

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1999 20:38:22.00

SUBJECT: CBS Face The Nation, July 25, 1999

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 (Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet [UNKNOW
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/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: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/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: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/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: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
CBS FACE THE NATION
Aired on JULY 25, 1999

SPEAKERS: BOB SCHIEFFER, HOST, CBS FACE THE NATION
GLORIA BORGER, U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT
CORRESPONDENT
ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, KENNEDY HISTORIAN
LETITIA BALDRIGE, JACQUELINE KENNEDY'S SOCIAL
SECRETARY
LAWRENCE SUMMERS, U.S. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
U.S. SENATOR PETE DOMENICI, (R-NM)
U.S. SENATOR JOHN BREAUX, (D-LA)

SCHIEFFER: Today on FACE THE NATION we'll look back at an extraordinary outpouring of national grief over the death of John F. Kennedy, Jr., and we'll look ahead to the coming battle in Congress over tax cuts.

He had every gift but length of years, the eulogy for John F. Kennedy, Jr., said. Why does this tragedy affect Americans so? We'll ask the noted historian and Kennedy family friend Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Letitia Baldrige, social secretary at the Kennedy White House.

Then we'll turn to what will happen in the coming week in the Senate as it takes up the huge \$800 billion being tax cut passed by the House. Is there room for compromise? Is there any need for a tax cut at all? We'll talk with Senator Pete Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, and Senator John Breaux, Democrat of Louisiana. Then we'll get the White House view from Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers.

Gloria Borger will be here, and I'll have a final word on playing politics. But first, the Kennedy legacy on FACE THE NATION.

ANNOUNCER: FACE THE NATION, with Chief Washington Correspondent Bob Schieffer. And now from CBS NEWS in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: Good morning again. Historian Arthur Schlesinger is in New York this morning, with us here in Washington, Letitia Baldrige, who of course was the social secretary during the Kennedy administration.

Professor Schlesinger, put it in perspective for us. What did this week mean and why, really, did it happen?

SCHLESINGER: I think the outburst of emotion and concern and grief derives partly from the fact that this is one more chapter in a saga of people cut off -- a promising young man cut off in the midstream, high promise unfulfilled. And partly I think, because people feel a great pent-up need for a larger measure of idealism, concern for others -- the kind of thing for which the Kennedys have consistently stood. The sense that if you are lucky enough to be born to privilege, you owe something to the people who are not that lucky. I think there's a great feeling that that kind of idealism is missing in American life today.

SCHIEFFER: Ms. Baldrige, one of the things that struck me throughout all of this was a kind of the dignity of John Kennedy, he was a celebrity who seemed comfortable with that and with himself. You knew him when he

was a very small boy.

BALDRIDGE: He was a little boy, yes.

SCHIEFFER: How did he get to be the way he turned out to be, as it were?

BALDRIDGE: Well, the parents. You know, his parents were a tremendous influence, even though he was a little boy and baby and he doesn't remember too much.

His mother had a great sense of history, and Arthur, as a historian, will certainly bear me out on that. There were history books everywhere in the house and they were read avidly. They went to museums; he and Caroline went to museums. They also went to the circus and did fun things, but they had a tremendous sense of the history of Washington. And when the president and Mrs. Kennedy gave a dinner at Mt. Vernon, again, the sense of history. And that's the way they were raised.

And also the grace and style of that period. I mean, the women used to put on evening dresses when they gave dinners in their own houses. Everybody looked good; they knew how to dress. Today they go practically wearing jeans to dinners. It was just another era -- details counted. The children grew up in that kind of atmosphere.

BORGER: Can you tell us a little bit about the relationship between JFK, Jr., and his sister Caroline?

BALDRIDGE: Well, of course, they were always together, and of course, Caroline, being an older sister in those days, knew how to boss her little brother. If he got out of line, if he went the wrong way, she pulled him back. And so it was a typical older sister-brother relationship, but they were very close and they obviously remained very close through their lives.

Do you know, it does me such a good thing to see Arthur Schlesinger sitting there, we adored him in the White House. Our historian, the man who put the great books in the library. Oh, Arthur, it's so good to see you.

SCHLESINGER: Wonderful to see you, Tish.

SCHIEFFER: Professor, let me ask you. You were at the memorial service. Give us some sense of what that was like?

SCHLESINGER: It was a beautiful service, deeply moving service. Senator Kennedy gave a eulogy which was widely reprinted and it was superbly done. SCHLESINGER: Hamilton South (ph), who spoke for Carolyn Bassette Kennedy, did a fine job. A number of people read excerpts from the -- Caroline read that marvelous closing speech from "The Tempest," one of John Kennedy's favorites.

And I want to say that John and Caroline Kennedy, his sister, were extremely close. It was a great tribute to Jacqueline Kennedy, the fact that she brought these kids up, a single mother, and brought them up with such distinction of manner. I mean they are perfect models for the constructions and hopes that Tish Baldrige has expressed about the future of American manners.

John Kennedy had a great sense of equality. He was equally, uniformly kind to everyone, decent, friendly, unaffected, unspoiled; Caroline the same. They are a perfect product of distinguished American manners.

BORGER: Mr. Schlesinger, you have seen Senator Kennedy give eulogies before. He's become the family's official eulogizer, if you will. How does he get through it?

SCHLESINGER: Well he does -- at times he almost doesn't get through it. There are two or three times in this last eulogy in which his voice broke and for a moment he had to stop and pull himself together.

He's a patriarch -- he's the head of the family. He's developed a kind of patriarchal style. He's taken on himself -- he's become the surrogate father for so many nieces and nephews as well as father of his own children. He's a remarkable man and each time he rises to the

occasion.

BALDRIGE: There's a great sadness in his face, but he has risen to the occasion. He has become such a marvelous spokesperson for the family, for the history of the family and for dealing with the emotions.

You know, the Catholic mass itself is so beautiful at the funeral. The liturgy of the mass was so beautiful. I wasn't there, but I know the liturgy. That's my church and it was all so well done. It was so appropriately done, everything. Caroline and the senator did the right planning and orchestration.

SCHIEFFER: You know, Professor Schlesinger touched on this just a while ago, and I think this did have something to do with this tremendous outpouring that we saw. And that is, you also touched on it, and that is the good manners of this young man.

So many time our heroes in this modern communication age turn out to be such creeps and so selfish. And yet this young man, it seemed to me, had this dignity and this ability to be so comfortable with his celebrity that I think that transcended and people understood that.

BALDRIGE: He wrote thank you notes as a little boy, his mother guided his hand. His mother signed his name with him on his first thank you notes that she wrote. But then he learned to write his own thank you notes and people cherished the ones they have gotten from him as an adult, because he used to write them all the time. He treated the press with kindness. He didn't push them out of the way and yell obscenities at them. He was just a man of grace.

SCHIEFFER: And Professor finally, what should we expect from the Kennedys? Or where do you see this family and its legacy now as we move on to other things?

SCHLESINGER: Well, John, Jr., lived a secret life of good works. He did generous things by stealth, lest people think he was doing it for publicity. I think that instinct for public service, that instinct for helping others is alive among his cousins and their children. And I think the tradition of public service will continue to illuminate and strengthen American life.

SCHIEFFER: Quick. Final thought, Ms. Baldrige?

BALDRIGE: Well said. We need more families to pass that down through the generations, and talk about it and encourage their to volunteer and help their communities. We need that.

SCHIEFFER: Thanks so much to both of you. When we come back, we're going to talk about the upcoming battle over tax cuts. In a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: We're back now with someone we'll be hearing a lot from in the coming days, the Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici and Democratic Senator John Breaux.

Senator Domenici, the House, as everyone knows, passed this enormous tax cut last week and as everyone knows, it has absolutely no chance of being signed into law. The president has already said he would veto anything even close to that. You're about to propose a cut structured in a somewhat different way but almost of the same size. Why go through the exercise when you know you're not going to get this done unless you come to an agreement with the White House on some sort of compromise?

DOMENICI: Well, I think it's very simple. The question is, who spends the surplus? And the president has taken on an almost reckless approach to the facts, talking about the proposal of the Republicans when, as a matter of fact, it is very realistic.

I would like to do it this way. Here's the surplus. And we take two-quarters of it and we put that on Social Security and debt service. Here's one-quarter of it. We put that on expenditures of a high-priority item, and one-quarter for tax cuts. Now, if that's irresponsible and risky, then I really don't understand the word.

SCHIEFFER: Well, if you do -- but you have to assume that the surplus is going to be as large as these projections say it's going to be, and some people would come back to you and say, look, for this surplus to be this large, you have to have a 20 percent reduction in programs, you have to have -- that it's just totally unrealistic that it could be that size.

DOMENICI: See, that isn't true. That isn't true. The truth of the matter -- let me just show you one little simple one here.

SCHIEFFER: Boy, you come with a lot of props today.

DOMENICI: Look at this one, look at this one. This is the Republican plan. This amount, Social Security, debt service. More debt service than the president. You'll hear the secretary say it's not so, but that's what the Congressional Budget Office says.

This green is tax cuts, and guess what's left over? \$432 billion for those programs you're talking about, including Medicare and high-priority items like education. The whole issue is, who spends the surplus?

SCHIEFFER: Senator, just let me interrupt with one thing. In order for this surplus to be as large as it is, do you concede that the economy would have to keep booming at the rate it is booming right now for 10 years? You're saying that's a realistic outlook?

DOMENICI: Let me make sure everybody understands what I think the issue is on a booming economy.

SCHIEFFER: But that's right, is it not?

DOMENICI: The economists...

SCHIEFFER: To accept that figure, you have to continue to assume it will boom at the current rate for 10 years. Right?

DOMENICI: The OMB and CBO economists have put these projections together, and for the most part they agree. They are very modest growth assessments in it, very modest, and they even plan two recessions in that period of time and the surpluses are this size.

SCHIEFFER: OK.

DOMENICI: Frankly, if we don't do something like this, I think the American people can justifiably say, 'who is going to spend the surplus?'

SCHIEFFER: Let's go to Senator Breaux.

BORGER: Let's go to Senator Breaux. Senator Domenici said that the White House is reckless in its accusations. Yesterday, the president said the Republicans were reckless, using that same word. You voted for this Republican tax cut in committee, but you are going to propose one that is substantially smaller, from \$800 billion to \$500 billion. Why are you doing that?

BREAUX: Gloria, if we don't get together, we're headed for a major train wreck, which I think would be terrible for the American people. Here we have a trillion dollar surplus and the two political parties in Washington can't figure out what to do with it.

Only in Washington could you have that type of problem. We've got to quit talking just to ourselves and start talking to each other. It's clear that their proposal is going to be vetoed, and we'll end up with nothing. The American people don't want us to do nothing, but they would like us to do something that's reasonable. And I suggest about a \$500 billion tax cut over 10 years. That would give us enough money to address Medicare and prescription drugs and also give us enough money for discretionary spending.

SCHIEFFER: So you're talking about some kind of grand compromise.

BREAUX: Gloria, I think what ought to do -- we have an opportunity that's probably once in a political lifetime to do something worthwhile, and I would suggest that after this Republican bill passes the Senate, and it will next week, that we do not go to conference with the House; we hold back. We take the recess to cool off...

SCHIEFFER: So you don't have a veto -- no presidential veto.

BREAUX: We don't have a veto, we don't have an agreement. You just take

the time off in August and take a breath of fresh air and listen to the people back home. Come back in September and let us do a real Medicare reform bill with prescription drugs and then I think you're going to force both sides, you'll have people saying, look, we want Medicare, we want a tax cut. We better get together.'

BORGER: One more quick question. Do you think the president would sign on to that? Have you spoken to the White House about it?

BREAUX: I have talked to them a number of times. You should never say never about what you're going to do in politics. I think there are openings that we can get a good agreement.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Domenici, that sounds like a fairly reasonable approach. Would you go for something like that, putting off coming together on this bill right now?

DOMENICI: Look, what I would say right here is I would have no trouble working with this senator, no problem. If his suggestion is as he has it, which is probably very constructive. But let me suggest it's not what Senator Breaux thinks, it's what the White House thinks. And as a matter of fact, they will cite today that Alan Greenspan is against this tax cut, all to poison the well against tax cuts.

