBERTS: Has he talked to McCain in the last couple of days?

ROVE: I don't know about the last couple of days, but I know that they talked regularly.

ROBERTS: Since Friday?

ROVE: Not that I'm aware of.

ROBERTS: Now, again, in talking to these members of the House, they also feel that--and in a lot of their districts, that the top of the ticket, the Bush campaign, is running behind their own campaigns. And they think that it would be very helpful to them to hold on to the House, to have McCain on the ticket.

Do you care about that? Do you care about holding on to the House?

ROVE: We sure do. It's always better to win than to lose.

Cokie, I'm not certain I'd agree with the assumption. We're

seeing a lot of data, polling data from congressional campaigns around the country, and Governor Bush has--is leading the ticket in most of the data that I'm seeing. And we're hearing from a lot of members of Congress that they'd like Governor Bush to come and campaign in their states and districts because of that fact.

ROBERTS: But they're also saying they'd like to see John McCain come campaign in their districts, and they're not saying that about any of the other names we've been hearing about as vice presidential picks.

ROVE: I'm not certain about that, Cokie. In fact, I know just the opposite. I know that a lot of people who've been--whose names have been mentioned are people who have been enthusiastically supported by members of Congress and with phone calls and letters to the headquarters here.

ROBERTS: Let me ask you about two of the current mentions, Dick Cheney and John Danforth. Both served in Congress for a considerable period of time. Governor Bush has been running as an outsider to some degree.

How much do they thwart that outsider image, these long-time Washington hands?

ROVE: Well, Governor Bush is running to change the tone in Washington. That doesn't mean that he's anti-Washington. He just wants to change it in a more positive direction, to have a change in the attitude that we've seen in the last eight years where there's been extreme partisanship and the focus on the White House and winning the new cycle, rather than making progress for America. And there are a number of people who have served in Washington who could help the governor bring about that kind of change, because they share that sense that things need to be different in Washington.

ROBERTS: The other question about Mr. Cheney is that, of course, in recent years, he's been associated with an energy company, and they've already been allegations that Governor Bush is too close to big oil.

Would Mr. Cheney underline those allegations?

ROVE: I don't think so. And, look, what really matters here is the record and values and views of the presidential candidate. And in Al Gore's case, I thought that it was really ironic--he came to San Antonio, Texas, and attacked Governor Bush last week for supporting a \$20 million tax cut for small, independent oil producers in Texas, while at the same time he supported--Al Gore supported a half-billion dollar tax cut for oil producers and had just recently endorsed a \$170 billion tax break for oil companies operating in the Gulf of Mexico.

ROVE: So I'm sure Mr. Gore is going to be able to try and say anything he wants, but when it comes to a record, we'll be able to compare, and the American people will know the facts.

ROBERTS: Now you said at the beginning of our conversation that the governor would be making his decision today or tomorrow.

Do we know which one?

ROVE: No, I talked to him last night; he said he hadn't made a decision. His hope was to get it done today or tomorrow. I know that he's given this a lot of consideration, and he's pretty close to a decision. He's very comfortable--whoever's on that list, and only he knows the list. Whoever's on that list are a group of people whom he feels very comfortable with.

ROBERTS: And we will know when he knows?

ROVE: Shortly thereafter.

ROBERTS: OK, thank you very much. Thanks for joining us, Karl Rove.

ROVE: Thank you, Cokie.

ROBERTS: And now with us from Nashville, Tennessee, is Mark Fabiani, spokesman for Gore 2000. Thanks for being with us.

FABIANI: Thanks for having me, Cokie.

ROBERTS: Now, on Friday, when these reports of the McCain possible vice presidency were coming out, we heard some moaning from the Gore campaign.

You relieved at the reaction from the Bush campaign?

FABIANI: Yes, I don't know what to make of all this. You know, the Bush campaign has been so floundering for the last three or four weeks. Mr. Bush's campaigning has been so empty and vapid that really all they've had to talk about for three or four weeks now is who he was going to pick. They've used this process, which should be a very serious process, picking the vice president of the United States, potentially, as a way to create news.

He goes and has lunch with people, dinner with people, meetings with people. He talks about what he's thinking. You know, this is a serious process; it shouldn't be used for public relations games, and that's what Governor Bush has been doing.

ROBERTS: Well, he seems to have tried to do them quite privately and secretly. It's us trying to ferret them out. We had a hard time getting that meeting of John Danforth in Chicago; I don't think that that was exactly done for news (OFF-MIKE)

(CROSSTALK)

FABIANI: Well, I'm talking about his repeated meetings in Pennsylvania with Governor Ridge, his public lunch with Pataki, his public meetings with Cheney at his ranch. He's really used this as a way to try to create news when his campaign is really floundering, and that's the bottom line.

ROBERTS: Let me ask you about McCain again, though. In California in the open primary, when the absentee ballots were all counted, McCain-Bush out-polled Bradley-Gore by 11 points.

If McCain were on the ticket, you could lose California, and then you'd be in real trouble.

FABIANI: Well, that's very hypothetical and given what I just heard Karl Rove say, there doesn't seem to be too much chance that Governor Bush is considering McCain very seriously. They clearly are looking indecisive down in Austin at this point. They were thrown off balance by McCain's interest on Friday, and they're trying to move as far away from this as they possibly can, and he's looking weak and indecisive now for the first time in a long time.

ROBERTS: On the Democratic side, anybody with that kind of excitement? I look at this list of Democratic politicians, and there's not a name that pops out where you would see the voters say, Oh, that's an interesting choice.

FABIANI: Well, you know Vice President Gore has been handling this processing, in contrast to Mr. Bush, very privately. He's working with former Secretary of State Christopher in Los Angeles, with his wife Tipper. Those are the only people who know about this process. So I can't tell you who's on the list, I can't tell you what he's thinking.

All I know is he's treating this very seriously, because he knows what it takes to be a good vice president. This isn't a public relations gimmick; this is something that you have to treat seriously because the person could be the next president of the United States.

ROBERTS: Would it be helpful to Vice President Gore, since he has been in Washington for basically all of his life, to have an outsider, someone who is a governor, although for Democrats those are few and far between?

But somebody--an outsider come on the ticket?

FABIANI: I'm not sure that that's a significant consideration. For the vice president, what's important to him is that the person be able to step in and be the president at a moment's notice, and that the two men, or man and woman, in this case, be able to work together to make this government run.

That's something that President Clinton and Vice President Gore have done very well for the last eight years. They've worked closely. They've created the greatest economic boom in history. And Vice President Gore wants a vice president who can serve in a similar capacity with him.

ROBERTS: OK, thank you very much. Thanks for joining us, Mark Fabiani for the Gore campaign.

FABIANI: Sure, thanks for having me.

ROBERTS: When we come back, the Pentagon vows to boost efforts to end harassment of gays. Will its plan work? We'll speak with the architect of the "don't ask, don't tell" and the mother of a gay soldier murdered last year, after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

ROBERTS: The question of gays in the military has been a hot one throughout the Clinton administration.

ROBERTS: Last Friday, the Defense Department held a press conference on the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, and declared it a success.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROSKER: I think the policy is working reasonably well to provide a degree of safety for those who want to serve in the military, regardless of sexual orientation.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

ROBERTS: Not everyone agrees with Undersecretary of Defense Rosker. Joining us from Colorado is Pat Kutteles, whose son was killed by a fellow soldier. And here in the studio is Charles Moskos, one of the authors of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. George Stephanopoulos will be interviewing them.

George?

STEPHANOPOULOS: Thank you, Cokie.

Mrs. Kutteles, the Pentagon investigation and the circumstances surrounding your son's death found that the harassment of him was only sporadic and that the overall climate on the base was positive. I know you spent a lot of time on the base and sat through the testimony in the trial of your son's attackers.

Does this square with what you learned?

KUTTELES: No, it doesn't.

STEPHANOPOULOS: What did you find out?

KUTTELES: What I had heard and what the people I have talked to--I have talked to many soldiers there who have been harassed repeatedly

while they were on base. There was an atmosphere of violence. There was a lack of safety, and there was a very poor command climate.

STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, this report also found that, with the exception of a single abusive sergeant, everyone else in the chain of command acted appropriately. The sergeant's been reassigned. No one else has been disciplined.

Do you think the Army's gone far enough here?

KUTTELES: No, I don't. I think that there needs to be more accountability. The atmosphere that was created was the responsibility of General Clark. I talked to men on a daily--quite often who are still being harassed, who are still afraid for their lives. It continues at this time.

STEPHANOPOULOS: So do you think the Army's covered up the circumstances on the--Ft. Campbell?

KUTTELES: I think the Army is more interested in protecting themselves and the brass than they are in our soldiers' safety.

STEPHANOPOULOS: How about that, Professor Moskos? Can the Army--or has the Army done here an adequate job of investigating this?

MOSKOS: It appears somewhere in the middle on this question. First of all, I want to extend my sympathies again to Mrs. Kutteles, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting before. And among other things, she mentioned too that this is a much more complex case, I think, because the instigator of the murder of her son had an ambiguous sexual orientation himself.

But I think "don't ask, don't tell" is about what Churchill said about democracy: It's the worst system possible, except for any other. We've always had gays in the military, including my company commander a generation ago. It was always kind of an informal "don't ask, don't tell."

But, certainly, violence has to be stopped. And murders of anybody are things that cannot possibly be sanctioned in any kind of military or even civilian setting. I might add, too, on the new standards about no harassment, now that's a little--it's touchy.

STEPHANOPOULOS: What do you mean by that?

MOSKOS: When I was a soldier in Germany, for example, I bought a girl's bicycle, and I was razed by my comrades as to my sexual orientation--masculinity. Would you punish those guys today? I mean, that's nonsense. So the point of how do you protect people from being physically assaulted is one question. Certainly, when you read that 80 percent of the soldiers report they'd heard an anti-gay comment in the last year, I'm surprised it's not 100 percent. I think even at the ABC newsroom probably people have heard anti-gay remarks in the last year.

STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, but the inspector general's report also found that there were about 37 percent of people saw that there was more serious harassment. And it is seven years since the policy was started.

Do these guidelines go far enough, and isn't it long past the time for zero tolerance?

MOSKOS: No, I don't know what zero tolerance means. I am sort of zero tolerance on zero tolerance. The question here is, let's use some common sense. If a man is bludgeoned to death, that's a horrendous crime. The proper punishment should be given out to all those who participated in that crime, of which there's some question to the quality of the treatment given to Glover and to Fisher, the two persons involved in this particular murder.

Now the other thing to remember is that the increase since

"don't ask, don't tell" has come about--there's been an increasing number of discharges for homosexuality, but there's interesting racial differences.

The data that I have collected show, for example, that black--white men are twice as likely to be discharged for homosexuality than black soldiers. White females are four times more likely to be discharged than are black females.

What does that mean? Are they profiling whites? Unlikely. Is the incidence of homosexuality exponentially greater among whites than it is among blacks? No. I think it reflects the different attitude toward homosexuality in the two communities. It has much more of a stigma in the black community, and that's why the rate is so much lower.

STEPHANOPOULOS: But others say that what's going on here, you know, after seven years of "don't ask, don't tell" us, is left with the Army situation as the worst of all worlds.

Some people are falsely saying that homosexuals are given an easy out. Other gays in the military say they still feel harassed, and the commanders are caught in the middle. They're supposed to stop harassment if they find evidence of homosexual behavior; they go against the person being harassed.

Why wouldn't it be simpler just to have a clear policy that lifts the ban?

MOSKOS: How about a clear policy that restores a full ban as it was in the times past? You can argue that either way. You can go back to a very clear position, which is "Thou shalt not have homosexuals." The other thing, George, to remember, of course ..

STEPHANOPOULOS: Is that what you're for?

MOSKOS: No, I'm for "don't ask, don't tell." It's the best of possible worlds. The issue here, of course, is everybody forgets this didn't come out of the blue. This is a political compromise, as you well know. The first months of the Clinton administration were being drowned in publicity on gays in the military, and we came up with this policy of "don't ask, don't tell." And it's now a congressional law. Congressional law specifically states homosexuality is incompatible with military service. If people don't like the policy, they should go to their congressman.

STEPHANOPOULOS: Mrs. Kutteles, one last question.

You're pursuing a wrongful death suit against the Army in the circumstances surrounding your son's death.

What do you hope to accomplish here?

KUTTELES: Well, I hope to accomplish changes throughout the military that will make it safer for the men and women to serve, for example, the alcoholism that was present and the use of alcohol down at Ft. Campbell, the harassment of others, a lot of changes that just to make the climate a safe place for our men and women to serve, so that nothing like this happens again and that so no other family has to go through what we have, in losing our son.

STEPHANOPOULOS: Mrs. Kutteles, Professor Moskos, thanks very much.

MOSKOS: Thank you.

STEPHANOPOULOS: Cokie.

ROBERTS: Thank you, George. When we come back, our round table. Paul Gigot of The Wall Street Journal joins us, after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-2000 09:14:10.00

SUBJECT: CNN Inside Politics, July 24, 2000

TO: Valerie J. Owens (CN=Valerie J. Owens/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: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/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: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/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: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachael F. Goldfarb (CN=Rachael F. Goldfarb/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: Michael K. Gehrke (CN=Michael K. Gehrke/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: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jacqueline F. Lain (CN=Jacqueline F. Lain/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: Justin L. Coleman (CN=Justin L. Coleman/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: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah E. Gegenheimer (CN=Sarah E. Gegenheimer/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: Rebecca J. Salay (CN=Rebecca J. Salay/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Raj Adlakha (CN=Raj Adlakha/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/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: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/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: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Anthony R. Bernal (CN=Anthony R. Bernal/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:
CNN Inside Politics
Aired July 24, 2000 - 5:00 p.m. ET

George W. Bush Expected to Name Dick Cheney as
Running Mate; Sierra Club Endorses Al Gore

BERNARD SHAW, CNN ANCHOR: Amid the wait for a Bush VP
announcement, a Colin Powell diversion and a hard look
at Dick Cheney's pros
and cons.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL ANALYST: Do like
I say,
not like I do, isn't that what our parents always told
us? If he picks Dick Cheney
to be his running mate, George W. Bush will be following
that advice.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

JUDY WOODRUFF, CNN ANCHOR: Bill Schneider on an option
that you might
call the anti-Quayle.

Plus...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I just
want to say
how proud I am to be running with the Sierra Club. Thank
you for your
endorsement and for your support.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Al Gore: running mates and a long-awaited
endorsement.

ANNOUNCER: From Washington, this is INSIDE POLITICS,
with Bernard
Shaw and Judy Woodruff.

WOODRUFF: Thank you for joining us.

It will not be official until George W. Bush makes it so, but GOP sources tell CNN that former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney is all but certain to be named Bush's running mate tomorrow.

Our senior correspondents Candy Crowley and John King are covering this story.

Let's go first now to John, who dug up this new information -- John. JOHN KING, CNN SENIOR WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT: Judy, several leading Republican sources tell us that, as you mentioned, Dick Cheney, the former defense secretary, a former member of the House of Representatives. a man well regarded by President Bush as well as Governor Bush will be named tomorrow as the governor's running mate.

Now one of these sources says Cheney has told a close associate in the past day that he will be Bush's choice, barring a last-second conversion. Other sources, including two very close to the deliberations, tell us we should describe Cheney as, quote, the "likely" choice and the "leading candidate." But they do caution that Governor Bush has yet to extend a formal offer.

We're told by these sources, however, that offer could come later this evening and that the governor has time on his schedule blocked out tomorrow morning in Austin so that he can call others who had been considered and advise them they had not been chosen and perhaps advise them of his pick as well.

So far, reaction throughout the Republican Party to news that Cheney appears to be the pick has been generally favorable. No known objections yet, although we spoke to two of those under consideration today and there was a bit of private grumbling. They were saying that if Bush had his eyes on Cheney all along -- Cheney, of course, was heading the vice presidential selection process -- they say went through 50, 60, 70 hours of paperwork and the

like and that perhaps
they were wasting their time.

But again, Bush -- sources close to the governor say he
came to this late. And
when asked if Cheney would be in Austin tomorrow,
perhaps only in his
capacity as the chairman of the search committee, a very
close associate said,
quote, his impression is "he will not be there as a
third party" -- Judy.

WOODRUFF: All right, John, we're going to ask you to
stand by while we turn
to Candy Crowley. She's in Austin, Texas, where Governor
Bush is finalizing all
his plans.

Candy, hello.

CANDY CROWLEY, CNN SENIOR POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT: Judy.
while top party activists and top party officials
believe that George Bush has
settled on former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, the
governor is not ready to
name names.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(voice-over): Aides say the decision isn't final until
Bush makes a phone call to
his choice.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Until Governor Bush has made a call
to ask someone
to be a vice presidential nominee, it is premature to
speculate.

CROWLEY: That call is expected to go out this evening.

Cheney, Bush's point man on the selection process, is
home in Dallas but
expected in Austin Tuesday.

RICHARD CHENEY, FORMER DEFENSE SECRETARY: I really don't
have
anything I can give you.

QUESTION: You haven't spoke at all...

QUESTION: Can you tell us any -- if there's any...

CHENEY: It's only 7:30. I just got up.

CROWLEY: Cheney's name, which has surfaced from time to time, catapulted back to the headlines last week, when he first switched his voter registration from Texas to Wyoming to avoid a possible constitutional problem and then got a clean bill of health from his doctor, apparently to ward off questions about three minor heart attacks Cheney had more than a decade ago.

A favored choice by many Republican officials contacted, Cheney is a conservative who is well liked by party moderates. He would leave Bush's considerable support with his base intact. Cheney brings no geographic advantage to the ticket, but he does have a lengthy resume of federal and foreign policy experience that Bush lacks.

Monday, the fever pitch in the public arena was so high it briefly produced the Republican's favorite hallucination: a George Bush-Colin Powell ticket. But a CBS report that the former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff might be back in the mix was quickly shot down in a written statement from Powell there was no truth to it. The focus returned to Cheney.

Many other possible choices have faded into the white noise, but those honorable mentions were on board and locked in behind Cheney.

GOV. FRANK KEATING (R), OKLAHOMA: I mean, I'm a Dick Cheney guy. If he were to say it's Colin Powell, I've always been a Colin Powell guy. I felt that Colin should consider this slot a long time ago. But whoever he chooses I'm for, because I'm for Bush.

GOV. GEORGE PATAKI (R), NEW YORK: Certainly Secretary Cheney is an outstanding leader with a tremendous record. He was secretary of defense during the Gulf War, a very difficult and tense time for America. And he was a strong leader, a calm leader under enormous pressures.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

CROWLEY: Those closest to the governor insist that

nothing is final, again, until
that call is made. But at this point, if the name that
is finally uttered in public is
anything other than Dick Cheney, it will be a monumental
surprise -- Judy.

WOODRUFF: Candy, John King is now joining us again.

John we're hearing what all the positives are with
regard to a Cheney choice.
What are Democrats going to say about him? Where -- what
criticism can be
made of this man? KING: Democrats, much like the Gore
campaign, are poring
over his House record. They're sure to find some votes
that they criticize.

Overall reaction among Democrats, including top Gore
aides, is that this is a
good solid pick, that this is a man that certainly has
the credentials to be
president.

They will paint him as a conservative. One likely line
of attack: He works right
now for an energy company, Halliburton in Texas. He
would have to leave that
post, of course, if he is the governor's running mate.
Governor Bush used to be
in the oil business. There's all this controversy over
high energy prices.
Democrats say perhaps they will paint the governor and
Mr. Cheney as in the
pocket of the oil industry against the working man. But
even as a senior
Democrat made that argument to me today in a
conversation, he said that shows
you how desperate we are. Dick Cheney is a solid
citizen.

WOODRUFF: All right, John. In just a moment we're going
to be taking a look at
Dick Cheney's record in the House.

Candy, indeed, if it is Dick Cheney -- and we have to
keep saying we don't
know, as you point out, until that phone call is made --
how is it that Bush would
have settled on this man after looking at so many others
who were governors,
senators, sitting in office?

CROWLEY: Well, I think when you look at the choices of
governors, you have
to remember that one of the weaknesses that Democrats

have been hitting at is
the George Bush is not ready for prime time, that he
doesn't have federal
experience. Generally, when governors do lead the party
ticket, they will look for
someone with federal experience. That certainly is Dick
Cheney. The other thing
is that Dick Cheney was the secretary of defense during
the Gulf War under the
father George Bush. He has foreign policy expertise.

So while this brings absolutely no sort of geographical
plus to the ticket, Bush
aides sort of dismissed geography early on. What this
does bring is sort of a
resume balance to the ticket. While George Bush can be
the outsider and the
governor who's made changes in Texas and the new kind of
Republican, he can
bring in a Dick Cheney who has both the foreign policy
credentials and the
federal credentials that can balance out those resumes.