BORGER: But he is. Alan Greenspan said this week that Congress should be more concerned about the federal debt than about a tax cut.

DOMENICI: Let me read an actual quote from him. ``Only if Congress believes that the surplus will be spent rather than saved is a tax cut wise.'

It is going to be spent. That's why we must cut taxes. I already showed you. The president is going to spend every nickel of it. So, Alan Greenspan would agree with us, if as a matter of fact the president were to prevail in what he wants to do with it.

SCHIEFFER: But Senator Breaux, Alan Greenspan and the Federal Reserve have just raised interest rates slightly, obviously because they fear we're about to trigger inflation. If you put in this massive tax cut, won't that just cause inflation to kick in and won't the Federal Reserve then have to raise interest rates again, and the net result is it...

BREAUX: Yes. I think that \$792 billion is irresponsible. It's like a family that owes \$100,000 and all of a sudden Uncle Bob dies and leaves them \$25,000. And instead of paying down their debt they spend it all on a Hawaiian vacation. They ought to take care of paying off their debt and also take care of their medical expenses first.

DOMENICI: Let me say, the first five years there's hardly a tax cut. So this gigantic tax cut, that even you are using the word ``big, outrageous,' it doesn't start in real until the sixth year. So it's a very little bit each year. As a matter I believe, if thoroughly understood, it is excellent economics to go very slow and have the tax cut increase. And that's what this plan does.

BREAUX: I'm sure how slow they went -- in March the surplus was projected to be \$796 billion, they're using \$792 billion of it for a tax cut without looking at the other items. I think that's not right.

SCHIEFFER: Gentlemen, thanks to both of you, I'm sorry we have to end here, but we just do.

When we come back we're going to get the White House view from the Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers. In a second.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: And we're joined now by Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers. Thank you, sir, for coming. You heard what John Breaux said. He said the plan that the Republicans has has no chance of getting past the president's veto.

On the other hand, he says he doesn't think that the Republicans will approve anything like what the president wants, so why not put all this off until September? The Senate's going to pass the Republican plan apparently. Let everybody kind of think about it during the month of

August. Come back in September and combine it with some sort of compromise on Medicare. I'm sure he's talking about things like prescription drugs, and then deal with this. What would the White House response to that be?

SUMMERS: Look, I think what's important is not the timing. What's important is that we find an approach that puts first things first: strengthens Medicare, provides for prescription drugs, strengthens the Social Security system, assures base government can keep functioning, everything from national parks to the Secret Service, and gives the right kind of tax cut for Americans.

SCHIEFFER: Well, if I can interrupt -- if I could interrupt, that sounds like to me you're saying the president would rather have a veto that he could take into the election year than to try to actually work out something with the Republicans.

SUMMERS: The president will veto that \$800 billion bill. The president will veto a \$500 billion tax cut because it doesn't leave room for what's necessary for paying down debt, doing what's gotten us here. Why do we have such a strong economy?

SCHIEFFER: But that doesn't answer the question. What I said was it sounds like the president would rather veto the bill than have some sort of legislation.

SUMMERS: The president's issue is where we end up, not how we get there. And where the president wants to end up is with an approach that puts first things first. Keeps us paying down debt, because that's how we've made this economy so strong. Keeps us strengthening Medicare and Social Security. If we can do those things, if we can do those things, we have a chance to keep this expansion going. But this is not the time to take what Chairman Greenspan, what six Nobel prize-winning economists have said would be a very risky course with a massive tax cut. We're not going to let it happen.

BORGER: So, you just said, if I heard you correctly, that the president would also veto a \$500 billion tax cut, which is what Senator Breaux, a Democrat, is talking about as some kind of compromise that might include prescription drug benefits, et cetera. So you're saying that's a no-go from the White House point of view?

SUMMERS: That is a no-go, and I'll tell you why, Gloria. You have to make choices. With that trillion dollar surplus, after you have taken out interest, you have about \$800 billion left. If you have a \$500 billion tax cut and you fund defense, you don't have enough to extend the solvency of Medicare; you don't have enough to keep core government going.

It's a choice. There are some who would rather see us take steps like raising the retirement age for Medicare or raising premiums on Medicare beneficiaries. There are others like the president who believe we should put aside the money, make reforms in Medicare, and that that should be our first priority before we get into all this discussion of tax cutting. We can have a tax cut but let's put first things first.

BORGER: Why did the president propose a tax cut at all then? If you're listening to Alan Greenspan, who says maybe we shouldn't have a tax cut, why did the president feel the need to propose his own \$250 billion tax cut?

SUMMERS: Because the president has looked hard at the numbers, and we can extend Medicare out all the way to 2027. We can keep base government going. We can add prescription drugs. We can fund education and the environment. And then we've got room...

BORGER: But he didn't feel some political need here?

SUMMERS: And then we have room, room for the right kind of tax cut that helps people save. That's what the president proposed, not some other kind of tax cut. And I think if we take that approach -- the president's approach has been very clear for two years now. The challenge of our time with these surpluses is to pay down debt and to get Social Security and Medicare where they need to be in the next generation. And then have a tax

cut. It's putting the cart before the horse to start negotiating what size of tax cut we have until we have established our right priorities. Only the president's proposal in this debate provides for eliminating the national debt by 2013.

SCHIEFFER: So is what you're saying here, my way or no way? And that's what has marked so much debate in Washington this year. It sounds like the White House says, we're going to have this position and we won't talk to anybody about anything else.

SUMMERS: There's a lot to talk about. There's a lot to talk about how we to cut taxes. There's a lot to talk about in Medicare and Social Security. But what the president feels is an absolute principle is Medicare, Social Security, protecting base government first and then let's have the right size tax cut for working families.

SCHIEFFER: All right. At that point we'll leave it. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

I'll be back in just a moment to tell you what I think about all this in just a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, if you want a souvenir of this Congress, I suggest saving the front pages of Friday's New York Times and Washington Post. Both headline the good news for taxpayers, the huge tax cut passed by the House of Representatives.

The bad news is down in the smaller type. Paragraph three of the Post story explains the bill has no chance of being enacted. Paragraph nine in the Times story reports the same thing. To me those sentences sum up this Congress and Washington. Whether it was passing legislation to post the ten commandments in schools or holding its annual debate on banning desecration of the flag, this Congress has specialized on issues that have made headlines but have had no chance of being written into law.

Two weeks ago it was Senate Democrats forcing a vote on an unrealistic HMO reform bill that had no chance of passage because they wanted to get Republicans on record against HMO reform. Then last week it was House Republicans ramming through a tax bill so laden with goodies and given so little chance of passage that it embarrassed even a lot of Republicans.

In both cases neither side showed even the mildest interest in compromise because they have come to believe voters give them no credit and, more importantly, no campaign contributions, for bipartisan achievement. John Kennedy once wrote a book about political leadership called "Profiles in Courage." Nothing in it should be confused with this Congress, which is compiling a long list of profiles in politics.

That's our broadcast. Thanks for watching. We'll see you next week here on FACE THE NATION.

END

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JUL-1999 20:40:03.00

SUBJECT: NBC Meet The Press, July 25, 1999

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 (Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet [UNKNOW
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/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: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/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: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/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: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
NBC MEET THE PRESS
Aired on JULY 25, 1999

SPEAKERS: TIM RUSSERT, HOST, NBC MEET THE PRESS
ALFONSE D'AMATO, FORMER SENATOR, GEORGE MAGAZINE
CONTRIBUTOR
DORIS KEARNS GOODWIN, PRESIDENTIAL HISTORIAN
RICHARD GOODWIN, FORMER SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO
PRESIDENT KENNEDY
PETE HAMILL, THE NEW YORKER
MARY MCGRORY, THE WASHINGTON POST
HARRISON ``LEE'' RAINIE, AUTHOR, ``GROWING UP KENNEDY''
JESSE VENTURA, MINNESOTA GOVERNOR

RUSSERT: But first, all week long, Americans riveted to the news. First the search, hopeful for rescue, then sadly the recovery of the bodies and the burial at sea, all the while reliving the scenes of Kennedy's Camelot from more than 35 years ago.

Doris Kearns Goodwin, what did our nation go through this past week?

KEARNS GOODWIN: Well, in a certain sense, what we saw was this strange mingling of a private family grief with a public outpouring of emotion, and I've thought about it a lot since then. To some extent, it must be a solace to the Kennedy family to see all of the flowers, all of the attention that was paid. When anybody dies in a family, the hardest thing you know is somehow to walk around the next few days on the street and realize everyone else is happy. They don't know what happened to me as I remember feeling when my own mother died as a teenager.

Well, the Kennedy family knows -- everyone knows what happened to them. But it's still fundamentally different what happened to them, than what happened to the nation. The national grieving can't really be a grieving in a sense, because they didn't know John Kennedy. To the older generation, I think it was a remembrance of all the memories of John and Bobby, who they did live with at a certain time.

To that younger generation, the irony is that in a certain sense this temporary community created by the saturation of the media during this last week, provided them with live images of Jack and of Bobby and of Camelot, and it may have created a sense for them through the footage that these people had come back; that history had come alive, meaning that the Kennedy story may go on into the 21st century in a strange way because of what we've been through through this last week. Even more than it might have otherwise.

RUSSERT: Mary McGrory, you covered the Kennedy years and have written beautifully about the death of John F. Kennedy, Jr. I remember as a little boy watching you talk to Daniel Patrick Moynihan way back in 1963 when he turned to you and said, Mary, what's the use of being Irish -- you don't know the world is going to break your heart eventually?

All this week, the fatalism of being Irish, the optimism of being Christian, those cross currents we witnessed. What's your sense of what we

went through this last week?

MCGRORY: Well, I think mainly that John Kennedy had a double identity for the country. He was the son and the namesake of John Kennedy, our most glamorous president, a relic of Camelot, an era that lives on in our memory. So that there was this sort of public grief that -- the unspoken, unstated, unrealized promise that he might take his father's place in politics one day. So that's why he was sort of doted on.

But he was loved by the people who knew him because he had a sweet nature and a kind heart, and he had the Kennedy vim and vigor and he married a beautiful blonde woman, and they were living happily ever after, so there was just that feeling that the Kennedy's were the luckiest and the unluckiest people any of us ever knew and on a different -- a different level of living.

RUSSERT: Richard Goodwin, you were part of the new frontier. You helped write a speech for John F. Kennedy way back in January of 1961. He had been elected but not sworn in, called ``City on a Hill.'' Let me play that speech for you and for our viewers and get your reaction.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JOHN F. KENNEDY: For those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date, the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us, recording whether in our brief span of service, we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state. Our success or failure in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions. First, were we truly men of courage? Secondly, were we truly men of judgment? Third, were we truly men of integrity? Finally, were we truly men of dedication?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Courage, judgment, integrity, dedication, politics seemed so much more uplifting, inspiring back then. Is that fair?

GOODWIN: I think that is fair. I think that one of the things I hoped come out of this week, is not only the grief, but the reminder that -- the kind of people who used to dominate our political life.

I mean, Kennedy meant those things, and I think he probably lived up to them, although opening statement to those to whom much is given, much is required. A lot has been required of the Kennedy's along the way. But I do think that it's maybe useful reminder to all those people you have around here who don't remember Kennedy and the assassination, that period; that politics did have another dimension to it. Of course, it was gritty and cruel and tough as it always has been. But there was an element of -- people were in this because they really wanted to do something for the country, and the constituency felt that way, too. So, I think it's fair to say that there was that standard.

RUSSERT: Senator Alfonse D'Amato, you are a conservative Republican. But you became a contributing writer for George magazine, got to know John F. Kennedy, Jr. Your thoughts on this week?

D'AMATO: I think Mary touched on a lot of the things. He brought a grace, a charm, a humility that was just staggering. Here is this son who carried the mantel of his daddy. There's no doubt about it, and he had his looks, and he had that -- the Kennedy enthusiasm. And yet, when the cameras went off, you couldn't meet a nicer person, down to earth, caring.

He had my mom enthralled after one luncheon with her, Tim, and I wrote a note and just told him how appreciative -- but that was with everyone. With all of his staffers and you know, again, the measure of a person and his goodness is not just the celebrity status and the quick sound bite that they make for the camera, is how are they when the cameras aren't there? And JFK, Jr. was a special person.

I tell you, I believe he would have carried that mantel of political leadership whether it's for the Senate or eventually the presidency, because he did have it. He was guarded, no doubt, because there were many who would have taken advantage, but this was one special person.

RUSSET: Pete Hamill, you knew Jacqueline Kennedy well, knew John Kennedy Jr. as a little boy. There's always has been a highly respected zone of privacy that Jackie cast around her children. Talk about that, talk about your memories and reflect on this week.

HAMILL: Well, I think she knew from the beginning that the most difficult thing of all was to be able to be this kind of freak in a way, someone looked at for something that is not even done, which is what a lot of that kind of celebrity is about. And having a normal life and having a normal life with those kids was, I think, the driving force in her life after the presidency.

I think you look at those kids, both of them, and they're no longer kids, and John is no longer here, but what they became is an amazing tribute to her, which is what everybody said this week. I think what's extraordinary about this week was that I could not hear a single person say anything at all bad about John Kennedy. There was none, nothing to be said that way. He was emblematic, in a way, of the kind of kid that I think every man and woman in America wished had had as a son. He was the son of the Jack Kennedy generation.

And in that sense, he's emblematic of his own generation detached from politics, skeptical, ironical about politics, but engaged in the world at the same time. And that generation is now suffered its first wound. It had no war. It had no riots. It had no tumult. Now, it has suffered the first wound and the first unacceptable loss and we're going to see what it does to that generation pretty quickly.

RUSSET: There has been discussion that Caroline Kennedy, John, Jr.'s sister, would now emerge publicly to carry the torch. You think otherwise, don't you?

HAMILL: I think she's a very private person. We saw that in the last couple days of the week. I think she'll be very much like her mother, which is to emerge when an issue is of interest to her the way her mother did. But she's, I don't think, going to hire a press agent and try to become famous. She was that the morning she was born.

RUSSET: Lee Rainie, you wrote a book, ``Growing up Kennedy,`` what was it like growing up John Kennedy Jr., and was he as much a Bouvier, part of Jacqueline's family, as much as a Kennedy?

RAINIE: I think that's exactly right. He was a Bouvier. He was shaped as much by the forces of that side of the family, as he was by the Kennedy family. This generation, the grandchildren of Joseph and Rose Kennedy, have a special sort of civilization that they've created, partly shaped by the family, its sense of tough competition and fierce loyalty, but also very much shaped by the tragedies that have befallen the family.

When John Kennedy was assassinated, inside this generation, the kids understood it as a uniquely horrible event. It was terrible that it happened to Uncle Jack, but it was at least explainable. When Robert Kennedy was assassinated, it took on a whole new dimension for them. They were scared for their surviving parents' lives. They were scared for their own safety. It was a deeply traumatizing thing that almost suggested different forces were at work in their life. And it took them long time to work through that.

RAINIE: I think Senator Kennedy's presidential campaign in 1980 when they all campaigned for him because of their deep love for him and then in 1983 when they talked him out of running for president in the 1984 cycle. It was an enormous moment of definition for this generation, because they said, we need our own space. We can't go through the same thing we went through in 1980. We need to grow up in our own special way and one of the things that they've done with the space that he gave them by not running, is broaden the definition of public service that exists in that family.

They are much more interested in media culture than their parents were before them, and their volunteer work is really staggering in its scope and its dimension and its intensity.

RUSSERT: On Friday, Senator Ted Kennedy gave a eulogy. Let me put some words on the screen, share them with our panel and with our viewers.

``He had a legacy and he learned to treasure it. He was part of a legend and he learned to live with it. He had amazing grace. He accepted who he was, but he cared more about what he could and should become.''

Remnants of Camelot in that phraseology Doris Kearns Goodwin, but also a recognition of the individuality even distance that John Kennedy Jr. took from some of the other Kennedy family members.

KEARNS GOODWIN: Now, it seems to me the most telling story, and it's one that Dick told me, so I always use his stories that, in fact, Jackie told him when John was a little boy and he was skiing and he fell and he started to cry and Bobby came over to him and said, Kennedy's don't cry, but he looked up at him with those eyes and he said, ``this Kennedy cries.''

Now, think of what that means -- that means that I'm a Kennedy, yes, I'm part of the tradition, I'm part of this myth, I'm part of the legacy, but I'm something different. And Jackie told the story, as I understand it, with pride that she wanted to have him feel distinctive. That meant she was going to keep him apart from those cousins sometimes, so they could have their own space to grow up in, but she also wanted him to be proud of being a Kennedy. And I think we saw both those sides were still in him, his own person and he was a Kennedy.

RUSSERT: Mary McGrory The New York Times writes today, ``We've been connected by these deaths. We share our public passions by electronic proxy.''

David Broder writes a column today that, fame and death have been exploited and the coverage has been excessive. What do you make of that?

MCGRORY: Oh, as usual, I'm ambivalent. I think that the coverage at times was excessive. I think by that I mean repetitive. I heard the same things said over and over again. I saw the same images over and over again. And there is a tendency on the part of all of us, not just television commentators -- we keep on talking even when we don't have something to say, which is unfortunate. So there was that element of it.

But also there was a huge public hunger, there is no question about it. And my friend, David Burke said, seeing those shrines and the flowers and the Teddy bears and all that, he said, you realize how many lonely people there are in the country. They want to be connected to somebody, and they want a family. They don't have a family of their own, but the Kennedy's will serve.

So, I don't know. I think it's six of one and half dozen of the other, like so many other things in life.

RUSSERT: Let me show you all again some words from Senator Kennedy's eulogy. This was about politics and popular culture.

``John Kennedy, Jr. though politics should be an integral part of our popular culture. And that popular culture should be an integral part of politics.''

Pete Hamill, that was the vision in many ways of George magazine. Some people were confused by it, didn't quite understand it, but John F. Kennedy Jr. was insistent that there was this intertwining of popular culture and politics, and believed one of the ways to bring in young people into the political arena was by appealing to their instinct and like of popular culture.

HAMILL: I think he was absolutely right, by the way. As the son of a politician who looked like a movie star, and someone who was young when a movie star managed to look like a politician and become president of the United States, too, I think that nexus of popular culture and politics was absolutely the reality of the United States in the last decade of the 20th century. And I think he was very smart to have gone right into that and tried to emphasize it in that magazine.

RUSSERT: Alfonse D'Amato, I have heard many people from George magazine

say to me that John F. Kennedy Jr. treated the George magazine staff as his family, extremely close to people, hands-on editor. What's your impression?

D'AMATO: Absolutely. He was special in that he really gave value to every person, every staffer. He was interested in their work. And, yet, he was not dictatorial. He let it flow. And, indeed, he was building something very special with George. Culture in politics is not just about whether or not we should have a 10 percent tax cut, or whether or not we're spending enough on military defense.

D'AMATO: But indeed, it was those thing that embody life itself and let it flow and so -- and he had great fun with his staff. I want to tell you, he enjoyed them. And they were his family, and as such, they had a dedication to him, to this young man, that was something wonderful to behold, just marvelous.

A true star in every sense and as you said, someone -- Pete said, you'd be proud to have a son like this. You hope -- you didn't know anybody like this. It just really was amazing. I knew him only for a short period of time in the last five months, and to know John and work with him just for a short time, you had to come away with a feeling, this is one special person. And he was, indeed.

RUSSET: Lee Rainie, in your book, "Growing Up Kennedy" you talk about the difficulties, the challenges, the opportunities and the advantages of growing up as a Kennedy.

The next generation, Patrick, the Congressman, now one of the ranking members in the House leadership. Kathleen Townsend, lieutenant governor of Maryland, perhaps the next governor. Joe Kennedy, looking at governor of Massachusetts. The Shriver, a force in Maryland politics. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. looking seriously at New York politics. What do you see for the next generation of Kennedys?

RAINIE: I think there will be several avenues that they will choose to exercise what they all think is the family mission of public service. Clearly elective politics is part of it. All of the people that you have mentioned that are thinking about office or thinking about stepping up to the next office. They've interestingly reflected the realities of our age.

Many of them are more new Democrats than classic Democrats, but I also think that many of them now define public service as working in the media culture. Maria Shriver, of course, on this network is a major news personality, but a lot of them have written books, as Caroline has. A lot of them contributed articles. John himself was working out his own politics in the publication of that magazine, which was very much a reflection of his personality and interests.

And then third, fourth I think that you have to mention in this is that they will stay involved in these charitable works. Eunice Shriver and the influence that she had on them is enormous. They will be involved with disabilities issues and other issues related to helping the poor and others, I think, throughout their lives and they're teaching their kids that, too.

RUSSET: After John F. Kennedy, there was Robert F. Kennedy, Dick Goodwin. You helped write a speech for him in Cape Town, South Africa just two years before he died. Let's play a piece of that for you and for our viewers.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KENNEDY: There is a Chinese curse which says "may he live in interesting times." Like it or not, we live in interesting times. They are times of danger and uncertainty, but they are also the most creative of any time in the history of mankind. And everyone here will ultimately be judged -- will ultimately judge himself, on the effort he has contributed to building a new world society, and the extent to which his ideals and goals have shaped that effort.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Dick Goodwin, when you were involved with the Kennedys way back then, did you have any idea that they would be such a dominant force in American politics for nearly a half century?

RAINIE: No, I don't think you could have foreseen that. Although when we worked for John Kennedy, we did feel that he and those of us who were lucky enough to be associated with him were going to be a dominant force in world history for at least the next eight years. But of course that wasn't to be, although I did go on to work with Lyndon Johnson, who also had quite an impact on the country. But, no, I don't think that.

I think, you know, I was once talking to Bobby, and I was trying to console him. He was worried that his brothers would be forgotten forever. Jackie used to be worry about that, too, he'd be forgotten. First of all, Johnson was so dominating and they would forget about Jack Kennedy.

And I tried to reassure him. I said, you know, I said, William -- Julius Caesar was emperor of Rome for only three years. He just looked at me. He wasn't going to take any of that guff. He says, yes, he says, it helps to have Shakespeare to write about you.

(LAUGHTER)

Which is also true. Imagine if we had films of Julius Caesar's assassination to watch on television, now, I mean, he'd be a major figure in our lives.

So I think instead of Shakespeare, which we can't seem to produce in this country, we have got those films and videos and visuals that are going to last forever, I suppose. And they keep bringing back the memory.

You've used the word Camelot. Now, 10 years ago, the word -- it would have been kind of a joke. People regarded the word Camelot as a effort of self-promotion by the Kennedy family. Now it's entered into the vocabulary so you can use it without smiling or trying to explain it away.

RUSSERT: Doris Kearns Goodwin, all this week, as Mary McGrory mentioned, Americans watched this, and yearned for it in many ways. But a whole new generation has now been exposed to -- has seen something they were unaware of. The idea of John Kennedy and Robert Kennedy and assassinations and idealism and the good and bad of the Kennedy family. What does that mean for our democracy, and will it motivate and inspire a whole new generation of people into public service, public life?

KEARNS GOODWIN: Yes, I think that whole new generation, including my own children, who weren't alive when John and Bobby were still alive, have seen what the Kennedys have meant to history. So, I think it brings back that sense of continuity over history's lifetime that the family has provided.

I think it's also shown the enduring role that faith plays. When you watch the way the Kennedys withstood all of this and everybody kept talking about the only reason they could do that was faith, it reminded me of that saying that Rose once said.

She said, "if God were to take away all my other gifts, health, education, intelligence, wealth and just leave me one gift, the gift of faith, I could then endure because I could withstand the loss of all the others."

Now, I remember, when she was 90 years old she once said to me, she was certain if her kids could come back, her dead children, Joe, Jr., Kathleen, Jack and Bobby, they would still choose to be who they had been because they had led lives of such adventure and excitement and great fortune. And that gave her great solace. It meant that the space they occupied was so big, it wholly didn't matter if the length of years were short. I think kids have seen that, too and that's a very remarkably positive thing.

RUSSERT: Senator Kennedy touched upon that very theme in that eulogy, and let me put that up on the screen as well. Talking about John Kennedy, Jr.

he said, ``We dared to think,' in that other Irish phrase, that ``this John Kennedy would live to comb gray hair with his beloved Carolyn by his side. But like his father, he had every gift but the length of years.''