WOODRUFF: All right, Candy Crowley joining us from
Austin, John King at the
White House. Thank you, both -- Bernie.

SHAW: As a former member of Congress, Dick Cheney has a
paper trail, a
voting record that Democrats probably will try to use
against him, as we heard
John King allude to.

CNN's Pat Neal looks at where Representative Cheney
stood on some key
issues.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CHENEY: The question before the House today is... PAT
NEAL, CNN

CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): During his 11 years in
Congress, Dick
Cheney may have appealed to moderates and worked with
liberals, but his record
was strictly conservative.

THOMAS MANN, BROOKINGS INSTITUTE: No question Dick
Cheney is a
bona fide conservative. He bills himself as such -- but
not an ideologue.

NEAL: Cheney believes the government's role in social
issues should be limited.

He opposed federal funding for abortions, with no exceptions in the case of rape or incest.

He voted against the equal rights amendment for women, along with 146 other members of Congress in 1983.

On education, he consistently opposed funding Head Start and voted against creating the Department of Education.

Cheney was raised in Wyoming and opposes, as many Westerners do, gun control limits. He was one of just 21 members of Congress in December of 1985 to vote against a ban on armor-piercing bullets, called "cop-killer" bullets.

Three years later, he was one of only four members of the House voting against a ban on plastic guns that could slip through airport security machines undetected. The NRA did not oppose this ban.

Also in 1988, Cheney voted to scrap a proposed national seven-day waiting period on handgun purchases.

BOB MICHEL, FORMER HOUSE MINORITY LEADER: Wyoming is a very conservative state. He was simply voting the convictions of the people back home.

NEAL: Cheney voted as a fiscal conservative, too, supporting legislation to balance the national budget.

On the environment, Cheney opposed refunding the Clean Water Act.

He voted to postpone sanctions slapped on air polluters that failed to meet pollution standards.

And he voted against legislation to require oil, chemical and other industries from making public records of emissions known to cause cancer, birth defects and other chronic diseases.

Dick Cheney consistently voted to raise military spending. He also supported aid

to the Nicaraguan rebels, even after a moratorium on funding was passed.

(on camera): During his 11 years in Congress, Cheney was known for having a moderate personal style and getting along with Republicans and Democrats. As for his voting, Cheney consistently received very high marks from conservative groups ranking his record.

Pat Neal, CNN, Capitol Hill. (END VIDEOTAPE)

WOODRUFF: Now another aspect of Cheney's past that will be examined closely if he's chosen: his three heart attacks.

CNN's Rhonda Rowland reports on Cheney's medical history and whether it could be a problem on the trail or in the White House.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RHONDA ROWLAND, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Mr. Cheney's health problems in the past should not interfere with a strenuous political campaign. That's the advice to George W. Bush from a prominent cardiovascular surgeon. Upon the request of President George Bush, and presumed approval of Governor Bush, Dr. Denton Cooley of the Texas Heart Institute consulted with Cheney's personal physician. A recent checkup showed normal heart function. And Cheney adheres to a vigorous exercise program at home.

Dick Cheney suffered his first heart attack in 1978, when he was 37 years old.

He had two subsequent heart attacks, one in 1984 and 1988. Cheney underwent quadruple heart bypass surgery following his third heart attack.

DR. SUSAN K. BENNETT, WASHINGTON HOSPITAL CENTER: Bypass surgery is one way that we re-vascularize the heart -- in other words, bring new, fresh blood to the heart. Bypass surgery is extremely successful. It is a very common operation for heart patients.

ROWLAND: However, bypasses are not always a permanent fix. They last, on

average, 10-15 years. That means half the bypasses fail before that time and half the patients can go longer without problem. Cheney's bypass operation was 12 years ago. If the bypass fails, doctors can prescribe medications, prop the clogged artery open with metal device called a stint, or they can redo the bypass procedure if the patient is in good health.

The hearts' condition may be the best predictor of future prognosis. The more severe a heart attack, the greater the scarring. Doctors characterize Cheney's attacks as mild.

BENNETT: As far as someone who did not have significant scarring in their heart muscle and was able to successfully undergo bypass, that person should be able to carry out the duties of vice president, or, if need be, president.

ROWLAND: But what about job stress?

BENNETT: It's not so much the stress in people's lives, but it's how we deal with that stress.

ROWLAND: A heart attack in President Eisenhower's first term did not prevent him from completing a second term in office.

Rhonda Rowland, CNN.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: And joining us now, Ron Brownstein of the "Los Angeles Times," author and journalist Elizabeth Drew, and Wayne Slater of the "Dallas Morning News."

Starting with you, Elizabeth, if the governor chooses Dick Cheney, what is he telegraphing about his ticket and his strategy for dealing with the Democrats?

ELIZABETH DREW, AUTHOR: Well, clearly, he is reaching for experience. He's reaching for someone who actually meets his stated criteria, someone who would be ready to govern at a moment's notice, someone whom he feels he can trust and who would be loyal. But I have to tell you,

Bernie, I've been talking
around Republicans ever since this name surfaced as very
serious, and there are
also some questions that this would -- this raised.

Among Republicans, one thing is, is it a forward-look
ticket? Is it conveying that
the nominee, or his father and their friends, feel that
he has to have one of his
father's people in order to do it? Also, there is a fair
amount of disgruntlement, to
be quite honest, among people who were asked to fill out
questionnaires listing
some of their most intimate secrets, things that they
don't particularly want made
public.

I just learned today, reliably, that Senator Jon Kyl of
Arizona was asked to fill out
a questionnaire. And there are a number of people, not
just on Capitol Hill, who
feel a bit used by this process, if -- as was said
earlier -- Bush really had Cheney
in mind all along. Except for John Danforth, nobody else
was interviewed by the
vice presidential -- by, excuse me, the presidential
candidate. So there are
questions. I think there -- we can come back to this --
there are -- the media and
the Gore campaign, I assure you, are going to ask a lot
of questions about
Cheney's recent business as chairman of the Halliburton
company, the world's
largest energy services supply company.

SHAW: Ron Brownstein, if it is Dick Cheney, what does
this say?

RON BROWNSTEIN, "LOS ANGELES TIMES": Well, I think it's
probably a
pick that has more to do with governing than the
campaign. I don't think that -- I
think that most Republican strategists believe that we
are beyond the names that
would have a significant impact on changing the
electoral dynamic. There are
pros and cons of Dick Cheney. He does bring experience.
He hearkens back to a
less partisan era in some ways, helps Bush with his
message of Washington
being more civil.

There are downsides in terms of -- as Elizabeth
mentioned -- his -- potential

Democratic attacks on two -- Republican ticket now with two men with ties to the oil industry -- questions about Bush reaching back to his father and allowing Gore perhaps some more ammunition to make that argument. But I think these are at the margin, Bernie. I think this is a -- this is a pick that is unlikely to significantly reshape the electoral battlefield in the way that a McCain, obviously a Powell, even a Tom Ridge might. Some, in that sense, I think this is more about someone that Bush might want in the room if he is president, than it is someone who is really going to make a significant difference on whether or not he becomes president.

SHAW: And Wayne Slater, your take from Dallas?

WAYNE SLATER, "DALLAS MORNING NEWS": I think Ron has got it exactly right. One of the things that occurs to me is that Cheney fits the bill in two or three of the departments that Bush was talking about. One, he wanted somebody he agrees with and get along with, someone who adds something to the ticket -- and in this case, adds a foreign-policy element, a sense of gravitas that certainly can help the ticket. And the other thing that it really adds is that, we have a person with whom Bush can work and won't be overshadowed.

I'm struck that the decision, if this is the decision that's finally made, is exactly the kind of person that reflects Bush's strategy and way of governing all along. And what I mean is, Governor Bush has always been risk-averse. He has only taken one significant risk as governor. And that was in 1997, when he proposed a significant tax cut. He failed on that. Everything else that he has done as governor has been really consistent with the advice of his advisers and really consistent with sort of the status quo in Austin.

He does not take risks. And if he chooses Cheney, he will have fulfilled one obligation, and that is: If you can't pick somebody who significantly helps you, do no harm.

SHAW: Let's go back to the subject that Elizabeth Drew raised a short moment ago.

Ron Brownstein, what does all of this say about this election process?

BROWNSTEIN: Well, you know, it's -- you go through a whole process and at the end of the day, you know, the people running it sort of look in the mirror and say, you know: We like ourselves. I believe you have to take Governor Bush at his word that he came to this late in the process.

What strikes me, though, as kind of interesting is that the two finalists, by all accounts, were Dick Cheney and John Danforth, both of whom represented earlier generation of the Republican party -- neither one of which are associated with the post-1994 leadership in Washington -- the revolutionary era of Republican -- both of which hearken back to sort of a different tone in Washington -- in Danforth's case, ideologically as well.

And I think that, you know, it is striking to me that Bush sort of was looking in these places for a way to perhaps reinforce his message that he wants to change the tone in Washington. No one really from the heart of the post-'94 party seemed to make it into the finals of this process.

SHAW: Well, in the process of looking at this candidate, is his health situation -- will his voting record be detrimental -- Elizabeth.

DREW: Well, I'm not sure -- for all the pluses about Cheney -- and it's interesting -- he's a very popular figure in Washington. He gets along with all sorts of people. Now, that makes him a Washington insider, I suppose. I don't -- I think the heart issue will be a distraction for a little while, but I think they've answered that fairly conclusively.

But I'm not sure that they have met the measure of no risk and do no harm. That is a very conservative voting record that was just cited. And I'm sure that Gore

and his running mate will make use of that. Furthermore, since he was in

Congress, he runs the world's largest energy supply services company. It does business with Iran. He has vociferously opposed -- including last month in a speech in Calgary, Canada -- restrictions on doing business with Iran.

And he has opposed Congressional restrictions on doing business with countries that have a boycott against Israel. Just think about where oil is drilled, and you begin to see the problems. This is not a killer, I don't think, but it is something I suspect maybe wasn't so thought through in that inner circle in Dallas and Austin.

SHAW: What about that, Wayne Slater? Here's a man who voted against the equal-rights amendment for women, among other things. Is this, in effect, a roll of the dice by George W. Bush?

SLATER: I really think, again, it's the opposite. It's a fairly safe pick in the sense that he's done no harm to his campaign. I think there will be some questions about his dealings with Halliburton. On May 31st, he filed a report with the Securities and Exchange Commission indicating he was going to sell about half the shares of stocks that he owns for several hundred million dollars in Halliburton.

Now, you can look at that any way you want to look at it. One is, any candidate who wants to avoid a conflict of interest would do just that. I could see the Gore people attacking that and saying, look, he sold stock when gas was high. We know who one of the beneficiaries was of the high gas prices this summer, Dick Cheney. But whether that really flies very far is anybody's -- anybody's guess.

In the end...

SHAW: Well, we've been struck by a technical gremlin. We apologize. Wayne Slater just went poof. He's from "The Dallas Morning News," and out thanks to

author and journalist Elizabeth Drew, and Ron Brownstein
of "The Los Angeles
Times." Thanks very much.

And still ahead here on INSIDE POLITICS, the Democratic
candidate: Vice
President Al Gore picking up a key endorsement as his
campaign responds to the
possibility of a Bush-Cheney ticket.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

WOODRUFF: Vice President Al Gore is on his way back to
Washington this
hour, after a full day on the campaign trail. It began
in Michigan, where Gore
accepted the endorsement of the Sierra Club.

But as Chris Black reports, Gore could not escape the
frenzy over who might
join the presidential tickets.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

AL GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: I want to
begin by
saying a word about running mates.

CHRIS BLACK, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): In
Michigan, Al Gore
acknowledged the feverish speculation about vice
presidential candidates.

GORE: I'm sure Governor Bush will announce his sooner or
later, as will I. But
right now, I just want to say how proud I am to be
running with the Sierra Club.

BLACK: The line worked so well he used it again with
construction workers in
Ohio.

GORE: But I just want you to know I'm proud to be
running with the
construction trades and the working men and women of
this country. I'm proud
to have you!

(APPLAUSE)

BLACK: As to the real choice, Gore is dropping no early
clues. Aides say the
vice president plans to take his time on choosing a
running mate. Campaign aides

say Gore has the luxury to assess the impact of George W. Bush's choice before making his final decision. As speculation centered on former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, Gore aides were skeptical, seeing Cheney as a throwback and symbol of the last Bush administration: one Gore adviser calling it the all-oil ticket, referring to Bush and Cheney's ties to the oil business.

The Sierra Club, the nation's largest and oldest grassroots environmental organization, endorsed Gore, passing up the Green Party candidate, Ralph Nader, who won the support of only one local chapter. A driving force was fear of Bush.

ROBERT COX, PRESIDENT, SIERRA CLUB: We could face a very different America. We could face what the people of Texas are facing now: air pollution, water pollution, toxic waste, record numbers of violations of our clean air and clean water standards, environmental laws unenforced, and corporate polluters unchecked and out of control.

BLACK: The Sierra Club president said Gore's history of environmental activism made him a favorite with the group.

COX: Al Gore has proven himself in governance and has been an advocate long enough to know how to navigate some of these difficult issues involving the health of our planet.

BLACK: Gore, standing on the banks of the Grand River in Grand Rapids, Michigan, jokingly claimed his environmental book, "Earth in the Balance," was selling well in Philadelphia, scene of the Republican National Convention.

GORE: And I know that the polluters and the special interests are coming after he, and I wear their attacks as a badge of honor. I'm with you.

BLACK (on camera): The vice president plans to go on vacation later this week, heading to the shore of North Carolina to spend time

with his family and with his
own thoughts about who should be his vice president.

Chris Black, CNN, Cleveland, Ohio.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: From Georgia today, a plus for the Democrats.
Party sources say
former Governor Zell Miller has agreed to accept an
appointment to the U.S.
Senate, replacing Republican Paul Coverdell, who died
last week. And Miller is
planning to run in November to fill the remaining four
years of Coverdell's term.

Georgia's Democratic governor, Roy Barnes, is expected
to announce his
appointment of Miller this evening. Miller remains
popular with voters and is
likely to discourage any major primary challenge.

Several House Republicans from Georgia have expressed an
interest in the seat,
now a key battleground as the GOP defends its Senate
majority.

There is much more ahead on this edition of INSIDE
POLITICS.

WOODRUFF: Still to come, more on the possible GOP
running mate with a
closer look at Dick Cheney's record as defense
secretary.

Plus...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SCHNEIDER: Cheney is very much President Bush's man.
Democrats will call
the ticket a retread. Do voters want to go back to Bush
one?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Our Bill Schneider on the political implications
of putting Cheney on the
ticket.

And later...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRUCE MORTON, CNN CORRESPONDENT: John Adams, George Washington's vice president, called it the most insignificant office that ever the imagination of man contrived. But that was a long time ago. (END VIDEO CLIP)

WOODRUFF: Bruce Morton on the No. 2 job, then and now.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: We will have more of the day's political news coming up, but now a look at some other top stories.

Negotiators at Camp David are calling the Middle Peace negotiations "exhaustive" and "exhausting." In his afternoon briefing, White House spokesman Joe Lockhart said President Clinton continued a series of meetings with Palestinian and Israeli negotiators today. Control over Jerusalem has been a prime point.

CNN White House correspondent Kelly Wallace is near Camp David with the latest.

KELLY WALLACE, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, Bernie, President Clinton plunged right back into these negotiations, working almost around the clock. In about a half hour from now, he will meet with his U.S. team to map out the evening.

Mr. Clinton's spokesman says he will continue to do a -- quote -- "rolling assessment of the talks" and will keep the summit going as long as there is a realistic chance of getting an agreement.

Mr. Clinton met with Israeli and Palestinian negotiators without Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat from about 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. this afternoon. Mr. Clinton met with those same negotiators until about 5:00 this evening.

Now, the White House is not ruling out a meeting this evening between Mr. Clinton, Mr. Barak, and Chairman Arafat. But Press Secretary Joe Lockhart said the administration determined that the right approach

right now is to have the
president work through the issues with the negotiators.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: They're using
a number of different tools to try to reach an agreement,
one of which is to sit and
go through, and with all of the substantive detail
necessary, through a number of
issues that -- the work that needs to be done to get
there. And it's our judgment
at this point that the president, the president working
intensively with the
negotiators is the most productive use of time in order
to get to the agreement.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WALLACE: The main sticking point both sides continue to
say is the question of
Jerusalem: in particular, the sovereignty of East
Jerusalem. Sources close to the
negotiations say Mr. Clinton could tackle this thorny
issue of Jerusalem if he
meets with the Mideast leaders this evening. These
sources telling CNN that the
president's conversations with the negotiators have so
far focused on other core
issues, such as the fate of Palestinian refugees and the
borders of a future
Palestinian state.

Kelly Wallace, CNN, reporting live from near Camp David,
Maryland.

WOODRUFF: Thanks, Kelly.

A hostage standoff in Orlando, Florida ends with
tragedy. Police say the
gunman, 41-year-old Jamie Lee Petron, shot and killed
himself today. A
40-year-old female hostage was also found dead from what
appears to be a
gunshot wound. Sheriff Kevin Beary spoke to reporters
earlier today.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SHERIFF KEVIN BEARY, ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA: In spite of
all of
these efforts to avoid a tragedy, we still had one
hostage killed in the incident,

and our prayers and thoughts are with that victim's family.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WOODRUFF: Petron was suspected of killing a store clerk, and wounding the store owner and a sheriff's deputy.

In Philadelphia, two men were killed today when part of a building they were renovating collapsed. Another man was pulled from the rubble and taken to the hospital. Two workers walked away on their own.

Police say the first floor of the building housed a variety store; the second and third floors were apartments.

We're going to take a break. INSIDE POLITICS will be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: One of Dick Cheney's strongest selling points as a running mate for

George W. Bush is his experience, especially his tenure as secretary of defense.

Now, that Republican sources are saying Cheney is all but certain to be tapped by Governor Bush, CNN's Jamie McIntyre looks at Cheney's record as Pentagon chief and as a leading figure in the Gulf War.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JAMIE MCINTYRE, CNN CORRESPONDENT (VOICE-OVER): In 1990, Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, a man with no military experience, found himself advising President Bush on how to evict the forces of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GEORGE H. BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: We are going to prevail. I don't want to get up in some semantics about all of this. He's got to get out of Kuwait.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MCINTYRE: According to General Colin Powell's memoir, it

was Cheney, a
layman, who rejected Desert Storm commander Norman
Schwarzkopf's first
battle plan as "disappointing" and pushed for a
full-scale ground invasion despite
his fears of high casualties. Cheney was wrong about how
much resistance Iraq
would offer, much to his relief at the time.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

DICK CHENEY, FORMER U.S. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE: I think
it would
be accurate to say that generally we believe the
campaign has gone extremely
well to date.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MCINTYRE: But four months before the 1991 Persian Gulf
War, Cheney fired
one of his generals whose predictions were right on
target. Air Force chief Mike
Dugan told reporters Iraq had an air force with "very
limited capability" and "an
incompetent army." Dugan's offense was suggesting air
power could win the
war and that the American people would not support a lot
of "body bags," which
did not square with administration policy.

Cheney had a record of showing the brass who was boss.
Shortly after
becoming defense secretary in 1989, he publicly rebuked
another Air Force
chief, Larry Welch, for appearing to negotiate with
Congress over nuclear
missile deployments. As a congressman, Cheney was a
solid hawk, voting for
President Reagan's massive military buildup, including
the so-called "'Star Wars'
missile shield."

But as Bush's defense's chief, he oversaw a 25 percent
reduction in the size of
the military, slashing billions from the Pentagon
budget, including Star Wars
funding, and closing hundreds of bases overseas.

The current defense secretary, a Republican in a
Democratic administration, is
among Cheney's admirers.

WILLIAM COHEN, U.S. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE: I think that

he brings
enormous qualifications to the position.

MCINTYRE: Although even some Cheney fans think he missed
an opportunity to
transform the U.S. military into a force more suited to
the post-Cold War world.

LAWRENCE KORB, FORMER ASSISTANT DEFENSE SECRETARY: If
history look at Secretary Cheney's tenure in the
Pentagon, they'll say he was
very slow to adapt to the breakup of the Soviet Union.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

(AUDIO GAP) ... Congress to approve the Persian Gulf War
and in persuading
Saudi Arabia to allow U.S. troops to be based there --
Bernie.

SHAW: Jamie, on Cheney's tenure in the Pentagon, his
position on gays in the
military?

MCINTYRE: Well, during Cheney's time here, gays were not
allowed to serve in
the military because of the clause in the uniform code
of military justice that
simply said homosexuality is incompatible with the
military. The issue didn't
really come up until President Clinton made the pledge,
and Les Aspen got
saddled with that. So, it's unlikely that Cheney would
support any change in that.
Although he probably would endorse the "Don't-ask,
Don't-tell" compromise,
there wouldn't be any liberalizing under the rules under
a Bush-Cheney
administration.