Mary McGrory.

MCGRORY: Yes. Maybe it's time now to quote Shelley. ``He is a portion of the loveliness which once he made more lovely.''

RUSSET: Pete Hamill?

HAMILL: Well, I think we should remember him alive, not look for him as a figure of death, but of a vitality and youth and sense that the world is a great and glorious place to be living in. That's what we should remember.

RUSSET: Lee Rainie, final thought?

RAINIE: I think the martyrdom of their fathers and their uncles defined who this family is for many Americans. It was interesting to see how John Kennedy was refining that and moving forward from that, and I think Pete Hamill is exactly right. The family will want him remembered as a life force.

RUSSET: Doris Kearns Goodwin, final thought?

KEARNS GOODWIN: Well, I think that what we've seen this last week is the chance for history to become part of the present and part of the future. And for those of us who are historians that are always trying to make history to come life again, it's almost as if you promise to continue to tell and to retell the stories of people long gone by, they will be embedded in the next generation. And I think that's a good thought to leave with.

RUSSET: Doris Kearns Goodwin, Dick Goodwin, Lee Rainie, Mary McGrory, Pete Hamill, Alfonse D'Amato, thank you all.

Coming next, Minnesota's Governor, Jesse Ventura, his views on Ross Perot and the National Reform Party.

Then, this week, for the first time, the three Apollo 11 astronauts talk about the potential of disaster on their mission to the Moon 30 years ago.

All coming up right here, on MEET THE PRESS.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RUSSET: Yesterday I asked Governor Jesse Ventura of Minnesota for his thoughts about this intense and tragic week.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

VENTURA: Well, I think in some ways there was some overexploitation, Tim, of the media. I know that they -- you know, it was an important event, but I think, you know, if I put myself in the position of the Kennedy family, I think that it was a bit of overexploitation in a private moment like this. Because I'm sure they're, you know, they're feeling grief and suffering beyond belief because John Kennedy, Jr. was just stepping into the prime of his life and to have it snuffed out and tragically taken away this way is a very, very sad, sad case for a family that certainly has been stricken with a lot of sadness through the years.

RUSSET: Let me turn to the Reform Party convention this weekend. You have said the Reform Party is at a crossroads. What do you mean by that?

VENTURA: Well, certainly we're at a crossroads, because it's a crossroads of growing. And I feel very strongly that -- I respect Ross Perot. I think what he has accomplished has been remarkable in many ways and in establishing and creating the Reform Party and the third party movement.

But as all leaders, just as we see presidents go and we see leadership always change hands, it is time now for Mr. Perot, I think, to take a supportive role on the sidelines. Certainly, we still need him, but it's time for him to step aside and let the party expand and grow and let it become truly a third alternative for people in the United States of America at all election levels.

RUSSET: Have you had a chance to speak to Mr. Perot directly about

this?

VENTURA: No, I have not. I'm busy running the state of Minnesota on a day-to-day basis and personally don't want to get that involved right now in national politics. I guess I'm kind of forced into the situation because I am the highest elected official in the Reform Party, so it kind of pushes you to the forefront, whether you like it or not.

But I have a full-time job, Tim, running the state of Minnesota. Believe me, it's a full plate on a daily basis for me. That's why you elect party leadership, both at the state level as well as the national level. That's their job to build the party. We've just elected a new party leader here in Minnesota, Rick McLuin (ph) and I think he's going to do an outstanding job. He's aggressive. He's got great new ideas. And that's Rick's job to do it at the state level. And they'll elect a new party leader at the national level on Sunday.

RUSSET: You're supporting a man named Jack Gargan for national chairman of the Reform Party. If Jack Gargan does not win, will you leave the Reform party?

VENTURA: No, not at all. It's good to have choices. That's why the Reform party is here, Tim. We want a third choice other than Democrats and Republicans. No, I just want to ensure that it's an open process, that everyone is given a fair chance to assume that leadership. And if the vote goes against me and goes for someone else, so be it. That's democracy. No, I will not leave the Reform party if Jack Gargan is not chosen, but I think Jack will make an outstanding leader. That's why I stepped forward and supported him in the process.

RUSSET: If Ross Perot is not the candidate of the Reform Party for president in 2000, who would be? Let me go through some names: Donald Trump?

VENTURA: Well, I haven't seen him at any conventions. I think it would be nice if Donald would show up. You know, we would enjoy that for someone to show a little, you know, enthusiasm to want to be with the party. I don't think you just pick someone out. I think you have to have someone who wants to be part of the Reform Party.

RUSSET: Pat Buchanan?

VENTURA: I believe Mr. Buchanan puts social issues on the front burner, and we in the Reform Party do not put social issues on the front burner. We look more at straight government issues, finance reform, taxation, things of that nature, so I'm not sure if Pat would make a good fit for the Reform Party.

RUSSET: Former Connecticut Governor Lowell Weicker?

VENTURA: I think Lowell's a name. I've met with Lowell, and Lowell has shown some interest. Certainly he's a possibility out there to step forward for the Reform Party and I think he still wants to get his feet wet in politics, which is still very, very important.

RUSSET: And there is no way whatsoever Jesse Ventura, would run for president in 2000?

VENTURA: No way. Absolutely no way whatsoever. The only way I could become president, Tim, is if they vote me in, and then I ask the question, do you have to take the job if you win because I'm certainly not going to campaign for it. I made a promise to the State of Minnesota that I would serve as governor. I will fulfill my promises.

RUSSET: You know, in 1992, about two-thirds of the American voters said they were not satisfied with the Democratic and Republican nominees and wanted a third party candidate. As we approach 2000, less than a third of the people say they're not satisfied. Do you think that the energy and interest in the third party has diminished?

VENTURA: No, I don't think it has. I think -- in fact, I think it's increased. I think my election shows that, because I went against two very powerful Democrat and Republican candidates here in Minnesota. Two extremely popular big name candidates. You can't get any more big name

than the name Humphrey in Minnesota, and yet, I won the election.

And I think that it's more of a case of people are getting very disenchanted with the partisan party politics, bickering that goes on with these two parties. They're not doing the work of the people. They're doing what they do now, and that is battling for power and battling for supremacy between their two parties, and I frankly think the average American citizen is fed up and tired of it.

RUSSERT: If we know who the Democratic and Republican nominees are by March of the year 2000, and the election isn't until November, do you think a third party candidate could mount a campaign say, late in the year, September, October and rush or even steal the election?

VENTURA: Yes, I do. I think it's a good possibility because they're now starting their candidacies. I mean, we're going to be getting TV ads here in the next couple of weeks it looks like. They're starting to run two years ahead of time for the office, and I really believe by the time next July or August comes around, people are going to be tired of those two candidates. They're going to be sick of watching the whole Republican and Democratic rhetoric on television. And I think a powerful third party candidate could step in absolutely and win that election down the stretch, much the same as I did.

I mean, at the primary I was only polling 10 percent, and, yet, the general election took place six to seven weeks later. I went from 10 percent all the way to 37 percent.

RUSSERT: Here in Washington, governor, the House Republicans have decided the best way to deal with the surplus is by giving an \$800 billion tax cut over the next 10 years. Are you supportive of that size tax cut?

VENTURA: Well, I would have to really delve into their budget before I could speak on it because I'm not privy to the national budget as people elected to national positions are. But I certainly think that if they're developing that type of surplus, that maybe, yeah, you would go for a tax cut. You know, over ten years, that's not really that much when you stop and think about it. I mean 10 years takes us almost to the year 2010. I think maybe they ought to carve a little more out of it, if they can.

RUSSERT: On July 14th, you created quite a stir there in Minnesota when you announced that you were returning to the World Wrestling Federation as a referee in the Summer Slam coming in August. Let me show a little tape of that press conference and then ask you a question.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

VENTURA: I am more powerful than the World Wrestling Federation.

(APPLAUSE)

As long as you're in this state, you hold no power here. I --it's very simple. It's the Body rules. It's my rules or the highway.

(APPLAUSE)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Governor, you've worked hard to make the transition from Jesse ``the Body'' to Jesse ``the Mind'' to Jesse ``the Governor.'' Are you concerned when the American people see you with those sunglasses and feather boas around your neck and running around the wrestling ring, that they're not going to take you seriously as a governor or national political figure?

VENTURA: Not at all. I mean, I'm doing this on my own time. It's a Sunday night event. It's an event that was scheduled months ahead of time. It was sold out before I even got involved in it, Tim. But I'm not going to cease to have fun, and the opportunity arose and I'm going to have a great time. I'm going to step back in the ring. It's a bit nostalgic for me. I think I established myself as a governor, that's why the timing doesn't matter to me now. I mean we got through a legislative session here in Minnesota. It was extremely successful.

We showed tri-partisan politics can work and be successful, and you know what's interesting, the latest poll -- the polling was done right during this announcement with the World Wrestling Federation and my poll numbers are the highest of any governor in the history of the state. VENTURA: They're at 73 percent. So I don't think the people of Minnesota are worried about their governor going out and having some fun, going back to a profession that he used to work in for many, many years.

RUSSET: The Minneapolis Star Tribune, your local paper, had some things to say about this. Let me put it on the screen and read it for you and our viewers. ``The first commandment of public service is thou shalt not exploit elected office for personal gain. And when a washed up wrestler stands to profit because he has gained fame as a gadfly governor, he is exploiting his job. That's more than just unseemly. It's unethical. Ventura can make a spectacle of himself any day he chooses but he ought to give away every extra penny he makes in the process.'' Your response?

VENTURA: Well, my response is why don't they say the same thing to St. Paul Mayor Norm Coleman who has just taken a radio job for money? The amount of money, if, indeed -- and they don't even know what I'm being paid because Tim, my appearance fee, I'm donating it all to charity. My appearance fee is \$100,000 and I'm starting the Jesse Ventura Scholarship Fund at my old Roosevelt High School where I'll give out a \$5,000 scholarship every year to a student that maybe can't go to college. And then we're starting the Jade Foundation named in honor of my daughter Jade to help kids who have been the victims of violence and things of that nature.

I think -- and the term washed up -- now, I take offense to that when you consider that Hulk Hogan is the world champion right now in one of the leagues and he's only two years younger than I am. Rick Flair is still wrestling. He's three or four years older than I am and Vern Gonyon (ph), who is a legend of Minnesota wrestling, wrestled until he was 60 years of age.

Would they call Walter Cronkite washed up because he's no longer doing the news on the television? Or would they call their local columnist, Jim Klobitcher (ph), who's retired -- would the term washed up go in front of his name? That's what I took exception to, the term ``washed up.'' That's personal, and, you know, that bothers me.

But the point is, the people don't care. The people are enjoying it. I'm enjoy it, and, you know if The Star Tribune has a problem with it, that's their problem. They need to look at the picture, not the amount of money, but the precedents. You notice they don't say anything about the St. Paul Mayor taking a radio job for pay. I believe the only reason this radio station hired him is because he's the St. Paul mayor.

RUSSET: They say you may make a million dollars or more in royalties down the road. Would you give those to charity?

VENTURA: That's confidential. Whether I make a nickel down the road is my business. I may not be making anything down the road. All I'm telling you is my appearance fee is for \$100,000. Then there is in my contract, they are buying the rights to my trademark name and then my federal court case, which was deemed in court, if there's a video tape of it, I will get the royalties that the court saw fit to give me in the court case in federal court, and that's the extent of my contract.

RUSSET: Governor, Ricky Martin, the new star singer said the other day that you have changed politics forever, that presidents will sing and singers may run for president. Do you think that there is now I mixing of pop culture and politics and it will be changed forever?

VENTURA: I don't know about that. I met Ricky at the Tonight Show. He's a very talented young man. And why he would want to get into politics, I don't know. He's doing well being just a singer. If he has aspirations to do so, I'm certain he may carry the strong female vote very powerfully, but...

(LAUGHTER)

.... but I'm flattered that he would say that, that I've changed politics forever. And if I have, well, so be it. We live in a changing world, Tim that changes all the time. So if I'm a part of that, well, and he wants to give me credit for it, I'm flattered over that fact.

RUSSERT: Governor Jesse Ventura, we'll see you August 22nd in the ring as the referee and we'll see you back here on MEET THE PRESS, I'm sure.

VENTURA: You know, Tim, if I'm successful, maybe I'll challenge you Tim ``The Body''...

(LAUGHTER)

.... to come in the ring with me.

RUSSERT: That's all I need.

All right. See you.

VENTURA: Thanks, Tim.

RUSSERT: That's an American original.

Coming next -- our MEET THE PRESS Minute with Apollo 8 Commander Frank Borman. And the Apollo 11 astronauts share their memories of the mission to the moon 30 years ago and their belief in life beyond earth.

Then, a final remembrance of John F. Kennedy, Jr., his wife and sister-in-law. Coming up right here on MEET THE PRESS.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RUSSERT: We're back. Thirty years ago the world watched in awe.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

ARMSTRONG: It's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

(END AUDIO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin became the first humans to walk on the moon.

(AUDIO CLIP)

ARMSTRONG (?): You can see the stars and stripes on the...

(END AUDIO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Days before the launch of Apollo 11, the commander of the Apollo 8 mission, Frank Borman, appeared on MEET THE PRESS to provide some insight to the mission at hand.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

UNKNOWN: Despite the extraordinary success of Apollo 8, 9 and 10, which prepared the way for a moon landing, many Americans are deeply worried that Apollo 11 might fail. Why are you so sure that it won't?

BORMAN: Well, everything that is humanly possible has been done for Apollo 11. The technicians, the engineers, the crew are at a razor-sharp edge. The important thing is, I think, that people should realize, the crew, all of us who fly these things, really believe that what we're doing is a value not only to the country but for all mankind. And as pioneers in the past, we're willing to accept a certain amount of risk. We firmly believe the risks are minimized but there are some.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: Frank Borman thought enough about those risks to place a phone call to Nixon aide William Safire and suggest the White House be prepared in case the mission ended tragically. The result -- Jim Mann (ph) of the LA Times recently discovered this memo from William Safire that outlined a speech and plan of action for President Nixon. Quote, ``in the event of moon disaster.''' The draft speech said in part, ``fate has ordained that the men who went to the moon to explore in peace will stay on the moon to rest in peace. These brave men, Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin, know that there is no hope for their recovery, but they also know there is hope for mankind in their sacrifice.''

And the final footnote on this chapter of history: on Tuesday, at a historic gathering of the Apollo 11 astronauts at the Newseum, I asked Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Michael Collins about the moon disaster speech never given.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSET: Does it give you pause?

ARMSTRONG (?): Well, certainly. We spent all our time preparing for the flight, trying to prepare ourselves to be able to handle any kind of emergency that might arise. But we were success-oriented.

ALDRIN (?): The success of landing successfully and the failure of having a disaster, one as a leader counts on his staff to be able to prepare him to cope with those situations.

COLLINS (?): So that's not at all surprising that someone would pick somebody as talented as William Safire to put those words together.

RUSSET: Michael Collins, you would have to be prepared in that situation to leave alone.

COLLINS: Yeah, sure, I didn't write any memos...

(LAUGHTER)

.... but I'd be very surprised if the White House had not written them, let me put it that way. Yes, of course, that was on all our minds I think to some extent. Clearly, I did not want to come home by myself. But if I had to, I would have.

RUSSET: One other historical footnote. The pilot of the Apollo 11 command module, Michael Collins, firmly believes there is life beyond earth.

COLLINS: You know, we're relatively sure there is no such thing as intelligent life on Mars. You have to go further out for that.

RUSSET: You think there is life out there?

COLLINS: Oh, absolutely.

RUSSET: You do? How far out?

COLLINS: I don't know, but I think what you do is you start with a blackboard and a piece of chalk and write down the number of stars that are out there, which is one followed by more zeros than I can write in a hurry or even describe. And making the most pessimistic assumptions that you could possibly make, you still end up with gazillions and quadrillions of stars that are just as capable of sustaining life as our own sun is. So, it seems to me the height of arrogance to say that our little stupid sun off in one obscure corner of an odd galaxy called the Milky Way should be the only one in the whole universe capable of developing what we sometimes refer to as intelligent life.

RUSSET: Where do earthlings fit into this whole spectrum?

COLLINS: Not too high, not too high...

(LAUGHTER)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSET: Take that, you fellow earthlings. And we'll be right back for the final remembrance of John F. Kennedy, Jr., his wife and sister-in-law.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

RUSSET: We conclude our program the way we began, remembering the lives of John F. Kennedy, Jr. and Carolyn and Lauren Bessette. And on this Sunday morning, may their families find comfort in the enormous outpouring of thoughts and prayers from people the world over.

We begin with the words of President John Kennedy from 1962. May these three young Americans find eternal peace at sea.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

KENNEDY: I really don't know why it is that all of us are so committed to the sea, except I am -- I think it's because, in addition to the fact that the sea changes and the light changes, and ships change. It's because we all came from the sea. And it is an interesting biological fact that all of us have, in our veins, the exact same percentage of salt in our blood that exists in the ocean. And, therefore, we have salt in our blood, in our sweat, in our tears. We are tied to the ocean. And when we go back to the sea -- whether it is to sail or to watch it -- we are going back from whence we came.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSET: Start your day tomorrow on Today with Katie Couric and Matt Lauer and then the NBC Nightly News with Tom Brokaw. We'll be back next week. If it's Sunday, it's MEET THE PRESS.

END

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Erica S. Lepping (CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JUL-1999 10:27:21.00

SUBJECT: press guidance requests

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP (LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
please, by 12:30 p.m., on:

* Tax Cuts...NYT/WSJ/WP...we will veto? our stance...NEC/OMB
* Vietnam Trade...NEC...thank you...I received
* Census...emergency spending...our position...House vote...WP
ed....Bachman

- * Budget...OMB...riders...
- * JFK, Jr.... justification for why burial at sea happened within one day when in other cases it can take weeks...which agency handles this?
Cabinet Affairs
- * China WTO... NSC/NEC... please consult.. House vote Tuesday on normal trade relations...

Thanks

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUL-1999 10:58:45.00

SUBJECT: FOX Special Report, July 26, 1999

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 (Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet [UNKNOW
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rajiv Y. Mody (CN=Rajiv Y. Mody/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: Laura J. Lewis (CN=Laura J. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/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: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/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: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
FOX SPECIAL REPORT WITH BRIT HUME
Aired July 26, 1999

JUAN WILLIAMS, HOST, SPECIAL REPORT: Welcome to Washington. I'm Juan Williams, in for Brit Hume.

While the Senate is preparing to take up its version of a 10-year \$792 billion tax cut, the Clinton administration is warning that the president would veto even a compromise plan that lowers the cut by hundreds of billions of dollars. FOX NEWS correspondent Jim Angle gives us the details.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JIM ANGLE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Republicans in Congress want \$792 billion in tax relief, the White House wants \$250 billion. But the president's aides flatly rejected a Democratic suggestion to meet in the middle at \$500 billion.

JACK LEW, WHITE HOUSE BUDGET DIRECTOR: The challenge is not to split the difference. The challenge is to agree on a broad set of goals that can be accomplished and to be honest about the cost of those goals.

ANGLE: Senate Democrats joined the attack on the Republican tax cut proposals even as they were proposing a new way to spend some of the surplus.

U.S. SENATOR TOM HARKIN (D-IA): So when it comes to the tax bill, the hogs truly are at the trough. But when it comes to our farmers and our people in rural areas, we can't even get a grain, a kernel to get out to help them.

ANGLE: Harkin and other Senate Democrats propose \$9.9 billion in emergency spending to help out farmers, whose prices are plummeting because of bumper crops and weak overseas markets. In fact, Harkin says, for many farmers this is the worst crisis since the Depression.

HARKIN: Since November, 1997, cash prices have fallen by 45 percent. There is no sector of our society, of our economy, that's been hit that hard.

ANGLE: But with debates over other spending, such as Medicare reform, a prescription drug benefit, Social Security and defense spending, what is the White House willing to spend on farmers? A leading Republican has called hearings for next week with administration officials to find out.

U.S. SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR (R-IN): The administration finally has to say, you know, "We're in charge. We are the executive branch." Somebody has to see some priorities around here.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ANGLE: The president has said he would do something to help the farmers, but officials in the White House are reluctant to open the doors for a raid on the surplus no matter how good the reason. So officials here couldn't say what position the White House will eventually take on emergency aid to farmers, and Vice President Gore's office says he is still reviewing the matter.

Juan?

WILLIAMS: Jim, let's talk about taxes for a second. Is the White House simply jockeying for position by threatening to veto even the \$500 proposal?

ANGLE: Well, you know, when you ask officials that, of course, they wouldn't say if they were bluffing. But I'll tell you, one person did point out to me that they had the secretary of the treasury and every other high-ranking official out there saying there is no way they're going to go for this. It would be very hard to roll it back.

They're also worried about whether or not there will even be a surplus. Everyone now recognizes that the spending caps are very, very tight, and the Congressional Budget Office recently said that if they just raised spending over the next 10 years at the rate of inflation, that about two thirds of the expected surplus that we're arguing over here for tax cuts -- about two third would simply evaporate.

Juan?

WILLIAMS: Jim Angle at the White House, thank you very much.

While the country and the news media focused last week on the death of John F. Kennedy, Jr., campaign advisers for Vice President Gore and Texas Governor George W. Bush, front-runners for the Democratic and Republican nominations, continued to work on political strategy. We're only six months from the presidential primaries and caucuses, and so far Gore's advisers are telling him they're not ready to go after their presumed opponent. FOX NEWS correspondent Carl Cameron filed this "You Decide 2000" report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CARL CAMERON, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Campaigning for president in his home state of Tennessee...

ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Well, it's great to be with you, and I appreciate the warm welcome.

CAMERON: ... yet another dispute within Al Gore's reportedly rift-ridden campaign ranks, this time over when or even if the vice president should publicly attack Republican front-runner George W. Bush. With Bush expected to win a much-hyped albeit non-binding straw poll of Republican candidates in Iowa next month that many think will further solidify his position as the all-but-official Republican nominee, several Gore aides think the vice president needs to criticize Bush directly, if nothing else to cast himself as Bush's equally predestined rival and to stay in the campaign new.

GORE: All of our thoughts and prayers are with the Kennedy family and the Bessette family.

CAMERON: The death of JFK, Jr., caused Gore aides, who have been looking for opportunities to blast Bush, to hold off last week because aides say they realize that the timing might be considered unseemly, and it would almost certainly be overshadowed. But now some Gore strategists argue that going after Bush is unnecessarily risky, far too early and ultimately could backfire if Gore is seen as going negative or desperate. They think attacks should be left for now to surrogates.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Use whatever slogans you want, but tell us where you stand.

CAMERON: But even barbs from the president have not knocked Bush off stride. Gore's team thinks Bush is most vulnerable on two fronts: not outlining specific policy issues and his huge war chest. But if the vice president tries to take on Bush for his money, many think it will only conjure up images of his own fund-raising controversies and somewhat awkward attempts to explain it.

GORE: There is no controlling legal authority...

(END VIDEOTAPE)

CAMERON: And all the indecision and upheaval in the Gore campaign has prompted some Democrats to take a more serious look at Democratic opponent Bill Bradley's candidacy. As for the Democratic National

Committee, sources there are so concerned about Bush's fund-raising prowess -- the Republican front-runner -- that they are now predicting that they will have to raise record amounts of so-called soft money contributions, donations to the party for fund-raising and party-building exercises, in order to counter Bush's money in the upcoming campaign. The problem for Gore in that regard is, first of all, it's exactly the same money that got the Clinton campaign in such trouble in the scandals of 1996.

Juan?

WILLIAMS: Carl, what's the latest on the campaign finance investigations?

CAMERON: Well, Department of Justice investigators have been working with both Charlie Trie, the president's long-time friend and fund-raiser, and Johnny Chung, both of whom who have pled guilty and are cooperating with investigators. But sources inside the task force say despite efforts by Trie and Chung to tell more stories of alleged impropriety by both the White House and the Democratic National Committee officials, they are being told essentially ``We don't want to hear it. We want to close up these investigations.'' Sources close to both Chung and Trie say they have stories to tell, and it's falling on deaf ears at the Justice Department.