SHAW: OK, thank you, Jamie McIntyre at the Pentagon --
Judy.

WOODRUFF: Well, given his background may, Dick Cheney
may remind voters
of the George Herbert Walker Bush's administration. But
there are some aspects
of the era that even some of the Bush family would
prefer to forget.

Here's our senior political analyst, Bill Schneider --
Bill.

SCHNEIDER: Judy, do as I say, not as I do. Isn't that

what our parents always
told us? If he picks Dick Cheney to be his running mate,
George W. Bush will be
following that advice from his own father.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1988)

choice
GEORGE H. BUSH, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: My
for the vice presidency is Senator Dan Quayle of
Indiana.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SCHNEIDER (voice-over): What Bush's father did was pick
Dan Quayle as his
running mate. It's hard to imagine a less like Quayle-
like choice than Dick
Cheney. Cheney is usually described as solid, safe,
experienced, and
knowledgeable, words not typically used to describe
George W. Bush.

BRENT SCOWCROFT, FORMER NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISER: What
he
brings is what Governor Bush does not have, and that is
practical experience in
working in Washington.

SCHNEIDER: Would Cheney add those qualities to the
ticket? Or would his
presence on the ticket call attention to Bush's
weaknesses? Cheney is very much
President Bush's man. Democrats will call the ticket a
retread, a return to the
past. Do voters want to go back to Bush I? In some ways,
yes. When he was up
for reelection in November, 1992, President Bush's job
rating at 34 percent.
Earlier this year, when Americans were asked whether
they approve or
disapprove of the way Bush handled his job as president,
his rating was up to 74
percent, higher than Bill Clinton's.

Bush I sends a mixed message. Democrats will remind
voters of why they did
not rehire President Bush for a second term: He couldn't
manage the economy.
He was out of touch with ordinary Americans.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1992)

GORE: In November, George Bush and Dan Quayle will be history. It is time for them to go.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SCHNEIDER: But there were also things voters liked about Bush I, things that Cheney shares, like President Bush's impeccable character, and his record of international leadership. Bush II is trying, visibly, to link himself with his father's international policy. What better way to do that than to have the secretary of defense from the Persian Gulf War as your running mate? Bush II wants to send the message that this is a new Republican Party.

Is it smart to embrace someone from the past like Cheney? Cheney is a conservative like Governor Bush. But also like Bush, Cheney is not harshly partisan. He can work with more moderate Republicans. He was President Ford's chief of staff. The image Bush II wants for the new Republican Party is tolerant, compassionate and inclusive -- an un-Gingrich image, a lot like Bush I.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, 1988)

VICE PRESIDENT BUSH: I want a kinder and gentler nation.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SCHNEIDER: Cheney raises another question: How much influence would former President Bush have in his son's administration? The elder Bush's role in the campaign has already provoked controversy.

GEORGE H. BUSH: And this boy, this son of ours is not going to let you down.

SCHNEIDER: The younger Bush insists he'll set his own priorities.

GEORGE W. BUSH: His major role is to be a loving father.

SCHNEIDER: But with figures like Cheney around the White House, the influence of former President Bush would certainly be felt, for better or for

worse.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SCHNEIDER: Now, that's the problem with surrounding yourself with impressive establishment figures like Dick Cheney. You don't know if they make you look more impressive or more like a front man -- Judy.

WOODRUFF: All right, Bill Schneider, thanks very much.

Well, although John McCain apparently will not be tapped as Bush's running mate, there is a new indication that the former rivals plan to present a united front. CNN has learned that Governor Bush will spend the night at McCain's cabin in Sedona, Arizona on August 12th. That is two days before the Democratic convention in Los Angeles. The visit was scheduled a number of weeks ago.

And up next: a look back at the evolution of the vice presidency.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: As Governor George Bush prepares to announce the name of the man who would serve as his vice president -- if they are elected -- we take a moment to consider the office itself. In his "Campaign Journal," our Bruce Morton considers how the vice presidency has changed over the years.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

MORTON (voice-over): John Adams, George Washington's vice president, called it "the most insignificant office that ever the imagination of man contrived," but that was a long time ago. Back then, the VP was whoever finished second in the electoral college vote for president, so Adams got Thomas Jefferson as his veep, even though they were in different parties. They changed that. Still, the office stayed fairly obscure.

Woodrow Wilson's vice president, Thomas Marshall, wrote:

Once, there were
two brothers. One ran away to sea. The other became vice
president. And
neither was ever heard of again." The Democrats chose
Harry Truman as
Franklin Roosevelt's running mate in 1944. Roosevelt
himself had said that any
one of three candidates was fine with him, and he kept
Truman so ignorant that,
when FDR died, and Truman became president, he didn't
even know the U.S.
was developing the atom bomb, though he was the one who
had to decide
whether to use it against Japan.

The Cold War probably changed the job. Presidents knew
their VP's might have
to be president and kept them informed and tried to give
them useful things to
do. Richard Nixon, Dwight Eisenhower's VP, met Soviet
leader Nikita
Khrushchev and got to know most of the international
players. And that's been
true pretty much ever since.

(on camera); Presidential nominees choose running mates
for politics of course:
an Easterner with a Westerner; a moderate with a
conservative. But more and
more in recent years, they have also thought: Can he or
she be president?

(voice-over): Bill Clinton picked Al Gore, for instance
-- two moderate
democrats, two men from the mid-South -- but Gore had
Washington experience
Clinton lacked, and clearly, could take over if he had
too. Jimmy Carter and
Walter Mondale publicly interviewed candidates when they
sought running
mates. The most casual recent pick was probably in 1972
when George
McGovern, exhausted after a convention session that ran
hours late, said to his
aides: "Tom Eagleton. He'll be all right. I know him
from the Senate."

So much for background check. Eagleton subsequently
admitted receiving
electric shock therapy and had to leave the ticket,
ending any faint chance
McGovern might have had of beating Richard Nixon.

George W. Bush's rules seem good: somebody who can be

president and
somebody you can work with.

It's a very odd job. John Adams again, when he was VP:
"I am nothing, but I
may be all."

Bruce Morton, CNN, Philadelphia.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

WOODRUFF: Just ahead, the process, the possibilities and
the participants: a
look at George W. Bush's vice presidential selection
process.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

WOODRUFF: This bulletin hot off the wires: The Associate
Press reporting that

Governor George W. Bush has decided to offer the
position of his running mate,
his vice presidential running mate to Dick Cheney,
former secretary of defense.

The AP is reporting that the job will be offered
tonight, Monday night, and
separately, the AP is reporting that Dick Cheney has
told associates that he
would accept it.

Our Jonathan Karl takes a look now back at the
Republican veepstakes.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JONATHAN KARL, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over):
Speculation started
even before the primaries.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

QUESTION: Would you be interested, Mr. Kasich?

REP. JOHN KASICH (R), OHIO: All I want to do...

GEORGE W. BUSH: Of course he would be...

(LAUGHTER)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KARL: After he clinched the nomination, Bush put in play
the name Tom Ridge,
Pennsylvania's pro-abortion rights governor. But Ridge's

start seemed to fade in
the face of opposition by the conservative faithful.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

PAT ROBERTSON, FOUNDER, CHRISTIAN COALITION: I have said
on
another occasion that if George Bush appoints or selects
a pro-choice running
mate, it may well cost him the presidency.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KARL: In late April, Bush tapped Dick Cheney to take
charge of the search for a
running mate.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GEORGE W. BUSH: He's agreed to lead the search. I'm
honored that he would
take time out of his busy life to do so. I can't think
of a better person to do it.
He's a man of enormous experience.

KARL: It sounded like he was describing a good vice
president, but Cheney
seemed to take himself out of the running, assuring
shareholders of the
Halliburton Corporation, of which he is CEO -- quote --
"I made a long-term
commitment to the company and I have absolutely no
desire to go back to
government."

Bush vowed to have a dignified, low-key search process.
For a while it looked
like it was a job nobody wanted.

John Danforth's name first emerged in May, but the
former Missouri senator
said he, too, wasn't interested. Conservatives started
to lobby for Oklahoma
Governor Frank Keating, who for one said he'd eagerly
accept.

(on camera): Bush's staff has been tightlipped
throughout this entire process, but
if, as expected, Bush goes ahead and puts Dick Cheney on
his ticket, they will
not have succeeded in their ultimate goal: making the
choice of a running mate a
surprise.

Jonathan Karl, CNN, Austin.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: And that's all for this edition of INSIDE
POLITICS, and of course, you
can go online all the time at CNN's allpolitics.com.

WOODRUFF: This programming note. Will Dick Cheney get
that nod from
George W. Bush? That's the topic on CNN's "CROSSFIRE"
tonight, starting at
7:30 p.m. Eastern.

I'm Judy Woodruff.

SHAW: I'm Bernard Shaw. "WORLDVIEW" is next.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: AdamEinVA@aol.com (AdamEinVA@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JUL-2000 11:03:07.00

SUBJECT: Fwd: Despite his lesbian daughter, gays differ sharply over Cheney

TO: "undisclosed-recipients:;"@eop.gov ("undisclosed-recipients:;"@eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

In a message dated 7/26/00 1:17:02 AM, doug.case@sdsu.edu writes:

<< GayWired.com News

<http://www.gaywired.com>

July 25, 2000

Despite Cheney's Lesbian Daughter, Gays Differ Sharply Over Bush's Pick for
his Running Mate

By Karen Ocamb, GayWired.com News

It's official: Texas Gov. George W. Bush picked former Defense Secretary
Dick

Cheney as his running mate. Cheney, who'd been scouting vice-presidential
possibilities for the presumptive Republican presidential candidate, is
considered an affable conservative with two qualities Bush lacks, foreign
policy experience and gravitas. But not mentioned in the avalanche of news
reports is that Cheney also has an open lesbian daughter, gay friends, and
a

debatable record on gays in the military. Cheney once described the issue
of

security clearances for gays in the military as "an old chestnut."

Neither Rich Tafel, executive director of the gay Log Cabin Republican Club

(LCR), nor David Elliot, director of Communications for the National Gay and

Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) would confirm or deny that Mary Cheney is, in fact, a lesbian. But gays who have worked with her as Manager, Corporate Relations for Coors Brewing Company in Golden Colorado, say she does GLBT outreach as an open lesbian. She's appeared before many groups, including the

West Hollywood City Council and the Stonewall Democratic Club of Los Angeles,

to argue that Coors has pro-gay policies and against the long-standing Coors

Boycott. One source with whom Mary Cheney has done business says that she may

have left her job last month to go back to school to get an MBA in New Media.

On the other hand, the source says, she may have left when Bush put her father in charge of the vice-presidential "Veep-stakes." An attempt to reach

Mary Cheney late Monday was unsuccessful.

Tafel and Elliott did offer diametrically opposed opinions about Dick Cheney,

however.

"He's a good choice for us," Tafel said in a phone interview. "He comes from

the more moderate wing of the Party. During the military issue, he was one of

the first to say that the outright ban was not a well-thought out policy. And

when Pete Williams was outed in 1991, he stuck by him through the whole thing. He didn't back down. And that took more courage to do then than it would now. I get the sense that he's extremely comfortable with gays."

Additionally, says Tafel, the choice of Cheney sends yet another positive message that the Bush campaign intends to make the Republican Party more inclusive and tolerant. In advance of the 1996 Republican Convention in San Diego, the Log Cabin Club went through several dramatic struggles with Bob Dole's presidential campaign, including the famous back and forth over a Log

Cabin contribution. But, in the end, in exchange for their endorsement, Dole

agreed to all of LCR's requirements, including the C-SPAN-televised podium speech by San Francisco chapter president Steve Fong just three hours before

Dole's acceptance speech.

This year, says Tafel, the Bush campaign has already agreed to have openly gay Rep. Jim Kolbe address the convention on Tuesday night (Aug. 1), as well

as having a speaker with AIDS. The campaign is also hosting an official/unofficial lunch reception for gay elected officials and others on Monday afternoon. The featured speaker is CNN "Crossfire" co-host Mary Matalin. That night the Human Rights Campaign is also hosting an "Honoring Our Allies" event, in competition with the opening of the convention. Late Tuesday afternoon, LCR is holding a tribute to Kolbe that is expected to draw

moderate Republicans. "The whole tone has changed," says Tafel. "It's all the

things we've been looking for." And as a vice presidential pick in the year 2000, he says, Bush "couldn't have made a better choice" than Cheney.

Elliot, however, thinks Cheney's conservative record as a six term Congressman from Wyoming, as well as his statements on gays in the military when he was Defense Secretary far outweigh any consideration gays might give

him for having a lesbian daughter. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, he pointed out in a phone interview, has a lesbian half-sister {Candace Gingrich} who has done "really good work" for the Human Rights Campaign, but her being openly gay "doesn't obviate his record."

Elliot finds the Pete Williams situation "really interesting" in that Cheney

drew a distinction between GLBT civilians serving the military, such as Williams, and uniformed gays and lesbians whose known existence violated military law. "He made a very interesting argument that he didn't have any problem with {GLBT} people serving in the military, but he didn't extend that philosophy to military personnel. It's unfortunate. I commend his attitude of

nondiscrimination in the Pentagon for people such as Williams. But of course,

we'd ask him to show the same consideration for {GLBT} servicemembers."

The "Pete Williams situation" has been thoroughly documented in "Queer in America: Sex, the Media, and the Closets of Power" by Michelangelo Signorile,

the gay writer who "outed" Williams in The Advocate in August of 1991. At the

time Williams, who was also stalked by Queer National Michael Petrelis, was Assistant Secretary of Defense and the spokesperson for the Pentagon's every

move and policy during the Gulf War.

In his book Signorile (currently Editor at Large for gay.com) writes how the

Williams-Cheney connection goes back to Casper, Wyoming where Williams was born, raised and attended the same public high school as had Cheney. Upon

graduation from Stanford University in 1970, Williams returned to Casper to pursue a journalism career where he wound up as news director of a local TV station. In 1986 he joined then-Wyoming Congressman Cheney as his press secretary. When Cheney was tapped by President George Bush Sr. for the job of

Defense Secretary in 1989, Williams went with him.

Meanwhile a 1989 report commissioned by the Pentagon concluded that the military policy was "irrational," says Signorile, suggesting that Williams and Cheney probably knew about the report. Despite Pentagon attempts to squash the Perserac Report, openly gay Congressman Gerry Studs and others leaked it to the press. Essentially it concluded that gays performed equal to, if not often better than, heterosexuals.

Williams, like many other closeted Washington staffers, did not refrain from

socializing and activists such as Petrelis and Signorile saw an opportunity to highlight the discrepancy of having a closeted gay man in the position of

explaining, if not promoting, the Gulf war and defending an anti-gay policy.

At the time, known gays and lesbians were being told to serve in the Gulf War

and informed before they left that they would be discharged for being gay when (and if) they returned. Others, writes Signorile, were the subjects of witch-hunts and dismissals.

The Advocate faxed an advanced copy of Signorile's cover story on Williams to

numerous reporters and a copy wound up in the hands of Rep. Barney Frank. On

July 31, 1991, Cheney appeared before the House Budget Committee, on which

Frank sat, and the Congressman decided to ask the Defense Secretary about the

military's policy on homosexuals. Cheney conceded that the idea of gays as easy to blackmail security-risks was "an old chestnut" and twice appeared to

try to distance himself by saying he had "inherited" the policy.

After Signorile's piece appeared, Sam Donaldson interviewed Cheney on ABC News' "This Week with David Brinkley" about Williams, though not by name.

"The policy in the Department applies specifically to the military, not to civilians, and the fact of the matter is that it's a policy I inherited. It's

based upon the proposition that gay lifestyle is incompatible with military service...I think that there are unique aspects of military service that justify a policy that takes into account the unique aspects of military service." He said he never asked his staff about their personal lives and it's nobody's business, "as long as they do their job in a professional manner, that's all that matters." But, he said, you can't make "the kind of separation in the military between private and professional life that you can

with respect to civilians. When you deploy for six months on an aircraft carrier at sea, it's a very different set of concerns and considerations. So

that is the policy that's there today, it's the policy that I've inherited, but I don't think it's fundamentally wrong for us to make a distinction between ---." And there, according to "Queer in America," Donaldson cut Cheney off to close off the topic.

Adding to his record on the issue, "Cheney stopped the recoupment of ROTC scholarships in three high-profile ROTC cases in the late 1980's after

threats of lawsuits by the ACLU. Those cases included Rob Bettiker, Jim Holobaugh and David Carney," says C. Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN). However Cheney stopped short

of memorializing the policy and when the Clinton Administration took office,

the military resumed the practice. Eventually SLDN was able to convince Under

Secretary of Defense John Deutch to call an official halt to the recoupment practice and policy. For the most part, reports SLDN, the military - with the

notable exception of the Air Force - have complied.

In 1993 Cheney was called to give his opinion at the height of the ugly debate over President Clinton's promised executive order to lift the military

ban. Now a civilian, Cheney said that defense cuts (as Pentagon head he had cut the department by 20 percent, according to an NBC News report), and the proposal to lift the ban "have led to a decline in the quality of military recruits." He added that "the whole reduction in defense spending, the controversy over gays in the military, has led to an unwillingness to serve and low morale."

Ironically, SLDN says more gays and lesbians have been expelled under the so-called "don't ask, don't tell" compromise policy than under the previous "ban." Meanwhile the military says it's having difficulty recruiting and retaining servicemembers.

"That 'old chestnut' quote is popping up all over place now," says Elliot.

"It shows, on one hand, that perhaps Dick Cheney can be educated on gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues. But, at the same time, he never

went far enough to repudiate the discrimination and to say, not only is this

an old chestnut, but an old chestnut we need to do away with."

Unlike Tafel, Elliot is "very worried about what's going to happen {at the Republican Convention} in Philadelphia next week." He says NGLTF is worried there will be "blatant gay-bashing" such as was issued from the podium by Patrick Buchanan at the 1992 Republican Convention in Houston. When told that

openly gay Congressman Jim Kolby was a scheduled speaker, Elliot wondered how

he'd be introduced and if during his speech Kolby or anyone else would utter

the words "gay and lesbian."

"It's not just what is said from podium but also what is NOT going to be said

from podium," says Elliot. "Are we going to exist? It's one thing to not blatantly attack us. But it's a positive step in our direction if people would at least acknowledge our existence." Elliot says NGLTF activist and writer Urvashi Vaid will be among four speakers at a major protest outside the convention.

Eric Bauman, president of Stonewall Democratic Club, also is concerned about

a Cheney candidacy. "This guy had a zero voting record on gay and lesbian issues, despite having a lesbian daughter. He also had a zero record on a woman's right to choose, on the environment, on gun control. He voted to slash public education and voted to shut down the Education Department. And he voted against Head Start every time. In 1988 he got a 100 percent scorecard from the Christian Coalition and zero from progressives. HRC gave him a 30 percent rating. He's a nice guy-type - but he's a hard right

winger.

And while he's hard, his wife Lynn Cheney is harshly far right. If Bush actually announces Dick Cheney as his running mate - so much for his definition of 'compassionate conservative.'"

According to news reports and a NGLTF press release, Cheney opposed the Equal

Rights Amendment, opposes reproductive choice, and supports prayer in public

schools. He voted against sanctions for South Africa as a protest against that country's system of apartheid. And despite his Gulf War foreign policy experience, as the CEO of a Texas-based oil service company, Cheney apparently does not favor sanctions against oil-rich Arab countries such as Iraq and Iran. He also serves as a trustee of the "arch-conservative"

American Enterprise Institute, where he was a former senior fellow. The American Enterprise Institute, notes NGLTF, "is home to many right-wing thinkers, such as former Supreme Court nominee Robert Bork, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Charles Murray, author of "The Bell Curve," a book

which suggests that differences in intelligence exist between blacks and whites and that these differences are genetic and immutable. American Enterprise Institute scholars have also been outspoken in their opposition to equal rights for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people." Cheney's wife Lynn is also a senior scholar.

"George W. Bush has flubbed the most important decision in his presidential campaign," said Elizabeth Toledo, NGLTF executive director. "His compassionate conservatism holds out no compassion whatsoever for the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community. Furthermore, it sends a chilling

signal to women, to people of color and to those concerned with fairness and

equality that a major political party would offer up a candidate with such a

background to the voters. This selection demonstrates that right-wing,

religious extremists are still a powerful force on the political landscape."

On conservative websites, Dick Cheney is being touted as "every Republican's

second choice for president." However, it is also noted that once Cheney was

"a protégé of Representative Donald Rumsfeld, a liberal Republican." When

President Gerald Ford became president made Rumsfeld his chief of staff,

Cheney became his deputy. Later he became Ford's chief of staff at age 34.