Juan?

WILLIAMS: Carl Cameron, thank you very much.

The already hot race for the U.S. Senate seat in New York just got hotter. A full report in just a moment.

(18:09)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

WILLIAMS: Representative Rick Lazio has sent a letter to Republican and Conservative Party leaders across New York confirming that he will officially declare his candidacy for U.S. Senate seat with a statewide tour in mid-August. The move would pit Lazio against New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani in a primary battle. FOX NEWS correspondent Rick Leventhal reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RICK LEVENTHAL, FOX NEWS (voice-over): New York Congressman Rick Lazio has made it official. He will join the race to be the Empire State's next senator in the year 2000. Lazio has two huge hurdles in his path, the political muscle of his likely Republican primary opponent, New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani, and the high profile of the likely Democratic candidate, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Political expert Joe Mercurio says Lazio is a long shot.

JOSEPH MERCURIO, POLITICAL CONSULTANT: He's a good, young, energetic Republican from Long Island who could further himself by beginning a campaign for Senate. But if Giuliani's in the race, it will be hopeless, and he shouldn't at some point drop out and support the logical Republican candidate.

LEVENTHAL: Lazio, a 41-year-old conservative, announced his candidacy by sending letters to Republican and Conservative Party chairmen across the state last Friday. In the letter Lazio states, ``It's clear to me that New Yorkers want a senator who cares about them and their problems, not someone who is interested in a stepping stone to a higher office.''

His official announcement comes the week of August 16th, but Lazio will have a tough time gaining support if the polls are accurate. The latest Zogby ``New York Post'' poll shows Giuliani with a commanding 4-to-1 lead in a primary race.

JOHN ZOGBY, POLLSTER: The reality is that New York Republicans, we've found in our poll, they want to defeat Hillary Rodham Clinton. That's their goal, more than anything else. And they believe that they have their candidate, and that's Rudy Giuliani.

LEVENTHAL: Giuliani is out of town fund-raising, but told reporters

he didn't think Lazio's candidacy matters and doesn't worry about it.

(on camera): Lazio's camp says there is a precedent for a relatively unknown candidate in New York state to come out of nowhere and defeat a nationally known figure. George Pataki was a long-shot state representative when he beat Mario Cuomo to become governor. And Pataki, who has never seen eye to eye with Giuliani, has been a big supporter of Lazio's in the past.

(voice-over): A source in Lazio's office says rumors that Republican leaders have urged him to step aside and let Giuliani run unopposed are simply not true. Instead, the source says, Lazio has gotten nothing but encouragement from his party. He's already raised more than \$3 million, and in his letter says ``I feel confident we will win.''

In New York, Rick Leventhal, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

WILLIAMS: In a vote marking a dramatic shift for the Reform Party and defeat for its founder, Ross Perot, a retired financial consultant with the backing of Jesse Ventura has been elected chairman of the fledgling party. FOX NEWS correspondent Steve Brown attended the Reform Party convention and wraps up this weekend's events.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

STEVE BROWN, FOX NEWS (voice-over): If you thought the national Reform Party was still the party of Ross Perot, well, then Jack Gargan has two words for you.

JACK GARGAN, REFORM PARTY CHAIRMAN-ELECT: No more.

BROWN: The 68-year-old Floridian was elected as the new chairman of the Reform Party. Gargan's biggest endorsement was from the party's biggest star, Jesse Ventura.

GARGAN: This is the 800-pound gorilla, you know. He carries a big stick, and I'm sure that a lot of people will be enamored because of the great job he's doing personally, and he makes a great role model for us.

BROWN: The Minnesota governor says the time is ripe for Perot to step down from the Reform Party's center state.

JESSE VENTURA (REFORM), MINNESOTA GOVERNOR: He is the founder of the Reform Party, and he deserves total credit for that. But like anything, you start growing beyond. You have to expand beyond where you've been before.

BROWN: But for those still loyal to Perot, Ventura's endorsement smelled like a power play. The soon-to-be ex-Reform Party boss, Russell Verney, says wounded feelings of Perot supporters will not last.

RUSSELL VERNEY, REFORM PARTY CHAIRMAN: I think it'll take about 15 more minutes while they act strange, and it'll all be forgotten and everybody's happy.

BROWN: The next big race is next year's presidential campaign, and Ventura has some ideas on the subject. On Fox News Sunday, he rattled off a couple of names high on his list of favorites.

VENTURA: Well, I've met with former senator and governor Lowell Weicker. I think he carries name recognition that could do the party some good. And I think if Lowell wants to get his feet back into politics as a Reform Party candidate, we -- I think we would be the perfect forum for him. I think Senator McCain of Arizona is interesting.

BROWN: When reached by phone for reaction, a McCain spokesman said under no circumstances would the senator shun the GOP for the Reform Party.

(on camera): Gargan says his first order of business will be to move the Reform Party headquarters from Perot's home city of Dallas to Gargan's home state of Florida, yet another sign that the Reform Party has moved into its post-Perot era.

In Dearborn, Michigan, Steve Brown, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

WILLIAMS: Next up, a conversation with David Yepsen of the ``Des

Moines Register.'' Stay tuned.

(18:16)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Interview with David Yepsen of the Des Moines Register

WILLIAMS: The Iowa Republican straw poll is coming up on August 14th, and this year it will make or break some presidential candidates. No delegates will be selected at the straw poll, and ``Des Moines Register''s political editor David Yepsen is here to explain the significance.

David, Welcome.

DAVID YEPSEN, ``DES MOINES REGISTER'': Good to be here.

WILLIAMS: David, is every bus, every air-conditioned bus sold out in Iowa, as I've read?

YEPSEN: You bet. You can't rent a commercial bus in this state right now, and probably for a couple states around. All the campaigns are renting buses to bring their supporters to Ames on August 14th.

WILLIAMS: And you're going to have about 10,000 to 12,000 people, I've read, or maybe more. Now, explain why this year's edition of this caucus is so critical.

YEPSEN: Well, every year is different, but in the past, these straw polls have told us some things. In 1987, it told us that social conservatives were really a force to be reckoned with, when Pat Robertson beat then Vice President George Bush. Four years ago, when Phil Gramm tied Bob Dole, it didn't say so much about Phil Gramm as it did about Bob Dole. He had problems with his organization and with his message.

And so we're looking at this straw poll in Ames to maybe tell us some things about the status of this race. Is George W. Bush really the front-runner? Has Steve Forbes got a ground game going? Can Elizabeth Dole get these young women out to a straw poll? Can Lamar Alexander hold on? What about Dan Quayle and Pat Buchanan?

It will tell us something about the organizational abilities of the various campaigns.

WILLIAMS: Well, Dave, you know, what I was thinking was with this compressed season of elections, what we have here is a situation where if a candidate doesn't show some spark in these Iowa caucuses, that means that there's nobody going to be left to challenge the front-runner, George W. Bush, on the Republican side.

YEPSEN: I think that's absolutely right, Juan, and these challengers, they need to start scuffling Bush up. I mean, he's just got such a lead in money that it's drying up the dough for everybody else. And I think that may be the most significant thing that comes out of this straw poll, that if George W. Bush stumbles, well, he's got enough money to keep going, but the other campaigns will get a new shot of oxygen. But if, on the other hand, he wins this thing -- and he's campaigning hard to do it -- it's going to further dry up the resources for these other candidates, and they're just not going to be able to continue in the race.

WILLIAMS: All right, let's get hardball for a second here. Let's talk about who would get knocked out. Now, in Washington, the word is that Dan Quayle is on that line, that he would be eliminated quickly unless he shows some surprising results in Iowa. Similarly, people are talking about not only Dan Quayle, but Lamar Alexander.

YEPSEN: Yeah, I agree with all that, and I think the problem is financial. Those two gentlemen have spent a lot of time in this state. They're working hard. And if they don't do well in the straw poll, it's going to be pretty strong evidence that their message just has not sold or that Republicans like somebody else. That hurts their fund-raising. They can't -- their heart may want to continue in this race, but their ability to wage an effective campaign will be over.

WILLIAMS: And similarly, what about Gary Bauer, Elizabeth Dole, Pat Buchanan?

YEPSEN: Well, I think that George W. Bush, Steve Forbes and Elizabeth Dole may all stay in the race no matter how they do, for a variety of different reasons. Forbes has got a lot of money. Elizabeth Dole's a national figure. But for a Gary Bauer and a Pat Buchanan, candidates like that, who are trying to solidify the party's right, who are trying to rally social conservatives, if you will, to become their champion in the race -- I think one of them will emerge out of this straw poll as sort of the leading social conservative in the race. And the others are going to find it very difficult to continue. There are a lot of social conservative leaders in this state who are saying it may be time for some folks to get out of the race, to rally around one candidate.

WILLIAMS: Now, what about on the Democratic side? Is there any chance that Bill Bradley could come in there and do some surprising things against Al Gore?

YEPSEN: Well, Juan, Bill Bradley is doing very well in this state. Now, the polls show Al Gore way ahead, but Senator Bradley has made some real inroads here. And you know, Jim Angle's piece at the top of the hour I think may have something to do with what happens in February. If the rural economy in this country goes to pot, that's going to have an adverse impact on Al Gore, particularly in a general election fight, where in states like downstate Illinois, central Ohio, central Pennsylvania, the rural vote is not that big, but it can be pivotal in a battleground state -- Missouri. And the Clinton administration does not want to come off looking insensitive to rural folks or it will hurt Al Gore, and that will really start to slam into this rural economy 'long about February.

WILLIAMS: Well, let's go back, then, to the GOP straw poll. Given the concerns that exist about the farm economy, what are people thinking about a front-runner like George Bush? Is he expected to be more sensitive? Is he -- he's been out there campaigning. There was some reluctance on his part to campaign in the first place, but now that he's there, what's he saying about the farmers' troubles?

YEPSEN: Well, he's -- like all the Republicans, he's promising some emergency relief for help, expand exports. They're critical of the Clinton administration for not doing more to expand exports, which are key to bolstering farm income. So Governor Bush is trying to do like all good candidates, and that is show some sensitivity to the problem. I mean, this guy's been governor of Texas. That's a pretty rural state. He talks the lingo. He understands the problem.

WILLIAMS: Now, who among the minor candidates -- and I'm putting only Governor Bush in the major candidate line here. Who among the minor candidates has shown strong organizational ability to pay the \$25 to those voters to get them out, to get them on the air-conditioned bus and get them to Ames?

YEPSEN: I think Steve Forbes has. He's put a lot of his resources into a ground attack here this time. Elizabeth Dole has put a lot of effort into getting her new people out. And so has Gary Bauer, the social activist and conservative leader. He's put a lot of effort into getting his people out. So keep an eye on those folks. They're working it hard.

WILLIAMS: And among those three, who do you pick for an upset?

YEPSEN: Oh, boy. If I knew that, Juan, I mean, it wouldn't be an upset.

WILLIAMS: But there's nobody that you're right now seeing a groundswell developing for out in Iowa?

YEPSEN: No. No. They're all working it very hard, and there's no groundswell for any one person. I suppose if you had to go out on a limb, you'd say Steve Forbes is putting together a really good ground assault here.

WILLIAMS: But what's his -- what is Forbes focusing on, taxes?

YEPSEN: Taxes, and also social issues. The Steve Forbes of this election is different from the Steve Forbes of the last election in that there are social components. There's an abortion component to his message now. He talks a great deal about that. Last time he didn't. And so even he's out there making a pitch for the votes of social conservatives and religious conservatives.

WILLIAMS: You know, David, I -- does it bother you at all, the idea that people have to pay for votes with this -- with this event, which is now going to be absolutely critical in terms of what -- what the American people have to say come election day?

YEPSEN: Yeah, Juan, and there are a lot of crazy rituals in American politics, and this is turning out to be one of them. I guess money is a factor in American politics, and if you have an ability to raise it, you're going to be more viable than somebody who isn't. May not be right, but certainly, because this thing is an institutional thing that has told us things in the past, it's just taken on a huge amount of significance this time, particularly as these other candidates try to trip up George W. Bush. So for better or worse, it's 25 bucks a vote. The one thing they did do to improve it this time over last is it's Iowans only. You've got to show an Iowa driver's license in order to cast a vote. So those buses won't be coming in here from Texas and Kansas and other states like they did four years ago.