Cheney was elected to Congress from Wyoming in 1978 and rose through the

ranks to become Minority Whip, well before the Republican Revolution. Despite

a history of heart problems, Cheney has often flirted with running for the

presidency. During a short-lived 1996 consideration, it was revealed his

daughter Mary is a lesbian.

Nonetheless, according to one conservative website, leading conservative activist Paul Weyrich said in 1994, "Dick Cheney is everybody's second choice"

for the GOP nomination for president. "On the other hand, Christian Coalition

founder Pat Robertson in 1994 noted Cheney's record as part of the GOP's

Ford-Bush wing and suggested that he was too liberal to make it through

Republican primaries. David Keene, chairman of the American Conservative

Union, conceded that Cheney's 'entire professional career has been in the

company of Ford and Bush Republicans.' But Keene said Cheney's record in

Congress was 'rock-hard conservative on a variety of issues,' even though, because Cheney was from a 'safe seat, he could have taken any position he wanted.'"

Political pundits are calling Cheney a "safe choice" for Bush. But for gays and lesbians, "safe" might be considered a relative term.

-----The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational

service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anyplace on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research." >>

Return-path:

<sentto-1549171-723-964588554-adameinva=aol.com@returns.onelist.com>

Received: from rly-za01.mx.aol.com (rly-za01.mail.aol.com [172.31.36.97]) by air-za04.mail.aol.com (v75_b1.4) with ESMTP; Wed, 26 Jul 2000 01:17:02 -0400

Received: from cj.egroups.com (cj.egroups.com [208.50.144.68]) by rly-za01.mx.aol.com (v75_b3.9) with ESMTP; Wed, 26 Jul 2000 01:16:31 -0400

Received: from [10.1.10.36] by cj.egroups.com with NNFMP; 26 Jul 2000 05:15:54 -0000

Received: (qmail 19745 invoked from network); 26 Jul 2000 05:15:53 -0000

Received: from unknown (10.1.10.26) by m2.onelist.org with QMQP; 26 Jul 2000 05:15:53 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO mail.sdsu.edu) (130.191.25.1) by mta1 with SMTP; 26 Jul 2000 05:15:53 -0000

Received: from [130.191.242.20] ([130.191.242.20]) by mail.sdsu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id WAA16742; Tue, 25 Jul 2000 22:15:52 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Tue, 25 Jul 2000 22:15:51 -0700

From: LGBT Activists List <doug.case@sdsu.edu>

Subject: [lgbt-politics] Despite his lesbian daughter, gays differ sharply over Cheney

X-Sender: dcase@mail.sdsu.edu

To: lgbt-politics@egroups.com, queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu

Message-id: <v04020a08b5a423ae7f2a@[130.191.242.20]>

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Unknown

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Precedence: bulk

Delivered-to: mailing list lgbt-politics@egroups.com

Mailing-List: list lgbt-politics@egroups.com; contact

lgbt-politics-owner@egroups.com

X-eGroups-Return:

sento-1549171-723-964588554-adameinva=aol.com@returns.onelist.com

List-Unsubscribe: <<mailto:lgbt-politics-unsubscribe@egroups.com>>

GayWired.com News

<http://www.gaywired.com>

July 25, 2000

Despite Cheney's Lesbian Daughter, Gays Differ Sharply Over Bush's Pick for his Running Mate

By Karen Ocamb, GayWired.com News

It's official: Texas Gov. George W. Bush picked former Defense Secretary Dick

Cheney as his running mate. Cheney, who'd been scouting vice-presidential possibilities for the presumptive Republican presidential candidate, is considered an affable conservative with two qualities Bush lacks, foreign policy experience and gravitas. But not mentioned in the avalanche of news reports is that Cheney also has an open lesbian daughter, gay friends, and a

debatable record on gays in the military. Cheney once described the issue of security clearances for gays in the military as "an old chestnut."

Neither Rich Tafel, executive director of the gay Log Cabin Republican Club (LCR), nor David Elliot, director of Communications for the National Gay and

Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) would confirm or deny that Mary Cheney is, in fact, a lesbian. But gays who have worked with her as Manager, Corporate Relations for Coors Brewing Company in Golden Colorado, say she does GLBT outreach as an open lesbian. She's appeared before many groups, including the

West Hollywood City Council and the Stonewall Democratic Club of Los Angeles,

to argue that Coors has pro-gay policies and against the long-standing Coors

Boycott. One source with whom Mary Cheney has done business says that she may

have left her job last month to go back to school to get an MBA in New Media.

On the other hand, the source says, she may have left when Bush put her father in charge of the vice-presidential "Veep-stakes." An attempt to reach

Mary Cheney late Monday was unsuccessful.

Tafel and Elliott did offer diametrically opposed opinions about Dick Cheney, however.

"He's a good choice for us," Tafel said in a phone interview. "He comes

from
the more moderate wing of the Party. During the military issue, he was one
of
the first to say that the outright ban was not a well-thought out policy.
And
when Pete Williams was outed in 1991, he stuck by him through the whole
thing. He didn't back down. And that took more courage to do then than it
would now. I get the sense that he's extremely comfortable with gays."

Additionally, says Tafel, the choice of Cheney sends yet another positive
message that the Bush campaign intends to make the Republican Party more
inclusive and tolerant. In advance of the 1996 Republican Convention in San
Diego, the Log Cabin Club went through several dramatic struggles with Bob
Dole's presidential campaign, including the famous back and forth over a
Log
Cabin contribution. But, in the end, in exchange for their endorsement,
Dole
agreed to all of LCR's requirements, including the C-SPAN-televised podium
speech by San Francisco chapter president Steve Fong just three hours
before
Dole's acceptance speech.

This year, says Tafel, the Bush campaign has already agreed to have openly
gay Rep. Jim Kolbe address the convention on Tuesday night (Aug. 1), as
well
as having a speaker with AIDS. The campaign is also hosting an
official/unofficial lunch reception for gay elected officials and others on
Monday afternoon. The featured speaker is CNN "Crossfire" co-host Mary
Matalin. That night the Human Rights Campaign is also hosting an "Honoring
Our Allies" event, in competition with the opening of the convention. Late
Tuesday afternoon, LCR is holding a tribute to Kolbe that is expected to
draw
moderate Republicans. "The whole tone has changed," says Tafel. "It's all
the
things we've been looking for." And as a vice presidential pick in the year
2000, he says, Bush "couldn't have made a better choice" than Cheney.

Elliot, however, thinks Cheney's conservative record as a six term
Congressman from Wyoming, as well as his statements on gays in the military
when he was Defense Secretary far outweigh any consideration gays might
give
him for having a lesbian daughter. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, he
pointed out in a phone interview, has a lesbian half-sister {Candace
Gingrich} who has done "really good work" for the Human Rights Campaign,
but
her being openly gay "doesn't obviate his record."

Elliot finds the Pete Williams situation "really interesting" in that
Cheney
drew a distinction between GLBT civilians serving the military, such as
Williams, and uniformed gays and lesbians whose known existence violated
military law. "He made a very interesting argument that he didn't have any
problem with {GLBT} people serving in the military, but he didn't extend
that

philosophy to military personnel. It's unfortunate. I commend his attitude of nondiscrimination in the Pentagon for people such as Williams. But of course, we'd ask him to show the same consideration for {GLBT} servicemembers."

The "Pete Williams situation" has been thoroughly documented in "Queer in America: Sex, the Media, and the Closets of Power" by Michelangelo Signorile, the gay writer who "outed" Williams in The Advocate in August of 1991. At the time Williams, who was also stalked by Queer National Michael Petrelis, was Assistant Secretary of Defense and the spokesperson for the Pentagon's every move and policy during the Gulf War.

In his book Signorile (currently Editor at Large for gay.com) writes how the Williams-Cheney connection goes back to Casper, Wyoming where Williams was born, raised and attended the same public high school as had Cheney. Upon graduation from Stanford University in 1970, Williams returned to Casper to pursue a journalism career where he wound up as news director of a local TV station. In 1986 he joined then-Wyoming Congressman Cheney as his press secretary. When Cheney was tapped by President George Bush Sr. for the job of Defense Secretary in 1989, Williams went with him.

Meanwhile a 1989 report commissioned by the Pentagon concluded that the military policy was "irrational," says Signorile, suggesting that Williams and Cheney probably knew about the report. Despite Pentagon attempts to squash the Perserac Report, openly gay Congressman Gerry Studds and others leaked it to the press. Essentially it concluded that gays performed equal to, if not often better than, heterosexuals.

Williams, like many other closeted Washington staffers, did not refrain from socializing and activists such as Petrelis and Signorile saw an opportunity to highlight the discrepancy of having a closeted gay man in the position of explaining, if not promoting, the Gulf war and defending an anti-gay policy. At the time, known gays and lesbians were being told to serve in the Gulf War and informed before they left that they would be discharged for being gay when (and if) they returned. Others, writes Signorile, were the subjects of witch-hunts and dismissals.

The Advocate faxed an advanced copy of Signorile's cover story on Williams to numerous reporters and a copy wound up in the hands of Rep. Barney Frank. On July 31, 1991, Cheney appeared before the House Budget Committee, on which Frank sat, and the Congressman decided to ask the Defense Secretary about the

military's policy on homosexuals. Cheney conceded that the idea of gays as easy to blackmail security-risks was "an old chestnut" and twice appeared to try to distance himself by saying he had "inherited" the policy.

After Signorile's piece appeared, Sam Donaldson interviewed Cheney on ABC News' "This Week with David Brinkley" about Williams, though not by name. "The policy in the Department applies specifically to the military, not to civilians, and the fact of the matter is that it's a policy I inherited.

It's based upon the proposition that gay lifestyle is incompatible with military service...I think that there are unique aspects of military service that justify a policy that takes into account the unique aspects of military service." He said he never asked his staff about their personal lives and it's nobody's business, "as long as they do their job in a professional manner, that's all that matters." But, he said, you can't make "the kind of separation in the military between private and professional life that you can

with respect to civilians. When you deploy for six months on an aircraft carrier at sea, it's a very different set of concerns and considerations.

So that is the policy that's there today, it's the policy that I've inherited, but I don't think it's fundamentally wrong for us to make a distinction between ---." And there, according to "Queer in America," Donaldson cut Cheney off to close off the topic.

Adding to his record on the issue, "Cheney stopped the recoupment of ROTC scholarships in three high-profile ROTC cases in the late 1980's after threats of lawsuits by the ACLU. Those cases included Rob Bettiker, Jim Holobaugh and David Carney," says C. Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network (SLDN). However Cheney stopped short

of memorializing the policy and when the Clinton Administration took office, the military resumed the practice. Eventually SLDN was able to convince Under

Secretary of Defense John Deutch to call an official halt to the recoupment practice and policy. For the most part, reports SLDN, the military - with the notable exception of the Air Force - have complied.

In 1993 Cheney was called to give his opinion at the height of the ugly debate over President Clinton's promised executive order to lift the military

ban. Now a civilian, Cheney said that defense cuts (as Pentagon head he had cut the department by 20 percent, according to an NBC News report), and the proposal to lift the ban "have led to a decline in the quality of military recruits." He added that "the whole reduction in defense spending, the controversy over gays in the military, has led to an unwillingness to serve and low morale."

Ironically, SLDN says more gays and lesbians have been expelled under the so-called "don't ask, don't tell" compromise policy than under the previous "ban." Meanwhile the military says it's having difficulty recruiting and

retaining servicemembers.

"That 'old chestnut' quote is popping up all over place now," says Elliot. "It shows, on one hand, that perhaps Dick Cheney can be educated on gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues. But, at the same time, he never went far enough to repudiate the discrimination and to say, not only is this an old chestnut, but an old chestnut we need to do away with."

Unlike Tafel, Elliot is "very worried about what's going to happen {at the Republican Convention} in Philadelphia next week." He says NGLTF is worried there will be "blatant gay-bashing" such as was issued from the podium by Patrick Buchanan at the 1992 Republican Convention in Houston. When told that openly gay Congressman Jim Kolby was a scheduled speaker, Elliot wondered how he'd be introduced and if during his speech Kolby or anyone else would utter the words "gay and lesbian."

"It's not just what is said from podium but also what is NOT going to be said from podium," says Elliot. "Are we going to exist? It's one thing to not blatantly attack us. But it's a positive step in our direction if people would at least acknowledge our existence." Elliot says NGLTF activist and writer Urvashi Vaid will be among four speakers at a major protest outside the convention.

Eric Bauman, president of Stonewall Democratic Club, also is concerned about a Cheney candidacy. "This guy had a zero voting record on gay and lesbian issues, despite having a lesbian daughter. He also had a zero record on a woman's right to choose, on the environment, on gun control. He voted to slash public education and voted to shut down the Education Department. And he voted against Head Start every time. In 1988 he got a 100 percent scorecard from the Christian Coalition and zero from progressives. HRC gave him a 30 percent rating. He's a nice guy-type - but he's a hard right winger. And while he's hard, his wife Lynn Cheney is harshly far right. If Bush actually announces Dick Cheney as his running mate - so much for his definition of 'compassionate conservative.'"

According to news reports and a NGLTF press release, Cheney opposed the Equal Rights Amendment, opposes reproductive choice, and supports prayer in public schools. He voted against sanctions for South Africa as a protest against that country's system of apartheid. And despite his Gulf War foreign policy experience, as the CEO of a Texas-based oil service company, Cheney apparently does not favor sanctions against oil-rich Arab countries such as Iraq and Iran. He also serves as a trustee of the "arch-conservative" American Enterprise Institute, where he was a former senior fellow. The American Enterprise Institute, notes NGLTF, "is home to many right-wing thinkers, such as former Supreme Court nominee Robert Bork, former House

Speaker Newt Gingrich and Charles Murray, author of "The Bell Curve," a book which suggests that differences in intelligence exist between blacks and whites and that these differences are genetic and immutable. American Enterprise Institute scholars have also been outspoken in their opposition to equal rights for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people." Cheney's wife Lynn is also a senior scholar.

"George W. Bush has flubbed the most important decision in his presidential campaign," said Elizabeth Toledo, NGLTF executive director. "His compassionate conservatism holds out no compassion whatsoever for the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community. Furthermore, it sends a chilling signal to women, to people of color and to those concerned with fairness and equality that a major political party would offer up a candidate with such a background to the voters. This selection demonstrates that right-wing, religious extremists are still a powerful force on the political landscape."

On conservative websites, Dick Cheney is being touted as "every Republican's second choice for president." However, it is also noted that once Cheney was "a prot?g? of Representative Donald Rumsfeld, a liberal Republican." When President Gerald Ford became president made Rumsfeld his chief of staff, Cheney became his deputy. Later he became Ford's chief of staff at age 34. Cheney was elected to Congress from Wyoming in 1978 and rose through the ranks to become Minority Whip, well before the Republican Revolution. Despite a history of heart problems, Cheney has often flirted with running for the presidency. During a short-lived 1996 consideration, it was revealed his daughter Mary is a lesbian.

Nonetheless, according to one conservative website, leading conservative activist Paul Weyrich said in 1994, "Dick Cheney is everybody's second choice" for the GOP nomination for president. "On the other hand, Christian Coalition founder Pat Robertson in 1994 noted Cheney's record as part of the GOP's Ford-Bush wing and suggested that he was too liberal to make it through Republican primaries. David Keene, chairman of the American Conservative Union, conceded that Cheney's 'entire professional career has been in the company of Ford and Bush Republicans.' But Keene said Cheney's record in Congress was 'rock-hard conservative on a variety of issues,' even though, because Cheney was from a 'safe seat, he could have taken any position he wanted.'"

Political pundits are calling Cheney a "safe choice" for Bush. But for gays and lesbians, "safe" might be considered a relative term.

-----The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational

service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anyplace on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."

To Submit a Newsclipping or Press Release, send it to the moderator at:
lgbt-politics@eGroups.com

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to:
lgbt-politics-unsubscribe@eGroups.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Matthew Murguia (CN=Matthew Murguia/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-JUL-2000 14:44:57.00

SUBJECT: Re: guidance requests for lpm, pls

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Jenni: I hope this helps. The response is long because this is a very complex issue.

HIV/AIDS -- Rising Rates in Young People

Recent reports from San Francisco indicate a disturbing trend in new HIV infections in young gay men , with an estimate that new cases will rise from approximately 500 two years ago to as many as 900 this year in San Francisco.

It should be noted that is normal in an epidemic to rates of infection to increase and decrease over time. This has happened with other STDs and HIV is no exception. Yet, it is very important that we address this trend immediately.

Recent increases mean that we must redouble our efforts, ensure that they are factual, age appropriate, culturally and linguistically appropriate, and take into consideration the myriad of factors which affect decision making by youth. Young people, especially young gay people, are coming out to themselves and others at much younger ages than before, and for many, in a much more comfortable environment. However, many others continue to come to terms with their sexuality in an hostile environment.

Research and others believe the following factors are affecting what an increase in new infections in young gay men in San Francisco.

Complacency Many individuals have had to live their entire lives under the shadow of AIDS. For them, AIDS is not new, but rather an issue which has been in the forefront of their daily lives. They are tired of having to practice safer sex techniques, and are tired of having to discuss AIDS with potential sex or drug using partners.

New Drug Therapy: News about new drug therapies which have shown to increase the quality of life of many HIV infected individuals may be providing a false sense of security that AIDS is no longer a threat. This is especially relevant to young people who often do not think about how what they do today may affect them in the future.

Invincibility/Inevitability. There is plenty of research which shows that young people are very aware about HIV and how it is transmitted. Yet, young people often think that they are invincible, being it alcohol or

drug abuse, reckless driving, teen pregnancy or HIV infection. Research also shows that some individuals, especially young gay men, believe that they are more likely than not to become infected, thus their becoming infected is inevitable. This may affect their willingness to practice safer sex and drug using behaviors since they do not see the benefit if they are going to become infected anyway.

Self Esteem: Self esteem is a very complex issue. However, given the constant level of messages which promote the "being gay is bad" theme (e.g., Dr. Laura, no gays in the military, hate crimes), high self esteem in young gay people is often lacking. Young g people often look to other for acceptance and base their own sense of self worth on how others treat, react or speak about them. Research shows that some people will engage in unsafe behaviors as a means to maintain a relationship due to the intimacy is provides and as a means to feel in control of their actions.

CDC Plan

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has been engaged in process to refine their HIV prevention goals for the next five years. CDC is currently developing the Plan in conjunction with both federal and community/outside experts who are helping to write the goals and objectives.

Draft versions of the plan call on reducing new infections over the next five years from 40,000 per year to 20,000 per year. Draft strategies include increasing the number of individuals who know their HIV status, increasing condom use among those already sexually active, increasing the number of individuals who abstain from sex if not sexually active, reducing the number of sex partners, and discussing HIV status with potential partners.

Other components of the draft plan call for targeting hard to reach populations, such as young gay men, young women, racial and ethnic minorities, and other groups which tend to engage in high risk behaviors. The Plan will look at how funding is allocated to meet the newly established goals and strategies.

CDC is also in the process of developing a Know Your Status campaign aimed at increasing the number of individuals who know their HIV status. This campaign is still being developed and is anticipated to be announced shortly.

Contact person at CDC: Helene Gayle, MD (director, Center for HIV/STD/TB Prevention, 404-639-8000)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alexander N. Gertsen (CN=Alexander N. Gertsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-AUG-2000 18:07:02.00

SUBJECT: SPECIAL DELIVERY FOR ANNA RICHTER: Internal transcript: Interview of the President by Joe Klein

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript July 5, 2000

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY JOE KLEIN

New York, New York

5:00 P.M. EDT

Q Do you essentially agree with my sense that you had -- that the big issue has been moving from the Industrial Age to the Information Age, and that -- I mean, the toughest thing --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The short answer to that is yes.

Q -- to explain to people is, you take something like -- how can being in favor of affirmative action and being in favor of welfare reform be part of the same vision? How can being in favor of free trade and being in favor of universal health insurance be part of the same vision? There are people on the right or the left who would say, you can't do that. And yet, I think that they are part of the same vision.

But my first question is, how would you describe that vision?

THE PRESIDENT: I think my view -- I saw my presidency as a transformational period, and basically, America has gone through two before. Maybe it could start if we did it in historical times. There were basically -- I look at American history in the following -- we had the creation -- how we got started. And sort of filling out the elements of the national government and defining what it meant. And that basically went from the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution, Washington's presidency and the appointment of John Marshall as Chief Justice, which is a very important thing.