WILLIAMS: Well, you know, that's a tough one. The question is whether or not people are going to switch votes once they get inside. Do you think any of that will go on?

YEPSEN: It could. Some of it could. But most of the campaigns are doing a pretty good job of checking people out before they hand them a \$25 ticket. The big candidates can afford to give their people tickets. Some of these smaller campaigns are having to ask their people to pay, and so that even gives a further advantage to the frontrunning candidates in this race, the well-to-do candidates.

WILLIAMS: All right, David Yepsen of the ``Des Moines Register,' ' thanks so much for joining us. That's going to be an exciting race to look at.

YEPSEN: Yeah, it will. Thanks, Juan.

WILLIAMS: All right.

We have to take a break to do the news right now, but stay tuned. We'll have much more in just a moment.

(18:28)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Interview with Congressman Roy Blunt

WILLIAMS: The next phase of the House Republicans' \$792 billion tax cuts will hit the Senate floor this week, but the fact is that it passed, and the fact that it passed really was a big win for Speaker Dennis Hastert's leadership. The speaker is known for his low-key approach versus the arm-twisting tactics of his predecessor, Newt Gingrich. Here to discuss Speaker Hastert's leadership is one of his top aides, chief deputy whip Roy Blunt.

Congressman, thanks for joining us.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ROY BLUNT (R-MO): Hi, Juan. It's great to be with you.

WILLIAMS: Now, were you surprised by the thin margin of victory for the tax vote last week?

BLUNT: Well, no, I really wasn't. You know, one of the things I do in my job, one of the things the speaker did for four years is try to count those votes every -- every single day. And this was a very difficult coalition to put together. I think only the speaker, at the end of the day, could have gotten the majority we needed to get this tax bill passed.

WILLIAMS: Well, it's interesting that you say only the speaker could have done that because in his seven months, it's been a rocky road. He had trouble on the Kosovo vote. He thought that he'd get something done on gun control. He didn't get it. There were lots of people who were doubting him. Were you doubting that he would get this done?

BLUNT: Well, you know, I think a lot of that, Juan, is just the speaker's style. He's a listener. He has a low-key style. He doesn't -- he doesn't go out and try to manufacture credit even when he -- when he should be getting that credit. I think the speaker's done some incredible things. The budget resolution, getting it passed on time, having that resolution essentially call for this tax vote at this time and to also be calling for a balanced budget and to lock away Social Security -- those are big issues. I don't think we'd have gotten those done without Denny Hastert as the speaker.

WILLIAMS: Now, let's talk a little bit about inside baseball for the Republicans. What was Hastert saying to the conservatives in the party who said to him, ``We want more done to limit the marriage tax''?

BLUNT: Well, I think he was saying that there's still going to be some room on this to talk to the Senate. The Senate number is a little bigger than the number we had over here. I think the speaker has been an advocate of eliminating the marriage tax penalty. I think he could look at those of us who have that same concern along with him right in the eye and say -- there's a lot of negotiating to do with the Senate. They're looking at this same overall number. There's reason to believe that we're going to move in their direction on the marriage tax penalty to eliminate more of that. I think all the folks who thought that was the key issue felt good about that. I think the speaker's willingness and Chairman Archer's willingness to put some triggers in so that we're not going to have parts of this tax cut unless our projections about declining debt actually turn out to be on target.

WILLIAMS: Well, that was the other part of my question to you. What was he saying, then, to the moderates who were saying ``We've got to do more to put this money into paying off the debt, rather than giving people back their tax cuts''?

BLUNT: Well, he was, and I think he and Chairman Archer were both very open to some innovative ideas as to ways to trigger the 10 percent across-the-board part of the tax cut. I know during the evening before we voted on the package the next day, the speaker was working on that final few members. And when they got down to this issue, if this was the issue, he was sending them down the hall to get in a meeting with Chairman Archer and figure out the language on how we could actually trigger the across-the-board tax cuts based on what was happening with interest on the debt.

WILLIAMS: Now, it occurs to me, as we're talking here, that to say to everyone out there it was a 223-to-208 vote. That's how close it was. But you've got to consider that Denny Hastert's working with one of the smallest margins in the House since the 1950s. Nonetheless, I think there are lots of people who say, ``Well, why isn't he a tough guy? Why isn't he twisting arms like Newt Gingrich? Why isn't he, '' you know, ``rushing to the ramparts and screaming from the top?'' Isn't that the style that's needed?

BLUNT: Well, part of the problem is there just aren't as many arms to twist. You know, we've got a -- we've got a margin that turns around on five votes. We essentially have to keep -- from Coach Hastert's perspective, the way he'd look at this, we have to keep all our players on the field all the time. We don't have any substitutes to speak of. Everybody has to be there.

And if you had a bigger margin and 95, 96 percent of the conference was happy, it would look like it was pretty easy to get things done. With this margin, virtually everybody has to be happy. We lost four Republicans. We

picked up six Democrats.

But we could have passed this bill without a single vote from the Democrats, and that's a great credit to the speaker, who said ``We've got to -- we've got to count on ourselves.'' We know that leadership on the other side is focusing every day on seeing that we don't get anything accomplished, and we have to be able to do that virtually with our own conference and with those Democrats who are being willing -- who are willing to step over their leadership and say ``We don't care what you say. We're going to vote for something we think is good for the country.''

WILLIAMS: Well, it was quite a scene at the end there, where you had Chris Shays, the Republican from Connecticut, kind of leading the cheer, ``Coach, coach,'' as kind of a friendly name for Hastert, yelling ``Coach, coach.'' Is there a fear that, in fact, Hastert might fail, and if he fails, that's a bad sign for what's to come in the next elections for the House?

BLUNT: Well, Juan, there's incredible confidence in Denny. There's incredible fondness for Denny Hastert. In the job that I have now, that he had for four years, he was the guy who always in leadership who kept his door open, who talked to everybody, who everybody trusts. I think everybody in our conference has high regard for him. And certainly, we want him to do well, but I think we understand that if he does well, we do well. And this Congress is not going to be judged on what the press reports are day to day, but the end results of what we're able to do. And I think we're doing some -- some very big things with the speaker's leadership.

WILLIAMS: All right, just quickly now, what -- what do you think is going to happen in the Senate? Is the Senate going to act on the House proposal, or do you think the Senate's going to make some amendments that could put it in trouble?

BLUNT: Well, the Senate -- the Finance Committee, at the very time we were moving this bill, voted out of Finance Committee a bill that had the same amount of money. I think we understand that there's going to be some discussions both ways. The White House has gone from no tax cut to a \$300 billion tax cut. There's a lot of discussion that's going to be had here. I think we're seeing a lot of movement on the part of the administration because I think they know that Americans don't feel under taxes, they feel over-taxed. And if there's a -- if there's a surplus, it ought to be given back to them, rather than to dream up what new programs we've been able to do without up till now.

WILLIAMS: OK, chief deputy whip Roy Blunt, thanks for joining us.

BLUNT: Thanks, Juan.

WILLIAMS: Coming up: A team of investigators searches for answers to why JFK, Jr.'s plane crashed into the sea. A full report in just a moment.

(18:38)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

The Kennedy-Bessette Tragedy

WILLIAMS: A team of investigators is trying to piece together the plane crash that killed John F. Kennedy, Jr., his wife, Carolyn Bessette, and her sister, Lauren. One issue has already emerged regarding the information that might have been available to Kennedy. FOX NEWS correspondent David Shuster has the story.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID SHUSTER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The Federal Aviation Administration refuses to comment on reports that it was giving inaccurate weather information the night of the crash. Pilots calling an 800 number maintained by the FAA were allegedly told of clear skies off Long Island Sound and visibility stretching eight miles. But several pilots who flew in the area say conditions were actually hazy, eliminating any visual

clues that would have indicated where the horizon was. In other words, they say, you had to rely on instruments alone to keep the plane level.

John F. Kennedy, Jr., was not qualified for instrument flight. When he prepared for take-off from this airport in New Jersey, it's not clear if he even called the FAA or if their forecast factored into his flight plans. In any case, aviation experts say conditions on the eastern seaboard can change quickly.

MICHAEL PANGIA, AVIATION EXPERT: But when you look at a weather report, you have to understand that a weather report is weather that was at the time that the particular report was taken. And then you have forecast weather, which is weather that might be. So there's a judgment factor that's involved, and that comes with experience.

SHUSTER: Last Friday night, pieces of the Kennedy plane were transported by truck to a Coast Guard hangar in Massachusetts. At least eight investigators from the National Transportation Safety Board are examining the wreckage. The team is larger than those usually assigned for small plane crashes and includes structures experts and aviation engineers. They will examine the scrapes and damage to calculate at what angle the plane hit the ocean. In addition, they will piece together parts from the engine of the Piper Saratoga to determine if there were any mechanical problems.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

However, based on the radar and weather conditions that night, experts suspect that Kennedy became disoriented and flew his plane into a deadly spin. The investigation conducted by the safety board is expected to last up to six months.

Juan?

WILLIAMS: Over the weekend, one of the pioneers in television news talk programming, Martin Agronsky, died in Washington at the age of 84. Agronsky started as a newspaper and radio reporter. He won a 1952 Peabody Award for his reporting on Senator Joseph McCarthy. But Agronsky was best known for ``Agronsky and Company,' ' one of the first programs to use reporters talking among themselves instead of interviewing newsmakers.

That format is now widely used and will be again used in just a few minutes when we come back with our panel of journalists.

Stay with us.

(18:44)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

Special Report Roundtable

(FILM CLIP OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS WITH ``SPEAKER GEPHARDT' ' SIGN IN THE WINDOW)

WILLIAMS: Talk about wishful thinking, huh?

Well, joining us now is our panel of expert journalists in the Martin Agronsky tradition. Here with us is Jeff Birnbaum, Washington bureau chief for ``Fortune' ' magazine, Mort Kondracke, executive editor of ``Roll Call, and from the White House, my pal, Mara Liasson, White House correspondent for National Public Radio. All three are FOX NEWS contributors.

Let me start with you, Mort, and ask quickly about Steve Forbes. We were talking earlier with David Yepsen of the Iowa paper about Forbes possibly pulling an upset. Yepsen says he's the guy among all the other candidates who might threaten George Bush. Do you think so?

MORT KONDRACKE, ``ROLL CALL' ': Well, no. I actually don't. I mean, I think that at this straw poll, if money will buy personnel, you know, that he can rent more buses and probably hire up enough people that he can -- he could pack the hall and make a dent, and therefore keep himself alive -- but I just don't see the Republican Party, which is a kind of a -- you know, believes in resumes and believes in qualifications and all this,

nominating somebody who's never held a political office before.

WILLIAMS: Well -- well -- you know what...

KONDRACKE: And therefore, I just think that he's -- Forbes is money and not much else. He used to have a message.

WILLIAMS: But here's the...

KONDRACKE: He used to have a message, but his message is kind of diffused...

JEFF BIRNBAUM, ``FORTUNE'' MAGAZINE: Well, I think...

KONDRACKE: ... and he's kind of pandering to it.

WILLIAMS: Jeffrey?

BIRNBAUM: I think it's important to point out that the front-runner, George W. Bush, on the Republican side, does believe that his main competition could well be Steve Forbes because of the size of his pocketbook.

WILLIAMS: Right.

BIRNBAUM: That is, he could simply spend his way into a strong second place. And if George W. were to stumble, the person who is there waiting would be Steve Forbes.

WILLIAMS: Well, and also...

MARA LIASSON, NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO: And that's what happened...

WILLIAMS: Go ahead, Mara.

LIASSON: That's what happened in 1996. I mean, Steve Forbes really gave Bob Dole a roughing up, and that's what they're worried about this time. But I also think that it's not only that the Republican Party likes a resume. They don't seem to want to do something perverse, just vote for an outsider. The Democrat do that sometimes. But also, they're so hungry to win, and one of the biggest qualifications of George W. Bush right now, one of his biggest selling points, is that he looks like he can win.

WILLIAMS: Well, in addition to which, it looks like Forbes is reinventing himself as much more of a social conservative this time around, a ``family issues'' kind of guy. So let's look at a new Forbes commercial in which he features himself as ``the family man.''