And then, ironically, through Jefferson's presidency, with the purchase of Louisiana and the Lewis and Clark expedition, and then the next big challenge was, how would we adapt that to our growing industrialization, and how did we get rid of slavery, which was inconsistent with our principles. So obviously, that's what Lincoln and the Civil War and the constitutional amendments and everything that happened on civil rights after that was about slavery.

But there was no single president that managed the process, if you will, or laid out a framework from the agricultural society to an industrial society, but that's part of what the railroads, the canals was all about, and it's part of what -- and Lincoln was a part of that with the Moral Land Grant Act, with the colleges.

Q This happened too slowly for --

THE PRESIDENT: But it happened over a long period of time. Then, there was the transformation from the -- you know, it happened over a long period of time as we slowly became a balanced society. But then, when we burst onto the world scene as a major national industrial power, that process was basically defined by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. And I sort of saw this period in parallel with that.

The rest of the 20th century was mostly about dealing with the rise of -- first, the Great Depression then the war and the need to defeat totalitarian systems, which was part of the war and the Cold War, and dealing with the specific challenges at home -- principally, civil rights, the women's movement and the growth of environmental movement in America.

So here, we are moving into basically from an industrial society -- an industrial economy to an information economy. And at the same time, moving into an ever more globalized economy, which also is more and more of a global society and that we share common challenges and common interests that go beyond economics. And the globalization of the media has accelerated that.

So I saw my challenges trying to, first of all, maximize America's presence in the information economy. Second, to try to maximize our influence in the welfare of our country and like-minded people around the world in a globalized society. And then, the other -- and I'll get to your questions. And then the third big thing for me was trying to make people have a broader and deeper vision of the American community and how to handle diversity and how we would finally get a chance to see in ways we never had before what it meant to make one out of many, what our national motto meant.

And I think the -- and you ask me: Well, how can you reconcile those things? It seems to me that the two operational strategies we had to pursue those three great goals were: One, the Third Way political and social philosophy. If you believe in opportunity and responsibility and community, then it's perfectly clear why you would be for affirmative action and a global trading system -- you know, why you would be for health care for everybody and whatever else you said -- what was the other

thing?

Q Free trade. No, I said that.

THE PRESIDENT: Welfare reform.

Q Welfare reform.

THE PRESIDENT: Welfare reform, because first of all, work is the best social program. Secondly, it is imperative to have a basic work ethic if you believe in individual responsibility and you believe it gives meaning and direction to life, and I do. But if you do, you also recognize that there is no society -- no society has succeeded in providing access to health care to everybody without some governmental action.

Q But there have been people all along, as you know -- I mean, you and I had this same conversation in 1991. People all along said, this is just an electoral strategy, it isn't a government strategy.

THE PRESIDENT: It was never just an electoral strategy to me.

Q Well, me, neither, as you know. And the question -- I guess my question is, do you feel that you were ever able to really communicate the depth and breadth of this to the public?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but only -- probably only at the State of the Union Addresses, because it's probably the only time I ever got to say it unfiltered. If I made an error in those, even though they always received very high public approval ratings, they said it always took me so much time to explain my specific ideas in education or whatever, I'm not sure I ever took full advantage of the opportunity to lay the coherent philosophy out. Because I do think at those points, that people got it.

But what I was going to tell you, if I could go back -- I think we had the transformation from the industrial economy to the information economy, from the idea of a national society to an idea of a more global society in which nation states matter. I think the nation state will matter more in some ways in the 21st century. We can talk about that some.

And, thirdly, the whole idea of defining America where our diversity was something to be cherished and celebrated because -- because our common humanity and common values were more important. And then, operationally, I think, the two things I think that mattered, I made some -- the whole Third Way political and social philosophy, one, and second is sort of a relentless focus on the future, making people always -- trying to force people to always think about not only what we're doing, how does it affect today, but what's it going to be like five years from now, ten years from now, 20 years from now. And I think that is often -- that hasn't often been the business of the government.

But if you go back to Roosevelt's focus on conservation or Wilson's struggle of -- failed attempt at the League of Nations, I think

what made them both great presidents for the transformational period America was in is that they were not only successful in the moment, by and large, but they had this focus on the future; they kept trying to spark the public imagination with the future. And that's, I hope very much, that the announcement of this genome project, although I think it fills people with foreboding as well as hope, will tend to spark future orientation on the part of the voters.

So the issues that are plainly before us, but won't be felt for a few years will have more effect on the debate and also on people's voting rights.

Q But it's a difficult thing. Charlene Barshefsky said to me that there are times that you've really been concerned, that the expression you used was that you hadn't found your voice on trade, which is the equivalent of --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, one of the things -- she, of course, has to deal with it. But the two things in trade that have frustrated me most, although I think we've got a great record -- and you can go from NAFTA to the WTO, to the Africa CBI, to launching the free trade of the Americas to -- China.

Q The reason I raised it was because what just said about the genome reminded me -- I just read your remarks about NAFTA in October '93, and it was very similar, too.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And then, of course, China, and then in between we had 270-odd agreements, and we had the Mexican financial crisis and the Asian financial crisis. But the thing that bothered me about trade -- the two things that have bothered me about trade, I think, are, one, I have so far not created a consensus within my own party, at least among the elected officials, for the view of trade which I hold; and, two, and I think it's genuine -- that is, I don't think this is just politics. I think it's how people view the world.

The second thing, and closely related to that, is that -- I went to Geneva twice and I went to Davos once, and then I went out to Seattle to try to make the case that you can't have a global trading system apart from a global social conscience, anyway, where there is a legitimate place for the voices of those who care about the rights of workers, the condition of children in the workplace, the impact of economic development on the environment, both nationally and globally.

I haven't yet, at least, been able to convince people that there is a synthesizing vision here that has to drive not only a global trading system, but these other initiatives as well. And I suppose I shouldn't be surprised, because it's a fairly new debate. And one of the great things that always struck me is, if you look at the people who were demonstrating in Seattle, while I think they were all sincere, that is, they believed in what they were demonstrating against, their sense of solidarity was truly ironic, because they had completely conflicting positions.

Q What?

THE PRESIDENT: I mean, for example, a lot of the labor union people that demonstrated believe that even though -- for example, they think that even though this China deal is a short-term benefit to American industry because China drops their barriers, that they're so big that there will be so much investment there that they will develop a great deal of industrial capacity and that wage levels will be so low that it will cost the developed world, and particularly America because our markets are more open than the Europeans, a lot of our industrial base within a fairly short term, and that's what they really believe. I don't believe that, but that's what they believe.

And then you have the people that are demonstrating on behalf of the Third World, and they believe our concern for labor and the environment is a protectionist ruse to protect American high-wage jobs. But they're all out there in the streets in Seattle demonstrating together, because they're genuinely frustrated about the way the world is going and they kind of don't like this whole globalization thing. They think it's going to lead to further loss of control by ordinary people over the basic circumstances of their lives, and that bothers them.

Q I think that this is -- to kind of put a cap on the first question -- I mean, that's so much at the heart of what you've been trying to overcome. I was talked to Zoe Baird, who said that she always remembers the statistics that you used I think in around '95 that more jobs had been created by companies owned by women than had been lost by Fortune 500 companies. You always tried to make the future less frightened for folks.

And yet, I'm not sure you're convinced that you made the case.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think I made the case to the people that were open to it, but I believe that -- I think that it's hard -- everybody's for change in general, but normally against it in particular. You know, what's that Dick Riley used to say? Let's all change, you go first. (Laughter.) That's his sort of formulation of it. It shouldn't be surprising, but I still believe, first of all, I think that what I said to the American people is true and right. Secondly, I don't think there is any alternative to change. So I think the real question is, how do you bring your -- basically, values that don't change, how do you translate them into specific approaches and policies that have the greatest chance of enhancing those values in the world you're going to live in. That's the way I look at this.

And I think that for the United States to have essentially turned away from this world, I think, would have been a terrible mistake. And in fact, I think the only mistake we've made in this whole thing is not accelerating the integration of the free trade area of the Americas more -- more rapid.

Q Let me ask you some specific questions. Let's take a walk; start in '93. The First Lady said to me the other day that she believed that deficit reduction was a predicate for doing all the rest of the stuff.

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely.

Q She compared it to education in Arkansas when you were reelected.

THE PRESIDENT: The '93 Economic Plan made all the rest of this possible.

Q There were a fair number of people on your staff that were saying -- you know, it would throw the economy into recession, and you were dealing -- it was a theory at that point that if you lowered the deficit, interest rates would come down and you would achieve the kind of growth that you have achieved. I mean, what made you think that --

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, let me back up a little bit. The people on the staff who favored somewhat -- there was nobody on my staff that was against vigorous deficit reduction. There were some who were afraid that to make the decisions we would have to make to get the \$500 billion, which is what Lloyd Bentsen and Bob Rubin felt was sort of the magic psychological threshold we had to cross to get the bond markets and the stock market to respond in an appropriate way, they were afraid that if we did that, we would have to shelve too much of our progressive commitments in the campaign.

Now, what finally happened was, we came up with a plan that raised income taxes only on the top 1.2 percent of the people, which I had, after all, promised to do in the '92 campaign. It wasn't like I didn't tell upper-income people who supported me I wouldn't try to raise their taxes. But we had to raise them at the very end. Bentsen came in with a plan that essentially lifted the income cap off the Medicare taxes, which closed the gap. And we stuck with the gas tax, which Charlie Stenholm and some of our conservatives who were big deficit hawks were worried about, because they were afraid it would make our guys vulnerable, and I think it did -- it was the only thing that average people had to pay, except that there were, I think, 13 percent of the Social Security recipients paid more because we began to tax Social Security income more like regular pension income.

But it was the Republicans who believed that tax increases by definition were recessionary, and that -- so they unanimously opposed the plan. You asked me what convinced me. What convinced me finally was that I believe fundamentally, unless we got interest rates down and investment flowing, that we would never be able to see a decline in unemployment and growth in new businesses, particularly in this high-tech sector, which depended on vast flows of venture capital, confidence capital, if you will, that it seemed to me was just out there bursting, waiting to happen.

I think -- and maybe it was my experience as a governor that informed all this -- but I really did believe there was this huge, vast, pent-up potential in the American economy that had been artificially repressed ever since the deficit spending recovery at the end of President Reagan's first term. Basically, what happened at the end of the first Reagan term is, interest rates weren't too high because we had such a

terrible recession and so much inflation and such high interest rates at the end of President Carter's term, so when the interest rates came down, then inflation -- naturally inflation around the world came down.

Those huge deficits brought us back a little bit. But the long-term potential of the American economy, I was convinced, could never be unleashed until we got rid of the deficit. So finally, I just decided that if I didn't get the economy going, nothing else would matter in the end, and I believe that the pent-up potential of the American economy was so great, that if we did get the interest rates down and we did get investment up, everything else would fall into place. And I thought that I ought to listen to Bentsen and Rubin because they knew a lot more about it than I did.

Q But you didn't listen to Bentsen on the EITC. That was one place where you absolutely didn't bend at all.

THE PRESIDENT: No, but we had promised that, and I believed in it. I thought -- and again, I'm confident that not only what I saw in the campaign, but my experience as governor of a state that was always in the bottom two or three in per capita income, had an impact on this. But I just believe that we had to use the tax system to dignify the work of low-wage workers, and to make it possible for them to raise their children more successfully. I didn't think I could go out there and argue for a tough welfare reform bill and a tough deficit reduction package, and say I was going to have to slow down my increases in education spending and some other -- social spending, housing and all these other things that I would otherwise like to do -- if we weren't prepared to give lower-income working people more income.

I also thought it was good economics, because they were going to spend it, they needed to spend it.

Q Did you ever think that -- was there any way that you could have gotten Republicans to go along with this?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know, and I'll tell you why. In retrospect, maybe there were some things I could have done.

Q What if you had invited Dole and Michel to that dinner in Little Rock?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Or invited them down even on their own, it might have worked. The real problem I see with it -- in retrospect, the reason I say I don't know, first of all I wish I had done that, because later on I started bending over backwards. I had Gingrich in and Armey in and I met with them exhaustively, and I tried. Often, it didn't work, but we did get some things done from time to time.

I think they had made a decision to oppose all tax increases because of the Gingrich position vis-a-vis President Bush. And he was pretty well in the ideological saddle, the political saddle in the House then. And I think because Senator Dole obviously hoped to run for president in '96, I think the Republicans in the Senate were going to be

reluctant to break ranks once it was obvious that the House Republicans were going to oppose any kind of deficit reduction package that had any tax increases in it.

And I didn't believe -- if we hadn't gone for some upper income tax increases, then number one, we would have had to adopt cuts that the Democratic Majority in the House would not have supported, even under me, and number two, we could not have kept our commitments on the earned income tax credits on education, where we did have a substantial increase, or on the empowerment zones or a lot of the other things I did that I believed in.

Q Did the atmosphere surprise you -- the vitriol, the difficulty?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, it did. I think basically -- but I now know things I didn't know then.

Q What do you know now?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they really believed -- first, I know now something I didn't know, which is that some of the people on the Republican side -- actually, I did know this, but I didn't believe it when I got a call from the White House early -- before I decided to run in the summer of 1990 -- from a guy I knew who worked there who was saying, you know, you shouldn't run. Bush was at like 80 percent then or something; I couldn't believe -- so I had this serious talk with him about how President Bush had used his popularity to try to deal with the economy.

And after about five minutes, the guy said, now, let's just cut the crap. We've looked at this crowd and we can beat them all. All the guys in Congress have votes; we can beat them all. And we think Governor Cuomo's too liberal, but you're different. You might beat us, and so if you run we're going to take you out early.

Then, I realized that they somehow thought it was serious. Then, after I got up here and started dealing with them, what I realized is that they had been in for 12 years, but they basically had been in since President Nixon won, except for the Carter interregnum, which they thought was purely a function of Watergate, and therefore they saw it as an historical accident that they had quickly corrected, and that's the way they saw it. I actually think Jimmy Carter and before him Bobby Kennedy were the precursors of the sort of New Democrat, Third Way stuff I've tried to do here. And I think, therefore, it's not fair -- but that, exactly to diminish -- but that's the way they viewed it, anyway.

So I think they believed that there would never be another Democratic president; I really think a lot of them thought they could hold the White House forever until a third party came along to basically offer a competing vision. And so, they just never saw me as a legitimate person; they just thought I was, in President Bush's words, "the governor of a small southern state." And as I often crack on the trail, I was so naive that I actually thought that was a compliment. (Laughter.) And I still do.

So anyway, it did surprise me. I mean, I knew it was there, and I'd seen the Democrats do things -- in my view, I guess I've got a warped view, but I never thought it was nearly as bad as what they did to me. But from time to time, the Democrats did things I didn't approve of. I didn't like the nature of their arguments against John Tower or the fact that somebody checked out the movies that Bob Bork -- and I knew there was some of this up here.

But I never thought I would see it in the kind of systematic way that I saw it unfold. But when I got to know Newt Gingrich and actually had a lot of candid conversations with him, I realized that that's just the way they thought politics worked.

Q War without blood.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's what they thought.

Q That's what Newt called it.

THE PRESIDENT: I had a fascinating conversation with one Republican Senator in the middle of the D'Amato hearings when they were impugning Hillary. And I asked this guy who was pretty candid, I said, do you really think that my wife or I did anything wrong in this Whitewater thing? Not illegal, even wrong? And he just started laughing. He said, oh, you've got to be kidding, he said any fool who misread the record would know you didn't do anything wrong. He said, how could you do anything wrong? You didn't borrow any money from the S&L which failed; it was a very small S&L failure. And you lost \$40,000 or whatever you lost on the real estate deal. He said, of course, you didn't do anything wrong. He said, that's not the point of this; the point of this is to make people think you did something wrong.

But, so, it was funny. Yes, I was surprised by their vitriol, and yes, I was surprised, and I must say I was surprised that they believed -- and they had an electoral -- and they turned out to be right, but I made a mistake or two that helped them. They believed that they could win the Congress if they could just say no to everything. And they did. And I think it rested on basically three things. One is, we did the economy, the budget plan, which we had to do. And we had to expect some loss of midterm seats. And some of those seats we had for a long, long time were naturally Republican seats, anyway. So that was the first thing.

The second thing is, but the people hadn't felt the benefits of it. Then the second thing we did that cost us some seats, but I am absolutely convinced is the right thing to do, was the Brady Bill and the Crime Bill, which had the assault weapons ban. But there again, we got that done in 1994; had it happened in '93, I think it would not have hurt us so bad. But in '94, there wasn't enough time between the time that bill passed and the time people voted to convince the world people that voted against our congressmen on the Brady Bill and the assault weapons ban, that there wasn't anything going to happen to them and their hunting and sport shooting and all that.

By '96, the issue was working for us, because I could go to places like New Hampshire and say I want everybody that missed a day in the deer woods to vote against me; but if you didn't, they didn't tell you the truth and you ought to get even. That's what I said. And our winning margin in New Hampshire went from one point to 13 points or something.

But in '94, my party's members bore the brunt of that. Then the third problem we had, and this is where I think you were right, is I was trying so hard to keep all of my campaign commitments and the way I made them, I should have done welfare reform before health care; you were right about that.

Q I don't know that I took that position. In fact --

THE PRESIDENT: I thought you were saying that.

Q Well, I might have said it, but --

THE PRESIDENT: And it was right.

Q I'll tell you where I was wrong, is that when it came to doing welfare reform, I chickened out, and I wrote a column the week you signed it telling you not to sign it. I talked to Elwood last week, and he's turned around on it as well; we were both wrong.

THE PRESIDENT: But the reason is, I think, if you go back, there's one thing that nobody in the press has picked up and we ought to talk about this later -- is why I vetoed the first two bills and signed the third one -- we'll come back to that.

But if I hadn't done welfare reform first, that would have given the Democrats a chance to appeal to more conservative and moderate voters, and the system -- one thing I've learned is, since I've been there, is actually the system is capable of great change, but it can only digest so much at once. So in '93, they did a big economic plan and NAFTA, and in '94 they did this big crime bill. And they might have been able to do welfare reform, but there's no way the system could digest the health care thing. Either that, or if we were going to do health care first, then the mistake I made was saying I would veto anything short of 100 percent coverage, because --

Q Why did you say that?

THE PRESIDENT: -- it was one of those decisions we made practicing for the State of the Union and I just shouldn't have done it. It was a mistake. I was trying to bring clarity to the debate, and I was afraid that they would try to run something bogus by.

Q You're saying that you think there is no way you could have gotten a health insurance deal in '94?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q You don't think so?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q What about --

THE PRESIDENT: Let me tell you what happened.

Q What if you had gone and just dumped your bill and gone over to Chafee's press conference and said "I'm with him"?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, maybe, but --

Q He had universality. He had a tax increase to pay for it, and he had Bob Dole.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he sort of did, but let me tell you what happened. What happened was, I offered and Hillary offered not to submit a bill. We offered to do two different things. We offered to submit sort of a generic bill and let Congress fill in the blanks, and Rostenkowski asked us -- this is a little more detail, but -- then we offered not to submit our own bill at all, but instead to submit a joint bill with Dole, which I thought was good politics for him, because then he couldn't lose anything --

Q What was the time frame for this? When did you make that --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, before we introduced a bill. I can't remember exactly when --

Q So this is while the task force was --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, before we introduced the bill. And Dole said to me -- I'll never forget this, because we were at a leadership meeting in the Cabinet Room and he said, no, he said that's not the way we should do it. He said, you introduce a bill, we'll introduce a bill, then we'll get together, we'll put them together, we'll compromise and pass them.

Then after that, Dole got the memo from Bill Kristol, I think, which said -- which basically took the Gingrich line. The way you guys are going to win in the Congress and weaken them is to have nothing happen. If anything happens, the Democrats will get credit for it, so you guys have to make sure nothing happens. After that, I don't think we really had a chance. Because Mitchell killed himself to try to figure out a way to get to Chafee, do something and -- maybe if I had gone to Chafee's press conference, maybe that would have worked.

Q Or if the First Lady had.

THE PRESIDENT: You know, I hadn't thought of that, but all I can tell you is that I really believed because Dole -- with that single exception, all my other dealings with Dole, whatever he said, was the way we did it. In other words, not the way we did it, but I mean, if I made a deal with him, it always was honest.

Q He was as good as his word.

THE PRESIDENT: Exactly. And in this case, I just think, you know, he saw a chance to win the majority, saw a chance to get elected president, Bill Kristol told them don't do it; they didn't do it. And that's what I think happened.

Q But this is the thing that people on the left point to, that would have been your big achievement, the big, new deal kind of achievement. And when you look back on it, do you regret the substance of what you did? Do you think that going with an employer mandate was the wrong thing? And also, do you regret the detail in which you did it, the fact that you did the 1,300 pages and --

THE PRESIDENT: I think politically it was bad politics. On the substance, I think basically it was a privately-financed plan that relied on managed care, but had a patients' bill of rights in it. And I think the two things that made it unpalatable to Republicans were the employer mandate and the patients bill of rights. I think the thing that made it unpalatable to Democrats, a few of them, was the employer mandate.

But if you're not going to have an employer mandate, then you have to have a subsidy where people buy into either Medicare or Medicaid. And probably, that would have been simpler.

Q That's what you're going to have eventually.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what you're going to have eventually. And if I could do it now, that's what I would offer. But the problem is, I couldn't do it in '94 with the deficits the way they were without a tax increase. And I didn't feel that I could ask the Congress to vote for another tax increase even if it was a dedicated thing after we had just had that big one in '93.

Q Plus the reporting was way out of whack at that point, because you weren't getting credit for the savings, the managed care --

THE PRESIDENT: We were getting killed by the scoring. The scoring was all wrong, and we knew it was wrong. But I was stuck with the scoring. So if you look at it, the position I was in is, I was stuck with the scoring, I didn't want to ask for another tax increase; I didn't think that was right. So I had to try stay with the private insurance system. And I would have thought that the insurers would actually have liked that, because they were going to get a lot more customers.

But basically, they didn't like it because we couldn't just let them have all those mandated customers and have no patients' bill of rights and no restrictions on managed care, so they then developed this whole argument that it's a Rube Goldberg machine, it's a government takeover of health care and all this stuff, and that sort of stuck because they had all that money to put behind it.

But the truth is, in defense of what we offered, if you go back

and look at all the early soundings from all the experts when we first laid it out there, everybody said this is a moderate plan, this is not too far left, they've tried to keep their private insurance system, they've certainly left the private health care delivery system intact, because nobody said it was some big government takeover until all the people spent whatever they spent, \$100 million, \$200 million, whatever they spent in their later to try to perform reverse plastic surgery on it.

But I think that in the context you ask the questions, to go back, I think that the combined impact of the economic plan with people not fully feeling the benefits in '94, the gun deal where people had their fears fully allayed, and the health care thing where the people that wanted it didn't get it and the people that didn't like it knew what they didn't like about it. That tended to depress the Democratic voters, and the three things together produced -- plus the fact that the Republicans had this Contract on America, and people didn't really know what it was, they just knew they had a plan, gave them the big win they got.

Q Just to stay with health insurance for a minute, do you regret structurally the way you went about doing it? If you had to do it all over again, would you give it to the First Lady? Was that a mistake?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it was a mistake to give it to her; I think the mistake I made was, I either should have insisted on having her say, okay, here's all of our work, look at it. Here are the basic principles we want, you guys draft the bill. Or, I would have insisted that we had a joint bill. If we were going to draft the bill, I would have made the Republicans draft it with me. That was the mistake I made.

Neither one of those things was her doing. She gets a total bum rap on this. The plan she came up with, which was, she was told, we ain't going to have a tax increase, right, and therefore it's not going to be a total government program, but you have to try to get 100 percent coverage, so there was no other way to do it except with an employer mandate. And she was also told that managed care is going to happen and we favor it, which she did favor it, but we've got to have some protections in there for people.

I don't know how many doctors I've had come up to me since then, tell me that we were right and that basically it was a good plan. So in a way, I think she really got a bum rap on that deal because she was operating within constraints that were -- we now know impossible. What I should have done is to let her do all the work, publish all the findings, say here are our principles, you guys write the bill.

Or, I should have said, if you want me to do a bill, I will only do it if we have a bipartisan agreement on the bill. That would have produced something less than 100 percent of coverage, but at least it would have produced something that would have passed and gotten us up to 90 or maybe above 90 percent. That was the mistake I made.

But it was my mistake, not hers. She, I think, has gotten a totally bum rap on this deal. All she did was what she was asked to do.

Q I asked Ira about it, and he pointed to his e-commerce protocols, and he said, what I did was, I decided to do everything the exact opposite of what we did with health insurance, and it worked.

THE PRESIDENT: But the interesting thing there was, it worked because number one, we didn't have to pass a big bill because of the Telecommunications Act, which was a great success, which we ought to talk about later, was a big part of the economic program, was operating on a parallel track. And all we had to do there was to basically invite them to help us make government policy that would maximize economic growth. It was a much simpler problem.

There was absolutely no way to get to 100 percent of coverage, to have universal health coverage -- unless you had an employer mandate or the government filled in the difference. If we were doing it today, we could do it. And the next administration could do it, because now we have the money to do it; but then, we didn't.

Q You're going to come down closer to get what you want in reconciliation if you move the CHIPS program to cover the parents, and only --

THE PRESIDENT: The CHIPS program -- the parents, and you let people between 55 and 65 buy into Medicare, then the only people that won't be able to get health insurance are young, single people who think they'll live forever and just don't want to do it, or very wealthy people who just would rather go ahead and just pay their doctor.

Q The reason why I was always for universal was because I thought those people had a moral responsibility to pay in to help the risk pools.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if I can get this CHIPS thing, but if I can, it will make a huge difference.

Q I don't want to stick on the bad stuff in the first term too long, but -- things -- in retrospect, things seemed pretty much a mess in the White House for the first couple of years. And there were times -- several people have said to me that you came to them at various times and said, look, I'm in the wrong position; I'm to the left of where I should be, or things just don't feel right or things are out of control. And I guess two or three questions you could answer in a bunch.

How did that happen? I mean, how do you come out of the box doing gays in the military, for example, which I assume -- well, you believe in the policy -- it probably wasn't the best thing to come out of the box with -- why did you surround yourself with -- why were there so few --

(end of tape one, beginning of tape two -- no overlap)

Q At what point did you get a White House that you were really happy with the way it was working?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I think that in retrospect, I think if you compare the functioning of our White House, for example, with the Reagan White House in the first term, I think ours looks pretty good. And I think that the problems we had were fundamentally -- most of the mistakes we made were political, not substantive.

I mean, Bruce Reed was there, Sperling was there, McLarty was there, and Rubin was there. So I don't think -- I don't think it's fair to say -- and Laura Tyson agreed with us -- I don't think we had a bad -- I think we did have people who were philosophically and substantively and on policy terms, consistent with our New Democrat philosophy. And I think that budget from the empowerment zones to the charter schools we got in the beginning, to the Goals 2000 program to what we did on the student loan program, which was terrific -- it saved \$8 billion in student loan costs for kids -- to the overall economic plan, I think it was consistent.

I think the economic plan was consistent -- I mean the crime bill was completely New Democrat. I think family leave and the Brady Bill were. A lot of the most important things that were done that made possible all the stuff we've done in the last four years --

Q You left out NAFTA and reinventing government.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, we had NAFTA and we did RIGO and we did the WTO -- all that in the first two years.

Q But even given all that --

THE PRESIDENT: But what was wrong was that the political image was different from the reality. The substantive reality I think was quite good. I've heard Bob Rubin defend the White House repeatedly and talk about how the things that worked well later, especially the sense of comradery and team work and joint decision-making, were all put in place in that first year and a half.

But let's just go through the problems, and you'll see. Part of it was I think none of us were sensitive to the way -- sufficiently sensitive to the way Washington works and to the way little things would look big to other people. Now, let's just start with the gays in the military. How did that happen? It is not true that we brought it up first.

Q Andrea Mitchell brought it up in a press conference on November 11th.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but why? What happened? Dole introduced legislation -- Dole deserves credit for this. The Republicans should give Dole credit for this. They always say he was too moderate and all that -- they should give Dole credit for this. And I give him credit for it. I've thought a lot of times about how I could have out-maneuvered him on it. But I had two things going -- and the Joint Chiefs obviously agreed with him, which helped.

But what put this on the front burner early? Not me, it wasn't my

decision. Dole introduced a bill in Congress which was going to fly through there, because Nunn agreed with him, to keep the present policy. That was like the first thing he did. And then the Joint Chiefs demanded a meeting with me. The President can't refuse to meet with the Joint Chiefs. So it was those two things that put this thing front and center. I did not want this --

Q The bill came in after you said -- after Andrea Mitchell asked the question and you responded the way you did. I always thought that was because she needed a vacation and hadn't taken it.

THE PRESIDENT: No, no, it was because -- but he was going to put that in anyway. We knew what he was doing. So what happened was between the Joint Chiefs and the Dole bill, we were forced to put it up. I was going -- what I intended to do was to get all the stuff, my basic stuff organized, lead with that, and figure out how to handle the gays in the military. And they basically forced me to deal with it from the beginning.

And then the thing that -- then I got a lot of heat, obviously, from the gay community for what I did. But everybody ignores what precipitated "don't ask, don't tell," which was a vote in the Senate essentially on the Dole position that passed 68-32, i.e. by a veto-proof margin. There was no vote in the House.

In retrospect, given the way Washington works, what I probably should have done is issued a clean executive order, let them overturn it and basically let them live with the consequences of it. And I might have actually gotten a better result in the end, more like the one I wanted.

But when General Powell came to see me about the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, the commitments that were made were very different from the way that it worked out in practice later on. And so there was no question in my mind, given the way they laid out what their policy was going to be, that gay servicepeople would be better off under the new policy than they were under the old one. It didn't work out that way, but the commitments that I got and the descriptions that I gave when I announced it at the War College, there's no question that if that if had been followed through, the gays in the military would have been better off than they were under the old policy.

And the thing that I didn't understand about the way things play out in public, because I really was inexperienced in the way Washington worked when I got there, is that sometimes you just need clarity. And even if you lose, it's better to lose with clarity than ambiguity. And what had not sunk in on I think even the press writing about this was that once the Senate voted 68-32, the jig was up, it was over, because everybody knew there were more than 300 votes in the House against the policy. So we had a veto-proof majority in both Houses in favor of legislating the present policy unless I could find some way to go forward. So that's what I tried to do.

But the reason it came up first was essentially because the Joint Chiefs and Dole were determined --

Q So it wasn't the Andrea Mitchell question on November 11th?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q It was up --

THE PRESIDENT: Because I had lots of options there. I mean, Harry Truman basically -- if you go back and look at what he did with integration of the military, he basically signed an order that said, integrate; come back within three years and tell me how you did it.

Q You could have signed an executive order.

THE PRESIDENT: I could have done that. And like I said, in retrospect, we would have had greater clarity. And since there had been so many problems with implementing the policy, I'm not sure that for the past six years it would have been better. Now I think Secretary Cohen has really taken hold of this thing and there have been some changes in the last six months that I think really will make the future better than the previous policy was.

Q But to go back to the original question, I have a strong sense that during that first year, year and a half, you weren't satisfied with the way the White House was working --

THE PRESIDENT: No, because I thought we were often -- first of all, we had to do some stuff that was tough, that was going to get us out of position. Our foreign policy team I think was working very well, and except for it took us too long to build an international consensus in Bosnia, but we eventually did it and did the right thing there. We were doing well in the Middle East. We took a big, bold step away from the traditional American position to get involved in the Irish peace process. And on balance, I was pleased with that.

And actually, a lot of people have forgotten this, but when I came back from Jordan from the signing of the peace agreement in the Wadi Araba in Jordan in late '94, right before the election, we were still in reasonably good shape because my numbers went back up and that helped the Democrats.

But I still believe that the underlying problems were the reasons for the election results. But the political problems of gays in the military hurt. I think that we had a lot of -- I was more frustrated by operational things, like leaks on Supreme Court appointments that weren't even accurate, and I thought that the White House was not operating politically in a way that I thought was effective.

I thought, policy-wise, we weren't out of position on anything except the retrospective on health care. And I've already said what I thought the political mistake was there, about how I should have handled it, given the fact --

Q If you had to do it over again, you would have done welfare reform in '94 and the crime bill?

THE PRESIDENT: If I had to do it over again, I would have tried to do the welfare reform and the crime bill in '94, together, and started a bipartisan process on health care. I would have had Hillary up and meeting, issue the report with basic principles -- that whole 600-page, however long it was, the stuff we did -- I would have given it all to the Congress and said, either you write a bill or we write a bill together.

Q Let me give you another, I think a tough "if you had to do it all over again." When I look back on this period, you were rolling at the end of '93. You did NAFTA, you gave the speech in Memphis. I mean, even I was writing positive stuff about you at that point. And then came the wave of stupid scandal stories -- the Troopergate story, the Whitewater stuff. That December, the Washington Post asked for all the documents. And there was a meeting that you had, maybe the only time in recorded history that George and David Gergen agreed and said you should turn over all the date, everything.

And you didn't do it. Do you regret that? Do you think that that changed things?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't believe, given the subsequent coverage of the Whitewater thing, it would have made any difference. What I regret is asking for the special counsel, because under the law that existed before and the law that existed after, under neither law could a special counsel be called. They had one --

Q Why did you do it? I was there the night you did it. You were in Ukraine -- Kiev.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I did it because I was exhausted, because I just buried my mother and I had poor judgment. And I had people in the White House who couldn't stand the heat of the bad stories and they suggested that I do it, and that I'd have to do it. And I knew that there was nothing there. I knew it was just one guy lying. And I had Bernie Nussbaum and Bruce and a few other people screaming at me not to do it. They said, you don't understand.

I knew that Janet Reno would appoint a Republican, even though all other Presidents had been investigated by people who had basically supported them. Lawrence Walsh supported Reagan; Sirica -- no, what's his name?

Q Sirica.

THE PRESIDENT: No, Sirica was the judge. Jaworski (sp) supported Nixon. I knew Reno wouldn't do that. I knew Reno would appoint a Republican, but I knew that there was nothing there. I knew she'd appoint an honest, professional prosecutor. So I just did it. But it was wrong. Because the decision to appoint a special counsel is a decision to bankrupt anybody who's not rich. I mean, by definition, there's a penalty associated with it. But if Fiske had been allowed to do his job, this

whole thing would have been over in '95 or '96, and, of course, that's why he was replaced, because he was going to do his job.

Q Just staying on this for a minute --

THE PRESIDENT: But do I think so? No, because I think -- I mean, I don't want to get into this. I shouldn't talk about this much until I'm out of office. But I believe that the desire, the almost hysterical desire to have something to investigate was so great that it wouldn't have made any difference.

Because, look, what did this thing hang on? There was nothing in those private papers that we -- we gave it all to the Justice Department -- there was nothing in there that did anything other than support what the report said, which was that we lost money on a real estate investment. And if you noticed, when Starr got a hold of this, he immediately abandoned that and just went on to other stuff. There was never anything to it.

And I do not believe -- I have no reason to believe, given the coverage of the events of Whitewater, that it would have made any difference. I think they would have found some way to say, oh, there are questions here, let's have a special counsel. But do I wish I had done it? I mean, I don't know.

Q Last week you talked about the clanging tea kettle, and you know I've written this continuum -- I've wrote that this era is going to be remembered more for the severity -- for the ferocity of its prosecutions than for the severity of the crimes. And there's never been anything proven. And yet, the hatred and the vitriol has been relentless.

What do you think it is about you? Do you think it's you? Do you think it's us, our generation? And what about the Steve Skeronick (sp) theory, the Yale professor who talked about third way Presidents like you, like Wilson, substantively like Nixon, people who take the best of the opposition's agenda, sand off the rough edges, implement it, and are therefore, distrusted by their own party and hated by the opposition?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that that -- I read his book and it's a very good book. But I think, in this case that's not accurate, for the following reasons. Number one, if you go back to '93 and '94, the Democrats in Congress supported me more strongly than they had supported -- a higher percentage of Democrats voted for my programs than voted for Kennedy, Johnson or Carter. It was that the Republican opposition was more unanimous.

Number two, the Republicans never owned crime and welfare. They owned them rhetorically, but they didn't do much about it. And at least in the tradition that I came out of as a governor, we thought we were supposed to act on crime and welfare. Nobody -- when you check into the morgue, they don't ask for your party registration. And I never knew that anybody had a vested interest in poor people being out of work.

And so I just never accepted that. And I found that there were a

lot of Democrats in the Congress that were eager to deal with those issues. And if you look at it, we had -- I don't know -- more than two-thirds of the Democrats in the House and more than 75 percent of the Democrats in the Senate voted for welfare reform. And we had a higher percentage of Democrats than Republicans in the Senate voting for it, and slightly higher percentage of Republicans than Democrats voting for it in the House, but not huge.

So I think that maybe transformational figures generally inspire that, because most times people like to deal with folks they can put in a box. Maybe it's just -- maybe it's something about me that made them mad. You know my favorite joke about the guy that's walking along the edge of Grand Canyon and falls off -- so this guy is hurdling down hundreds of feet to certain death, and he looks out and he grabs this twig and it breaks his fall. He heaves a sigh of relief. Then all of a sudden he sees the roots coming loose. He looks up in the sky and says, "God, why me? I'm a good person. I've taken care of my family, I've paid my taxes, I've worked all my life. Why me?" And this thunderous voice says, "Son, there's just something about you I don't like." (Laughter.)

I don't know. I don't think --

Q The folks like you. They never cared about this stuff.

THE PRESIDENT: But I believe the Republicans thought -- I told you -- I think that they thought --

Q It wasn't just them, it was us, too.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The press I think -- I wasn't part of the Washington establishment, and I think that the press didn't know what to make of me. I think this travel office deal, it was largely a press deal. I mean, I didn't know that they thought they owned the travel office. It was a weird deal. And, of course, all I ever heard was one guy in the press who happened to be the head of the White House Correspondents at the time said, I wish you'd have somebody look into this because the costs are going up and it's not working well. I didn't realize that everybody else didn't care what happened. It was a strange thing.

But I think that -- all I can tell you is that the same guy that told me -- the same senator that told me that it was about making people think I'd done something wrong in Whitewater also said that the Republicans had learned a lot from my presidency. He said, before that they thought there was a liberal press, and he said, now we have a different view, we think that they are liberal and that they vote like you, but they think like us and that's more important.

And I said, what do you mean? And he said, well, we just don't believe in government very much, but we love power. And he says, you know, the press wants to be powerful and we both get it the same way, by hurting you. There could be something to that.

But I'm sure -- maybe there were times when I didn't handle it all

that well in the early going. But all I can tell you is, if you look back over it, the Whitewater thing was a total fraud. Now, I've got a friend named Brandy Ayres who is the editor of a little newspaper in Addison, Alabama -- do you know who he is?

Q I've met him, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: He wrote an editorial that said, this is what always happens when Republicans get in the majority. They did it when they got in the majority after World War II, they tried to convince us Harry Truman and Dean Acheson were communists. And then the second time, they gave us McCarthy and now they gave us this.

I don't know. I think part of it is how you view power. But for whatever reason, there is something about me that they didn't like very much. But it all worked out all right. Like I said, I'm sure that my not being familiar with Washington mores may have had something to do with the way I didn't handle the press right. Maybe I didn't --

Q Yes, you know -- I mean, I've said this in print, so I can say it to your face -- you're the most talented politician I've ever come across. And you're not a slow study. That's the other thing we know about you.

THE PRESIDENT: But I think in the beginning, for the first two years I thought I was pushing a lot of rocks up the hill. I was obsessed.

Thomas Patterson, who has written books about the presidency and the media and all that, he said in '95 that I'd already kept a higher percentage of my campaign promises than the previous five Presidents, which I felt really good about. We had just lost the Congress, I needed something to feel good about.

But I do believe in '95 I was -- and '93 and '94, I was just fixated on trying to get as much done as quickly as I could, and also on trying to learn the job, get the White House functioning, all that kind of stuff. And I think that I did not spend enough time probably at least working with the media, letting them ask me questions, at least trying to get the whole -- letting them get something in perspective. And I think maybe I was just the last gasp of 25 years of scandal mania. We may be swinging the other way on the pendulum now.

Q I think after '98 maybe we've learned -- I think we're doing a little bit better this year. You might see that in a different way.

Let's talk about '95 for a second. To my mind, the period of this presidency that is most touching to me, I think, are the weeks after -- well, the two days, April 18, 1995 --

THE PRESIDENT: Oklahoma City?

Q No, the press conference the night before Oklahoma City

when you said the President is still relevant here. I thought, oh, my God, that must be the rock bottom for him.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, actually, it wasn't -- I didn't have the same reaction to it than maybe -- you know, we often don't perceive ourselves as others see us. But that question, I learned something from that, which is, if someone asks you a question that you want to answer directly, but there's a word in it that's dynamite, you should answer it without using the word. Because actually, what I was doing in April of '95 in my own mind was prefiguring the fight which occurred at the end of '95 and the end of '96.

That is, I honestly didn't feel pathetic or irrelevant or anything. I knew that in the end, if a veto-proof minority of my party would stay with me, after the terrible licking they'd taken in '94, if they would stay with me, I believed in the end we'd have our chance to make our case to the American people. In other words, I believed it would turn out the way it did turn out at the end of '95 and the beginning of '96.

So, actually, to me, it wasn't the worst point of the presidency. When they asked me that question, a light went on in my head. I actually felt good about it. But because I used the word, it came out -- people perceived it differently than I did. I didn't feel that about it.

Q But then, a week later, you said -- at Michigan State, you said, you can't love your country and despise its government. And that's when a light went off in my mind, he's figured out how he's going to go up against these folks.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's what I believed. I think the Oklahoma City thing was awful, it was awful. But I think it began a kind of reassessment, a kind of breaking of the ice. And I don't mean that -- God knows --

Q Someone told me that you said, you told them that you wouldn't use the word "bureaucrat" again in a speech after that.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I did. It affected even me. I realized that I had played on the resentments people feel about government, and I thought that when government did something stupid or indefensible, they ought to be taken on. But I realized that even when you do that, you have to be careful what word you use. And I did say that. I said, how many times have I used the word "bureaucrat," and there are people there. And I didn't mean to say that I or even Newt Gingrich was responsible for Timothy McVeigh. I don't want to get -- that's what he did. Are the liberals responsible for Susan Smith -- the one throwing her kid out the window? I didn't want to get into that. But Oklahoma City had a profound impact on me, too.

I went down there and I was sitting there with the relatives, and one of the people that was killed had been in my inaugural and I was talking to his kinfolk. And I said, you know -- I just made up my mind I would try never again to discuss the government, even people's

frustrations with it, in a way that could be directed against categories of people. It really had a big impact on me. And I think it did on the country.

Q Would it be fair to say that by the time you gave that speech at Michigan State, you were ready for battle?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Yes.

Q Now, this is a really interesting part of your presidency to me. You had at that point a brilliant strategy in place to screw them. It was, smoke them out. You could have just sat there and said, well, what's your plan? You could have done to them what they did to you in '94. And yet, you insisted, ultimately, against, from what I can gather, your entire staff, including people like Bob Rubin, you insisted on coming out with your own budget, your own balanced budget that June. Why did you do that? I mean you didn't have to politically, right?

THE PRESIDENT: No, probably not. In other words, I could have done to them what they did to me. And that was the argument, that we'd just say no to them like they just said no to us. But governing is important to me. And I thought that in the end we would all be judged by how we had performed, and by whether we had performed. And this may sound naive, but I believed that in the end we could change the politics of Washington.

See, one of the reasons I ran for President is I didn't just want to prove that I could play the game they'd all been playing with each other -- "I got an idea, you got an idea, let's fight and maybe we can both get our 15 seconds on the evening news." That's basically the operative mode. I didn't want to do that. I came here to do things. I wanted to be President to do things, to change the country, to be relevant. And I thought that the Democrats -- I didn't think the Republicans would take us up on it initially, because Gingrich had basically made it clear that he wanted to basically be prime minister of the country and turn me into a ceremonial and foreign policy President. We'd have the French system, in effect.

Q Not only that, he told me on the phone one night he was personally going to lead a Wesleyan revolution that year.

THE PRESIDENT: So that's basically what he wanted to do. But I just felt that the Democrats could not sacrifice -- what I was trying to do was to build the Democrats as a party of fiscal responsibility. I wanted to prove that you could be socially progressive and fiscally responsible. And for us -- and I went out there saying, look, our credo is opportunity, responsibility, community. I just didn't see that I could stand there and say, what do you expect of me, I'm just the President, they're in the majority. That's just not my way. I believe that you have to do things if you can. And my own view of politics is that there's always plenty that the parties are honestly divided about at election time, no matter how much you get done.

Furthermore, I really did believe that the Democrat Party, in the end, would be successful by developing what is now known as the Third Way,

but which I really saw as basically an information age version of what we'd always been for.

Q What was your fantasy for a second term? If you'd had everything you wanted the day after you were reelected, what would it have been?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the validation of the economic strategy has been a part of it. I would have finished the job in health care and enacted my entire education budget. And the rest of it is still sort of pending. The Irish peace process worked out the way I'd hoped. I'm still hoping that we'll get more done in the Middle East. It's very difficult, but I'm hoping we will. And then, on the foreign policy front, it's going to pretty much work out the way I'd hoped it would I think.

Q When I look back at your speeches, if there were a couple of paragraphs where you best describe your political philosophy, the Third Way, they were in the 1998 State of the Union address, and nobody paid any attention. And you know why?

THE PRESIDENT: Because I was standing -- what I got credit for there was just getting up, standing up. (Laughter.)

Q What was the opportunity cost of that scandal? what did it cost you?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know yet, because actually we did -- in '98 we won seats in the House of Representatives, the first time a President's party has done that since --

Q I mean, substantively.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't know. Because I don't know whether the Congress, the Republicans would have been more willing to work with me, or not.

Q What about things like Social Security reform -- could you have made a --

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe. What I wanted to do with Social Security -- I am disappointed there. We still may get some Medicare restructuring reform out of this. And in any case, Medicare is going to be okay for 30 years, which is the longest it's been okay for in forever and ever. And I think --

Q Yes, but that's a problem, for god sakes. I mean, the generational transfer issue I think is something that you're really concerned about.

THE PRESIDENT: I am concerned about it. But --

Q You can't keep a fee-for-service --

THE PRESIDENT: But, but, but both Medicare taxes and Social

Security taxes, in fairness, since 1983 have been paying for everything else. So we've had a little of that in reverse.

Q That's very good.

THE PRESIDENT: Everybody has forgotten that. We've been dumping all these Social Security and Medicare taxes into the general economy all this time. I personally believe, though, that -- I regret we didn't get to do Social Security because I would have -- what happened was I think maybe we could have gotten it if we hadn't had that whole impeachment thing. But there was more resistance in both parties to do anything than I had imagined there was.

They'll have to come to terms with this. It will have to be done. And I think you've either got to raise taxes, cut benefits, or increase the rate of return. What I proposed in '98 on Social Security I think was a very good beginning, and I really thought we'd get something. Was that '98 or '99?

Q That was '98. And there was also the Breaux-Thomas, later Breaux-Frisk commission on Medicare. You could have, with your abilities, you could have gotten some kind of deal if you'd been able to at that point.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe. But they --

Q Breaux was your guy, right?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't agree with what he wanted to do there. And he knows that. I mean, I thought -- I agree with some of what they proposed, but some of what they proposed I think would not be good for Medicare. On policy grounds, he and I have had long discussions about it. I think there are a couple of things in that report that I just simply didn't agree with.

Q In general, when you talk about an information age safety net, what would it be and what would be the guiding principles? I don't think that you can have the kind of centralized, top-down sort of programs that Social Security and Medicare --

THE PRESIDENT: I think if you had -- yes, but there's a great article -- let me just say this -- there's a great article in the New York Times Sunday Magazine the day before yesterday --

Q The Sarah Moseley article?

THE PRESIDENT: About volunteerism. And I don't believe -- I think you have to have some sort of -- if you believe there should be a safety net, there has to be some sort of safety net. Now, there's all kinds of options to get it done, and I think there should be more -- you can have some more room for private initiative, but if you had a safety net that worked, you'd have something for the poor and the disabled, the people who through no fault of their own were in trouble. You would have genuinely world-class education for everybody who needed it, which is everybody. You would have access to health care at an affordable rate,

and decent housing, and you'd have to have a lifetime learning system.

And then I think you'd have to have some more generous version of the New Markets Initiative I proposed, because there will always be unevenness in the growth of the market economy. That's part of its genius because you have to have opportunity for new things to branch out. But in my view, this New Markets thing has been under-appreciated.

Q I was out there a year ago watching Al From and Jesse Jackson cavort along beside you.

THE PRESIDENT: And it may be one of the great opportunities for bipartisan achievement in this session. It may be one of the great opportunities because Hastert is completely committed to it, he's been as good as his word on everything. And I think Lott knows it's the right thing to do. I've talked to them both a lot. We do have a good working relationship now, even though we have our differences. I think the Senate has been far too grudging on the judges, particularly since I appointed basically mainstream judges, but they want more ideologues, and they hope they can get them next year. And I hope they can't, and we'll see what happens.

But anyway, I think a part of the safety net ought to be viewed as a willingness of the government to make continuing extraordinary efforts including big tax incentives to keep the people in places that are left behind in the emerging global economy, keep giving them a chance to catch up.

And I think this whole digital divide is a -- I prefer to think of it as a digital bridge. I think if you think about what this means, basically, this information economy can collapse distances in a way that telephones and railroads and electrical -- I mean, I think about it in terms of Arkansas. When they brought us REA and the interstate highway system, and I put all these little airports up in remote towns and all that -- it all helped to bring, like, small-scale manufacturing to places that had been left behind. But there was always the factor of distance.

And then I got to a place like the Ship Rock Navaho Reservation where they make really beautiful jewelry, for example, where the unemployment rate is 58 percent and only 30 percent of the people have telephones. And you realize that if they really were part of an information age economy, there are ways in which they could do -- I remember when I became President there were a lot of banks in New York shipping their data processing to Northern Ireland every day -- every day. And then bringing it back. There are all kinds of opportunities that we never had before. And I think people ought to start thinking about that as a part of the safety net.

Q You know, this raises an interesting point about you, personally. Shalala said to me that she thought that just as you were obsessed and voracious about social policy when you were government in the '80s -- that's one of the things I first noticed about you, is that you knew everything. I mean, you knew about the schools up here in East Harlem, more than Cuomo did, in fact. But as you were to social policy in

the '80s you've been hungry in the same way for knowledge about science and technology in the '90s.

And I talked to Herald Farmus (sp) about it, and other people have said the same thing. Is that true? And in that regard, talk to me a little bit about the policy that you pursued in high-tech and information age things that I don't understand that well, like telecommunications and

--

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let's talk about that. The one thing in our mantra about our economic policy which we always repeat, fiscal responsibility, expanded trade, and investing in people -- those three things really were the sort of three stools of our economic policy. But one thing I think that tends to understate is the role that technology, particularly information technology has played in this remarkable growth, and the productivity growth and the long economic expansion.

And I think our major contribution to that, apart from getting interest rates down so capital can flow to that sector, was in the Telecommunications Act of '96. And there were -- our major contributions to that act, I might say, Al Gore deserves a lot of credit for because he was our front guy on it -- were two. One is we insisted that the Telecom Act would be very much pro-competition, which required us to get into a very difficult political fight principally with the RBOCs, -- operating companies -- many of whom I've had very good relationships with because they do great stuff. They've helped us on all of our digital divide stuff, a lot of the New Market stuff. But I just thought that we had to bend over backwards to maximize the opportunity for people with ideas to start new companies and get in and compete.

And we fought that through, and it delayed the passage of the Telecom Act, but eventually we got what we wanted. And as I remember, while there were more Democrats than Republicans for our position, there were actually people on both sides of both parties. But we very much wanted to have a pro-competition bias.

The other night, interestingly enough, I was at dinner in New York with a friend of mine who was in the telecom business and then got in the venture capital business with telecom. He had a dinner for me and I had dinner with like 40 people, all of whom headed companies that didn't exist in 1996. I went out to UUP, which is an Internet connection company, which had 40 or 80 employees, something like that, in 1993, when I became President, and they have 8,000 now. I mean, it's amazing.

So that was good. And the second thing we did was to fight for the e-rate, which democratized the Internet and democratized the telecommunications revolution. We've got 95 percent of our schools have at least one Internet connection, and 90 percent of the poorest schools have an Internet connection.

So I think that those are the two things that happened. And then I also continued to push relentlessly these last eight years for greater investment in science and technology.

It was interesting, I've had an interesting relationship with the Congress since the Republicans won the majority because they look around for things that they can spend more money on than me.

Q NIH.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. And it's been very interesting. They knew they would always be -- whatever defense number I proposed, they'd always be for more. And they liked to -- I'm always for a balance between mass transit and highways, and they're always a little more on the highways side. But the big area was NIH. And Herald Farmus (sp) did a brilliant job -- when the Republicans won the Congress, he brought all these freshmen congressman out, showed them the NIH, showed them what they were doing, explained the genome project to them. And I think John Porter was the head of the subcommittee in the House that had this. He's a good man. He's smart and he wanted to do the right thing. And so, anyway, I figured out after the first go-round that whatever I proposed, they propose more, which suited me fine because I basically don't think you can spend too much on those things.

But the problem I had early on, and the problem I still have is, notwithstanding how much money we have, the Republicans do not, in my view, spend enough money on non-NIH research. For example, they just took out all the money that I proposed for nanotechnology, this highly microscopic technology which could increase the power of computer generation by unfathomable amounts.

Now, why is that a mistake? Because as -- one night Hillary had -- we had all these millennial evenings at the White House and then we had one the other day on outer space and the deep oceans. We did it in the afternoon. But we had one on the Human Genome Project, and we had Eric Ladner from Harvard, who is a biological scientist, and we had Ben Cerf, who was one of the developers of the Internet.

He actually sent the first e-mail ever sent, 18 years ago -- or 19 years ago now -- to his then profoundly deaf wife, who now can hear because she's got a microdigital chip that's been planted deep in her ear. She heard at 50 -- she said she's sure she's the only person who's ever heard James Taylor sing "Fire And Rain" at the age of 50 for the first time. She came and sort of stood up and was exhibit A.

But the point they were making is that the biomedical advances that would flow out of the Human Genome Project, which the Republican majority will support lavishly, depended upon the development of the computer technology. And that without the development of the computer technology, you could never parse something as small as the human genome, and get into all these genes and understand all the permutations.

For example, there was a fascinating article the other day about one of the implications of the human genome, saying that -- talking about these two women who had a form of cancer, and that basically, if you look at the historical studies of all women in this category with this kind of cancer, diagnosed at this point in their illness, that you would say they had a 45-percent chance of survival. But now they can do genetic testing

showing that they actually have very different conditions, and that one of them had a 20-percent chance of survival, the other had an 80-percent chance of survival.

Now, the reason they can do that is because not only of the biological advances, but the non-biological advances that make it possible to measure the biological differences. And I could give you lots of other examples.

And, again, I owe a lot of this to Al Gore. He convinced me in 1993 that climate change was real. And he wrote that book in '88 and they're still making fun of his book, and I remember as late as last year we had a House subcommittee that treated climate change like a conspiracy to destroy the economy of the United States. But now you've got all the major oil companies admitting that it's real, that the climate really is warming at an unsustainable rate. And that's why we pushed the Kyoto Protocol and why I want to spend a lot more money, and also have tax incentives, for people to keep making advances in energy technologies and environmental conservation technologies.

So my frustration about where we are now is that I'm really grateful that the Republican majority has embraced NIH, because it's been good and it's enabled me to present budgets under the old budget caps that I knew they would break, so I could get adequate funding for education, for example, and still know we're going to do a really good job on NIH. But I think we need a much broader commitment in the Congress to research in other areas of science and technology, going beyond the biological sciences.

(end of tape 2, beginning of tape 3 -- no overlap)

Q -- when it became clear to you -- I mean, I know this is prompting you to sound braggart, but so be it. There must have come a time when you realized, hey, our economic policy worked, this whole thing is taking off, and my larger sense of us moving from the Industrial Age to the Information Age is really true, and all of a sudden we have these surpluses. Was there a moment when the bolt of lightning hit and knocked you off the donkey on the way to the West Wing? Was there a day when you realized that --

THE PRESIDENT: I spent a lot of '98 trying to dodge bolts of lightning. (Laughter.)

Q Well, that's the irony of this, I think, is that that was probably going to be the moment that the press was going to realize that there had been a coherence to this whole project all along, and we managed to work our way out of that.

THE PRESIDENT: In '98, I spent a lot of '98 --

Q Is it fair to say '98 was the time that this --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, yes. And I spent a lot of '98 sort of wrestling with three overwhelming feelings. One is, obviously there was a

lot of pain involved because I had made a terrible personal mistake, which I did try to correct, which then a year later got outed on -- or almost a year later -- and had to live with. And it caused an enormous amount of pain to my family and my administration and to the country at large, and I felt awful about it. And I had to deal with the aftermath of it.

And then, I had to deal with what the Republicans were trying to do with it. But I had a totally different take on it than most people. I really believed then and I believe now I was defending the Constitution. And while I was responsible for what I did, I was not responsible for what they did with what I did -- that was their decision -- and that I had to defend the Constitution.

And so I felt that -- I still believe historically two of the great achievements of my administration were facing down the government shutdown in '95 and '96, and then facing this back; and that those two things together, essentially, ended the most overt and extreme manifestations of the Gingrich revolution.

And then the third thing I felt was this "gosh, it is all working and it's coming together and all these things will be possible." And I still believe if we can get one or two things straight for the future, that a lot of the good stuff is still ahead.

Q I'm not going to let you off that so easily. Were there days, were there moments that you remember where you saw, hey, this is happening?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I was really happy. I just was happy because I thought -- to be fair, I don't think any of us thought in '93 -- if you asked me in '93, what level of confidence do you have this economic plan is going to work, I would say, very, very high. And if you asked me, what do you mean by "working," when I started in '93, I would say we'd probably have between 16 million and 18 million new jobs. I never would have guessed 22.5 million, and maybe more.

I would have said -- I was fairly sure that we'd get rid of the deficit by the time I left office. I didn't know in '93 that we'd be paying off nearly \$400 billion of the national debt when I left office, and we'd be looking at taking America out of debt, which is a goal I hope will be ratified by this election and I hope the American people will embrace that, because I think that's quite important.

So in '98 I began to imagine just how far we could go, you know, and to think about that.

Q There's another aspect to this that we haven't talked about that I think has really been central. In '93 would you have predicted that the state of race relations would have gotten to the point that it's gotten to now? I mean, I don't know whether you can sense -- I sensed it out on the trail this year. Bob Dole went to Bob Jones in '96 and didn't pay any price at all, did he? This year you couldn't do it, and everywhere you go in this country, people of different races are having lunch together and holding hands.

THE PRESIDENT: I confess, you know, I like Senator Dole very much, but I would have made him pay a price if I had known he went to Bob Jones University. I just didn't know.

Q You didn't know about the dating policy?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I didn't know he went to Bob Jones University. I didn't know about the dating policy, but I knew about Bob Jones because I'm a white southerner. And I think the Bob Jones thing -- I think Governor Bush going there mattered more maybe to white southerners my age who supported civil rights than maybe to even other Americans, because it has a whole -- because of the history there. It was a big deal to me. I just didn't know.

But I do believe we have come a long way. And I think -- I hope I made some contribution to that, because I think it's really important. I've tried to get Americans to understand that how we handle this -- I still believe how we handle this is in a way the most important thing, because we're a great country and we're full of smart people, and we nearly always get it right, unless we get in our own way. And it's just like me -- nations are like people, individuals, in the sense that very often all their greatest wounds are self-inflicted. And this whole state of racism, it's a self-inflicted wound.

Q This was where I was wrong on affirmative action, I think, in the end, when I kicked you around on that.

THE PRESIDENT: I never wanted it to last forever, and I think that we had to clean up some of the contracting policies and some of the other things. But we --

Q Have those been done?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we made some changes, and I hear a lot of complaining about it from people that have been affected by them. But I still believe that -- and to be fair to my critics or skeptics, it's a lot easier to sell affirmative action in good economic times than in tough economic times. I believe what launched the assault on affirmative action in the beginning was that, number one, it did seem to be that nobody was ever reexamining it, its premises.

But secondly, the big start was in California because California was suffering so much from a recession in the late '80s and early '90s, and people felt that they were being disenfranchised, and they felt that the circumstances were squeezing in on them anyway and they didn't want any other burdens that they lost just because they happened to be in the majority. So I think maybe the acid test of whether I was right or not won't come until there's another period of economic difficulty.

Q People argue the same on welfare reform, as well, although --

THE PRESIDENT: But I think there's enough evidence in on that. I think if there are adversities coming out of welfare reform in the next

economic downturn, or as far as there are now, it may be because -- it's largely because of decisions states have made about how to spend or not to spend properly the big extra money they got because we grandfathered them in at the amount of money they were getting when welfare rolls were at their height in February of '94. I think that's when we did that. Maybe it was '96, but I think it was '94. I think we grandfathered them -- anyway, whatever month it was, we grandfathered their cash flow in when welfare rolls were high, on the theory that we wanted them to spend this money on education, on transportation, on housing assistance, on training people to not just take jobs, but to be able to keep jobs, or find new jobs if they lost them. And there are some stories coming in which are troubling, but which have more to do with decisions that were made at the state level.

The thing that some of the people who criticized me on the left for welfare reform never understood, I don't think -- they said, oh, gosh, he's ending this national benefit. But that was a joke, because for more than 20 years, by 1996, states had been able to set their own rate. So you had the family support, monthly support for a family of three on welfare varied anywhere from a low of \$187 a month to a high of \$665 a month -- on the day I signed the welfare reform bill.

So to pretend that there was somehow some national income safety net was a joke. Nobody was going to go below \$187 a month. And if there was a political consensus for a higher level, they weren't going to go out and gut people. And the idea of spending this money to empower people to go into the workplace, and then require people who could do so to try to get their personal act together and access the benefits and go in there, and then letting them keep their medical coverage for a while, is very, very important.

The only thing I didn't like about the welfare reform bill was not that, it was the immigrant thing. But the two I vetoed -- everybody acted at the time -- the only thing that really disturbed me, and I realized I had not succeeded in getting people into the intricacies of welfare policy was that I had people, both liberals and conservatives, who said, well, he vetoed two of them, but he signed the third one because it's getting close to the election and he wants credit for that. That's not true.

The thing we were fighting about was whether or not, if you required people on welfare to go to work and they refused to meet the requirement -- that is, they acted in a way that violated the responsibility portions of the law -- how do you minimize the impact on their kids. And what I was unwilling to do, because there was a uniform national benefit there, was to scrap the food stamps or the Medicaid coverage for the children, where we did have a uniform national standard. And nowhere near the variations that already existed in the monthly cash payment.

So I thought that finally when they agreed to put those back in, I believed, given the way the budget fights were unfolding -- and by then I was in my second one, in '96 -- that within a couple of years I would be able to restore most of the immigrant cuts. And sure enough, we did.

So I still think that some of them are not right and that we haven't restored, but I think, on balance, the welfare reform bill was a big net advance in American social policy and the right thing to do.

Q That's an interesting phrase, "given the way the budget fights were unfolding." There seems to have been a pattern since '95, and I think that that may be part of the reason why people might not see the whole of what has gone on here -- is that a lot of the stuff you've gotten since '95 has come in budget reconciliations at the end of the year --

THE PRESIDENT: Huge. And I've got to give a lot of credit to Panetta and Bowles, who was brilliant at it, and John Podesta and Ricchetti, and all these people that worked the Congress, because they -- and the congressional leadership in our party -- keep in mind, any time that our support among the Democratic minority drops below a third plus one, I have no power in the budget process. So I think that -- but we have gotten enormous amounts done for poor people, for the cause of education -- we've gone from a million dollars a year in three years to \$445 million a year, something like that, in programs for after-school. And my budget this year, if we get that, we'll really be able to put an after-school program in every failing school in America -- if we get what I asked for this year. Amazing stuff.

I think that's one of the reasons that a lot of what we did in education has not been fully appreciated.

Q Ten million people taking advantage of HOPE Scholarships and Lifelong Learning credits this year, according to Gene.

THE PRESIDENT: That's right.

Q I mean, are you frustrated that this kind of stuff isn't more known?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, a little bit. But the main thing for me now is that it's happening. And the other thing that I think is really important I'd just like to mention, that I think almost no one knows, that I think is, over the long run, particularly if we can get -- it's interesting, the Republicans say they're for accountability, but they won't adopt my education accountability act, which would require more explicit standards, more explicit -- turn around failing schools or shut them down, and voluntary national tests, which they're against, but we're working on it still.

But just what we did in '94 -- in '94, in a little-known provision of our reenactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we required states to identify -- getting Title I money -- to identify failing schools and to develop strategies to turn them around. States like Kentucky the have taken it seriously have had a breath-taking result.

I was down at that little school in Kentucky, in eastern Kentucky, the other day. And it was a failing school, one of the worst in Kentucky, over half the kids on school lunches, now ranked in the top 20 elementary schools in Kentucky -- in three years.

Q What did they do.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me tell you the results they got. In three years, here's what happened -- they went from 12 percent of the kids reading at or above grade level to 57 percent. They went from 5 percent of the kids doing math at or above grade level to 70 percent. They went from zero percent of the kids doing at or above grade level in science to 63 percent. In three years. And they ranked 18th in the performance of elementary schools in Kentucky.

Well, smaller classes, good school leadership, heavy involvement by the parents, and basically measuring their performance. It's stunning. I mean, it's just amazing.

I was in a school the other day in Spanish Harlem that in two years went from 80 percent of the kids doing reading and math at or below grade level to 74 percent of the kids doing reading and math at or above grade level. Below grade level, 80 percent below, to 74 percent at or above grade level. In two years. And I know what they did there because I spent a lot of time there. They got a new principal and they basically -- they went to a school uniform policy, one of my little ideas that was falsely maligned, had a huge impact -- and they basically went to -- they established goals and results, and you either met them or you didn't. It's amazing. And these children, the pride these children felt was breath-taking.

So one of the things -- I mean, I think one of the most important accomplishments of the administration was basically opening the doors of college to everybody with the HOPE Scholarships and the direct loans. And if we could just get this tuition tax deductibility then -- we haven't made it possible for every person making \$40,000 to send all their kids to Yale, but we made it possible for everybody to send all their kids somewhere.

Q That's not refundable, is it?

THE PRESIDENT: Not refundable, but it is deductible at the 28-percent level for people that are in the 15-percent income tax bracket.

Q Oh, I see. So it's a kind of semi-deduction.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, in our proposal you get to deduct up to \$10,000 at the 28-percent level even if you're in the 15-percent income tax bracket. So it's not refundable, but for the people that need refundability, they have access to the Pell Grants and to loans they can pay back now as a percentage of their income under the Direct Loan Program.

Q You're getting restless. Let me ask you one last -- well, I'm not going to guarantee this is one last, I might want to ask you -- if I have a few more over time, is there some way I can get in touch with you?

THE PRESIDENT: Sure. You've interviewed 50 people, you've taken this seriously, so I want to try to --

Q Well, it's the last eight years of my life, too, you know. (Laughter.) And I haven't even asked you about foreign policy, for god sakes. We'll do two things. Let me ask you about foreign policy. It seems to me that if you look at what you did, there are two big things you did in foreign policy. One was raise economic issues to the same level as strategic issues, which was crucial, and the other was to demonstrate over time that America was going to be involved and use force when necessary in the rest of the world.

The second one is, obviously, more messy and dicey than the first. The third thing you did was essentially not do anything wrong and do really right things when it came to the big things like Middle East, Russia, China.

The messy part of it is the dustups in places like Bosnia, Kosovo. People have told me that you really feel awful that you didn't do more in Rwanda. Is that true?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I don't know that I could have. Let me back up and say, I had a -- when I came here, came to the White House, I sat down, basically, and made my own list of what I wanted to accomplish in foreign policy. I wanted to maximize the chance that Russia would take the right course. I wanted to maximize the chance that China would take the right course. I wanted to do what I could to minimize these ethnic slaughters, which basically the end of the Cold War ripped the lid off -- it's not that they didn't occur before, but now they became the main problem with the world.

I wanted to try to create a unified Europe which included an expanded NATO, supporting European unification and dealing with all the countries around. I wanted to try to get Turkey into Europe as a bulwark against fundamentalist terrorism. That required some progress between Greece and Turkey, and we made some, not enough to suit me.

I wanted to try to minimize the turbulence -- the possibility of war and nuclear war between India and Pakistan, which is something that was not right for my involvement until rather late in my term. But one of the things that -- and I wanted to try to -- and I'll leave this until last -- I wanted to try to broaden the notion in America of what foreign policy and national security was, to include health issues, to include -- like we made AIDS a national security threat -- to include climate change; to include the globalized society, all these issues we started talking about.

So the one thing I would say to you is that I think this has all occurred kind of under the radar screen -- I'll come back to Rwanda -- but one of the things I think should be mentioned is we have spent an enormous amount of money and time and effort focusing America on how to minimize the threats of biological warfare, of chemical warfare. What are we going to do -- will the miniaturization of the information revolution lead to small-scale chemical, biological, even, God forbid, nuclear weapons; how

are we going to deal with that. So we've done a lot of work on that.

And to come back to Rwanda, one of the things I've tried to do with Africa is to -- and Sierra Leone is giving us a good test case here -- is to increase the capacity of the African nations to deal with their own problems, to support the regional operations like ECOWAS or OAU. And I developed something called the African Crisis Response Initiative, where we would go in and train African militaries. When I was in Senegal, for example, I went out to the community -- to the training site there on our trip to Africa, and saw the American soldiers training with the Senegalese to dramatically increase their capacity.

What happened basically with Rwanda is we were obsessed with Bosnia and all the other stuff, and it was over in 90 days. I mean, they basically killed hundreds of thousands of people in 90 days. And I just don't think we were -- any of us focused on it and whether we could have done something. But I made up my mind that we would certainly try to increase the capacity of Africans to deal with it and we would move in as quickly as we could. And like I said, what happens in Sierra Leone is going to be a little test of that.

Q Do you think you were prepared for being a foreign policy leader when you came in? What are the things that you've learned in terms of --

THE PRESIDENT: I would say, yes and no. I think --

Q You had it in principle.

THE PRESIDENT: I think I had a very -- because I'd been interested in it since I was a student in college, and I'd always been fascinated by world affairs. So the fact that I had not been a senator or served in a previous administration I don't think was a particular disadvantage. I think all the economic stuff I think I had right, and the fact that there was a lot more in economics involved and it was about democracy, it was about minimizing war, it was about lifting people's sights so they had something better to do than killing their neighbors because they were of a different religion or ethnic group. I think we had that right.

I think we basically had the nuclear issues right, and the big power issues right with Russia, with China, what we tried to do in the Korean Peninsula.

Where I felt -- I think where I felt some frustration is maybe where even a President with a lot of experience would have felt frustration, a lot of experience in this, which is building the post-Cold War alliances, which proved to be very frustrating. I mean, we had a lot of frustrations -- and we got panned a lot, and maybe we deserved some of it and maybe we didn't -- in '93 and '94, trying to put together some kind of coalition of our European allies to move in Bosnia.

In Kosovo, having had the Bosnia experience, even though there were differences in the alliance, I have nothing but compliments for my

allies. They were basically -- we had our arguments; we should have. Nobody has got a monopoly on truth. But basically, we got together, we moved quickly, we did the right things.

And I think that the idea of how we might even go about mechanically, operationally, dealing with something like Rwanda just wasn't there. The French and others that had been more active in that part of Africa, I think they may have had a better sense of it, although they went in late.

Q But you were acting with more confidence, too. You weren't asking, you were telling.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, it happens once you've been around and you know people, you know what it was. But it was -- I think that some of that, when you've got to have some support from other countries, and you can have an uncertain result, but you think you have to try, it just takes a while until you get your sea legs and you get everything worked out, particularly when there aren't sort of institutional structures and policies and rules of the road there. And so I think we did get it right.

If you take another sort of sad moment of the administration, when we lost our soldiers in Somalia --

Q Almost at the same time as the ship turned around in the harbor in Port-au-Prince.

THE PRESIDENT: When we lost our soldiers in Somalia, it was a very sad thing. But that happened I think -- and I hope the Congress will never decline to put people in peacekeeping missions because of it, because basically our guys did a terrific job there. But there was an operational, I think, decision made there, which, if I had to do it again, I might do what we did then, but I would do it in a different way.

I remember General Powell coming to me and saying, Aideed has killed all these Pakistanis and they're our allies. Somebody needs to try to arrest him, and we're the only people with the capacity to do it. And he said, we've got a 50-percent chance of getting him, and a 25-percent chance of getting him alive. And so, he said, I think you ought to do it. And I said, okay.

But today, with that number of people there -- and then he retired, he left like the next week -- I'm not blaming him, I'm just saying that he was gone. So what happened was, we had this huge battle in broad daylight where hundreds and hundreds of Somalis were killed and we lost 18 soldiers, in what was a U.N. action that basically, if I were going to do it again, I would treat it just like -- if we were going to do that, I'd say, okay, I need to know what's involved here, and let's do this the way we planned out the military action we took against Saddam Hussein, for example -- or the military action I took to try to get Usama bin Laden's training camps, or anything else.

It doesn't mean America shouldn't be involved in peacekeeping, but it means if you go beyond the normal parameters that you decide on the

front end, then the United States has to operate in a very different way.

Q There doesn't seem to be a uniform set of ground rules yet in place.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there is, but we're getting there.

Q Should there be? Could there be?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it's pretty hard, but I think you -- anyway, I will always regret that. I don't know if I could have saved those lives, or not, because I think what we were trying to do was the right thing to do, and the people who were there on the ground did the best they could. But I would have handled it in a different way if I had more experience, I think. I know I would have.

The only other thing I was going to say about this is that -- we talked about earlier how I hope in the future that the Congress will give more support to science and technology, beyond NIH. I hope in the future the Congress will give more support to our national security budget beyond the defense budget. As well-off as we are, one real big problem, we should be spending much more than we're spending, in my judgment, to fight global disease, to promote global development, to facilitate global peace-making and peacekeeping.

I think that we need to succeed in getting the bipartisan majority in Congress with a much broader view, because people look at us -- and they know how much money we've got and they know what our surplus is, and all these other countries are struggling, and we shouldn't be so begrudging -- I fight with the Congress all the time -- in our contributions to peacekeeping and to creating the conditions in which democracy and peace will flourish.

I'm encouraged by how Congress voted in this Colombia package because it's a balanced package and it has a lot of non-military, non-police stuff in it. And I'm hopeful that we'll have a more -- I saw Ben Gilman had a very good article -- somebody else, he and a Democrat, I can't remember who it was -- wrote an article in the L.A. Times yesterday, talking about the importance of the United States taking the lead in the international fight against global disease. That's one thing that I hope, after I'm gone, I hope that the next President will be more successful at than I was.

Q Let me ask you -- this is it -- after you're gone, you're going to be the youngest ex-President since Teddy Roosevelt. If there was one thing that Teddy Roosevelt did absolutely awful, it was be an ex-President. I mean, he was really terrible at it because he was so engaged, so involved, and he couldn't quit kibitzing.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he felt, to be fair to him, that the Republicans had abandoned his philosophy. He felt Taft had kind of let him down.

Q You also have a restraining amendment in the Constitution

that he didn't. But do you worry about that?

THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, I do, because -- (laughter) -- but not in the way you think. I don't think that the next President, whoever it is, will have problems with me acting like I wish I were still President. I mean, I think I know how to behave, and I've been here, and I want my country to succeed, and for my country to succeed, the presidency has to function. And I don't want to complicate that.

So the challenge I have is to figure out how to have a meaningful life, how to use all this phenomenal experience I've got and what I know and the ideas I have in a way that helps my country and helps the things I believe in around the world, and doesn't get in the way of the next President. And that's what I have to do. I've got to figure out how to do it.

Q Any thoughts?

THE PRESIDENT: I've thought about it, but I'm not ready to talk about it yet. But the one thing that I -- (laughter) --

Q You've talked about everything else today. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, but the one thing that I -- the reason I wanted to spend so much time with this interview -- if you want to talk to me anymore, just call and we'll talk more on the phone -- is that you always knew -- and even when you got mad at me it was because you thought I'd stopped it -- that I would take this job seriously. I mean, the basic thing that I can tell you about this is I will leave Washington, believe it or not, after all I've been through, more idealistic than I showed up here as, because I believe that if you have a serious presidency, if you have ideas and you're willing to work, and you're not so pig-headed that you think you've got the total truth, and you work with other people, and you just keep working at it, and you're willing to win in inches as well as feet, that a phenomenal amount of positive things can happen.

And you always thought that I was trying to have a serious presidency. That's all I ever wanted.

Q I got pretty pissed off at times.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that was all right. But at least -- but when you were mad, it was because you thought I was abandoning something I said I would do, that I was trying to do. I never had any -- my frustration was with the people in your line of work that I thought didn't take all this seriously, that thought it didn't matter one way or the other, that thought it was some game or who was up or who was down, or where was the power equation, or something.

Because it really does matter. There are consequences to the ideas people have. One of the worries I have about this election is all these people writing as if there is no differences and there are no consequences. The American people should make a judgment knowing that there are differences and there are consequences and it matters what you

do.

The thing that I think the last several years has shown is that a lot of these problems yield to effort. And if you're willing to just put in a few years of effort, you can push a lot of rocks up a lot of hills. People should feel really good about that.

One of the things that I hope when I leave office that people will say is, I hope that there will be a greater sense of self-confidence about what America can achieve. But it requires you -- everybody has got to play politics, and I understand all that. I don't want to get sanctimonious about that just because I'm not running for office for the first time in 26 years. That's part of the political system. And everybody will take their shots and do this. But in the end, the presidency should be informed by a set not just of core principles and core values, but ideas -- that there ought to be an agenda here; people ought to always be trying to get something done. And you shouldn't be deterred by people saying it's not big enough, or it's too big, or all that. There ought to be a broad-based view of where the world should go and what the role of the presidency is in taking America where it should go.

And as long as there is, I think our country is going to do pretty well. In that sense, I will leave office phenomenally optimistic. And everything I ever believed about the American people has been confirmed by my experience here. If they have enough time and enough information, no matter how it's thrown at them, in how many pieces and how slanted it is, or whether it's inflammatory or whether it's designed to produce sedation, no matter what happens, they nearly always get it right. That's the only reason we're around here after -- the Founding Fathers were right; democracy, if given a chance to work, really does. If there's enough time and enough information, the American people nearly always get it right.

So, in that sense, I just -- I'm grateful I've had the chance to serve. I've had the time of my life. I've loved it. Probably good we've got a 22nd Amendment; if we didn't, I'd probably try to do it for four more years. (Laughter.)

Q Well, I'll tell you something -- turning this off. Two things. One is, every last campaign I've covered since '92 I found myself judging against that one, in just big ways and little ways. And the other thing I promised my son I'd tell you -- he's just finishing up his first tour as a foreign service officer in Turkmenistan, and he said his proudest possession is his commission document with your signature on it.

THE PRESIDENT: Wow. Well, if you go back to that '92 campaign, it just shows you, though -- the only other thing I would say is I think I was so advantaged by having been a governor for 10 years when I started running, or however long I'd been serving, and having had the opportunity to develop these ideas over time, and then to measure them against the experience I've had.

I still think ideas and organized, concentrated effort mattered. No President with an ambitious agenda will fail to make errors. Things

happen in other people's lives. Maybe something will happen to the next President -- God knows they won't go through what I did, but maybe their kids will get sick. Things happen in people's lives and mistakes get made. And sometimes you just make a wrong call. But if you've got -- if you're serious and you've got a good agenda, and you have good people and you work at it in a steady way, you get results.

It really is a job like other jobs. That's another thing -- I think it's important -- you said something in your letter to me, which I think is true, that maybe we had removed all the mystery around the President --

Q I didn't even get a chance to ask that question.

THE PRESIDENT: -- and maybe that's not good. And maybe that's not good, but I do believe that we need to demystify the job. It is a job. And if you love your country and you've got something you want to do, and you've thought it through and you've put together a good team, and you're willing to be relentless and to exhaust yourself in the effort, results will come.

That's what I would like the American people to know. They should be very optimistic about this.

Q You know, they are. They're in such great shape right now. I noticed it traveling around this year. It's not just everybody is getting along, but they appreciate the thing that you always said way back when, which is that diversity is a strength.

Sandy was telling me about your first G-7 conference, which I don't expect you to talk about on the record, but he was telling me about how the Japanese were lecturing you about how to run an economy. And when you took office most people believed that we were going to get taken to the cleaners by the Japanese and the Germans, because they were homogenous and we were mongrels. And now most people -- you know, most of those Archie Bunkers out in Queens have a niece or a nephew who is dating a Puerto Rican at this point. And most people --

THE PRESIDENT: Or an Indian or a Pakistani. I went to a school in Queens the other day, and I mean I thought I was -- there was one guy there I could swear the kid was from Mongolia. There were a lot of East Asians; there were a lot of South Asians; there were all the Puerto Ricans; there were all the other Latins, you know.

But the test that -- that's not over, but I think people are beginning to feel good about it.

Q Well, I mean, kids my kids' age, your kid's age, think it's a positive value --

THE PRESIDENT: It is a positive value. It makes life more interesting. I keep telling everybody, the trick is to figure out how to respect all these people's -- other people's traditions, religions, the whole thing, cherish your own, and then -- but the only way to make it

work -- which is why I keep citing this human genome finding that we're 99.9 percent the same -- is to realize that the differences make life interesting, but the similarities are fundamental.

If you can get people to think that -- what we have in common is fundamental, but the differences make life more interesting -- then I think we'll be okay. And I still think that's still the most important thing of all. It's even more important than the right economic policy -- because, eventually, we'll get all that stuff. We'll make mistakes, we'll correct it. But if your whole heart and mind and spirit is wrongly turned, then you can do everything else right and you still come a cropper. You'll have problems.

So I really -- I think this advance in race relations is profoundly important. I'll give you one -- exhibit A was old Gordon Smith's speech for the hate crimes bill. Did you see that?

END 7:10 P.M. EDT