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP - Forbes campaign commercial)

STEVE FORBES (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Well, my wife and I of 27 years have five daughters.

DAUGHTER: I think my father's been a wonderful role model.

DAUGHTER: When we say that Dad understands human nature, he is so optimistic.

DAUGHTER: You have to be strong, and Dad's incredibly strong.

WIFE: You will have somebody extremely honest.

DAUGHTER: We're very lucky. I mean, our parents took their responsibilities extremely seriously.

FORBES: It is inspiring and sometimes frustrating and often humbling.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAMS: Mara, they're all girls in that commercial. How'd it sound to you?

LIASSON: All girls! I think that's the message. I mean, they're all girls, and his wife reminds me of Barbara Bush a little bit. But yeah, look, that was a very nice, warm and fuzzy ad. I think that it speaks to one of the problems Steve Forbes has, which is, as Mort mentioned, right now nobody knows who Steve Forbes is. They think he's a rich guy, a rich guy who used to be -- to have a very clear message, but they don't know anything about his family background. Maybe they would know that he was a magazine publisher, and that's about it.

KONDRACKE: Yeah, I -- you know, I think that it was -- it's very nice. I think it's a very nice ad. But it doesn't -- it doesn't move anything. I mean, it softens up his image. I'm not sure that softening up his image is what he needs. For one thing, he needs fire.

WILLIAMS: He needs fire.

KONDRACKE: He used to have it, you know, and his...

WILLIAMS: On the tax stuff.

KONDRACKE: Oh, he has -- he has been so deady dull lately in his speeches. He looks like a zombie. And I don't know why that -- you know, I'd spend some of my money on speech lessons, frankly, if I were him.

WILLIAMS: Jeffrey, does the tax fight here in Washington accrue to any benefit in the way of the Forbes campaign?

BIRNBAUM: Well, clearly, the Republicans are doing a lot of what Steve Forbes would like. It's not a flat tax that the congressional Republicans are pushing, but a deep tax cut is very much like what a supply-sider like Steve Forbes would prefer. But then again, we can't take seriously the particular tax cut that's going on here on Capitol Hill because it's more of a place holder for the druthers of the Republicans that a big tax cut, certainly not as big as this, would be part of the final compromise that includes Medicare. So I don't see it rounding...

WILLIAMS: Mara...

BIRNBAUM: By the way, I think this Forbes ad -- it strikes me as a vanity production. It really does.

WILLIAMS: You didn't like it.

BIRNBAUM: No, I like it very much, but is it really selling Steve Forbes as a presidential candidate or is it just something that he's trying to -- that his own consultants are selling him as something that might help and certainly strokes his ego. He's spending an awful lot of money...

WILLIAMS: Mara...

BIRNBAUM: ... maybe to no end.

WILLIAMS: Mara...

LIASSON: You know -- you know, let's point out -- what are we talking about? We're talking about an ad being run before the Iowa straw poll. Nobody else has the money to do this. There is nobody advertising now. And I think that that's kind of a strange thing.

WILLIAMS: Hey, Mara, just very quickly, did you hear anything over the White House today about the president on this tax business? Is he really going to veto any kind of proposal?

LIASSON: Well, what he has said, and what they're repeating again today, is that he would veto the \$500 billion compromise that was floated this weekend by John Breaux, a Democrat. He certainly will veto either the House Republican or the Senate Republican plan. He's sticking to his guns. He wants Medicare and Social Security taken care of. He wants his retirement savings account tax cut. And I think this is all going to wait for the negotiations in the fall.

WILLIAMS: All right, let me just quickly go to George W. Bush. The governor of Texas and the front-runner on the GOP side has been the focus of several pieces in ``The Washington Post'' on the front page, above the fold. And it's ongoing. This is going to be a seven-part series. Is this unfair, Mort?

KONDRACKE: Well, I guess this -- this is by way of introducing somebody who is largely unknown, you know? And ``The Washington Post'' obviously devoted a lot of resources, sent Lois Romano (ph) and George Lardner (ph) -- George Lardner being a crack veteran investigative reporter...

WILLIAMS: Right.

KONDRACKE: ... to find out whether -- and the obvious end result is they got -- they didn't find anything new. I mean, a lot of details that Jeff and I have both been down there endlessly looking for -- for...

WILLIAMS: I see you've delighted Jeffrey here. Nothing that Jeffrey hadn't found out before!

BIRNBAUM: Well, neither of us, as he said.

KONDRACKE: I did the same thing for ``Reader's Digest,'' you know?

WILLIAMS: Right.

KONDRACKE: It's forthcoming. And there's nothing new to be found. If somebody can find...

WILLIAMS: All right...

KONDRACKE: ... the cocaine episode, then that will be new.

LIASSON: But you know, but those...

KONDRACKE: But it won't matter.

LIASSON: ... pieces have been incredibly positive. I mean, you read them, and they're just...

WILLIAMS: They're glowing.

LIASSON: I mean, they're just glowing. Now, I assume they're going to do seven parts on Al Gore, too.

WILLIAMS: Well, I think they're going to do...

LIASSON: We just haven't read them yet.

WILLIAMS: Yeah, 'The Post' is going to do other major candidates. We don't know when they're going to do them, but they'll give them similar treatment.

Let me shift topics for a second and go back to the John F. Kennedy, Jr., tragedy and talk a little bit about another journalist, Mike Barnicle. Mike Barnicle, who at first was, you know, very sympathetic and praising John, Jr., was, in fact, highly critical previously, as you'll see here.

It says, 'JFK, Jr., comes off sounding like some thin-lipped, dim-witted, bad-backed polo player whose empty head can barely retain enough limited cocktail chatter to get him through dinner with that international moron, Princess Di.'

(BEGIN ON SCREEN)

'Boston Globe,' August 14, 1997

(END ON SCREEN)

But the other Mike Barnicle is out there now, praising JFK's memory. What do you think?

KONDRACKE: Mike Barnicle is, if nothing, uneven. You know, I mean, one of...

(CROSSTALK)

WILLIAMS: You're very kind.

KONDRACKE: I -- you know, I -- I -- I think that he's, you know, inconsistent and this is by the nature of his personality, mercurial, you know...

BIRNBAUM: The criticism that's being leveled against him is not only did he change his stripes, but he's also, I think, taking money as a consultant on this subject.

WILLIAMS: All right, Mara, Jeff, Mort -- thanks very much.

That's all the time we have for the panel, but stay with us. We'll show you how Hollywood is making another stab at explaining Watergate.

(18:56)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

WILLIAMS: In another two weeks, you'll be seeing all kinds of news reports marking the 25th anniversary of the resignation of President Richard Nixon. There'll be long explanations of the Watergate scandal and how the so-called 'third-rate burglary' led to the downfall of a president and the imprisonment of his top aides.

Well, Hollywood, in its continuing campaign to distort American history, is releasing a spoof of Watergate called 'Dick.' It looks like 'Clueless' meets 'All the President's Men.' Here are some excerpts.

(VIDEO CLIP, TRAILER FOR 'DICK')

WILLIAMS: What an affront to history! Everyone knows that Checkers, the dog, died in 1964, eight years before the Watergate break-in. President Nixon's Irish setter was named King Timahoe. And here's the basic question. If Hollywood aims at summer movies at teenagers, how many of them know enough about Watergate to get the inside jokes? Those girls

would never have become a threat. G. Gordon Liddy and the White House plumbers would have taken care of that.

That's SPECIAL REPORT for this time. Join us again next time, and in the meantime, our news is next.

END

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dacor@aol.com@INET@LNGTWY (Dacor@aol.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JUL-1999 16:49:23.00 .

SUBJECT: From Corn - LOYAL OPPOSITION - NYPress, 07/28/99

TO: David Halperin@eop (David Halperin@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Friends, Colleagues, Antagonists, Strangers,
Here is the latest installment of my column in the New York Press. (A pre-copy-edited version.) Feel free to pass this on and feel free to send e-mail addresses of others who might enjoy receiving this weekly feature. If you want to be removed from this list, send me a note and you'll be purged. To the scrolling-challenged, here's a little guidance: Item 1 concerns the media coverage of the death of JFK Jr.; Item 2 reports on the accomplishments of a not-so-do-nothing Congress; Item 3 shows the effects of George W. Bush's money on his competition; and Item 4 asks Bill Bradley, where's Clyde? (you'll see).

Cheers,
DC

LOYAL OPPOSITION -- New York Press -- July 28, 1999

By DAVID CORN

1. Rest in Hype

When did you scream at the television screen? For me, the moment came last Wednesday, when MSNBC's John Gibson wondered on air if "way too much effort and money" was being spent on the recovery of the wreckage of the plane of John F. Kennedy Jr. It took mucho nerve for Gibson--whose network (like CNN and Fox News Cable) was pumping out never-ending, regurgitative coverage--to question the extent of the salvage operation. He should have been on his knees, thankful for the ratings boost brought on by this accident.

The awful death of Kennedy and the Bessette sisters provided the national media, which craves that One Big Story, another opportunity to show how inanely it can behave. By now, you have probably heard enough blah-blah-blahing about the media treatment of the event, but I cannot resist a late-hit. When there was no news, the cable stations repeated non-news incessantly, shoving aside coverage of most everything else. Democrats and Republicans were slugging it out last week in the House over a weighted-toward-the-rich, GOP tax cut of \$792 billion--that's a mess of money--but the cameras were trained on the folks who had made the pilgrimage to the Tribeca loft of John Kennedy and Carolyn Bessette. "John John manifests everything that is good in this country," sobbed one TV-friendly mourner who never met the guy. For expert commentary, Fox News Channel turned

to a man who runs a company managing the images and names of famous dead people, such as Marilyn Monroe and Malcolm X. Kennedy's "fame will only grow now," he opined. What empty calories. Before funeral arrangements had been announced, MSNBC rushed a Catholic nun on air to discuss whether a burial at sea would be in keeping with Catholic dogma. Short answer: yes. But the network stretched the segment to kill time. FNC enlisted David Dinkins for help on Thursday. Why Dinkins? Because, as anchor David Asman, explained, Dinkins "was mayor of New York when John Kennedy was here." What did Dinkins add to the national media conversation? He informed us that "the women referred to him as a hunk." Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Even level-headed reporters such as CNN's Frank Sesno slipped. Before the bodies were located, he somberly noted that the nation was maintaining a "painful vigil." The nation? Most people were at work.

On Thursday, television cameras showed a barely-changing shot of the USS Briscoe for hours, and Chris Jansing on MSNBC said that Kennedy was "known so well to us." Not really--unless you believe he was "known" because millions read about him in People. I knew him slightly--we overlapped a year at college and then we were acquaintances in New York in the mid-1980s--and I didn't feel that Jansing was speaking for me. That same day, The Washington Post Style section ran a piece on "a grieving nation" that ludicrously lumped Kennedy with his dad, Martin Luther King Jr., Elvis, and John Lennon. The article approvingly quoted Gary Laderman, a professor of religion of Emory, who noted, "When you do have people of that magnitude [die], there is a kind of collective participation that takes place." It's not an insult to Kennedy to wonder on what basis he rates the magnitude of Lennon and King. And despite the mountain of flowers that grew on the doorstep of his apartment, how collective was the grief? In another article on the same page of the Post, reporter Emily Wax spoke to a number of twenty- and thirty-somethings in Washington and found them reasonably untouched by the death. "Personally affected?" asked Laura Bull, 20. "Maybe for Americans who are not my age. But I mean, I'm too young for that. I never thought of him until George magazine."

Kennedy was a decent fellow, who bore his good-looks-enhanced celebrity with a touch of class and a portion of humility. He published an erratic magazine that sought to attract people to politics, though it unfortunately focused more on the game and glitz of politics than the substance. But the abovementioned Style article went so far as to compare his demise to those of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. In a media universe dominated by celebrity, the death of a celebrity may well be the paramount news event. (Years ago there was a wonderful parody of The New York Post that bore a front page announcing a nuclear war. Michael Jackson and millions die, the headline shouted.) Ultimately, there was not much to say about Kennedy's death. The hype exceeded the information stream. The television news and

the
newsweeklies had declared this a mega-story, which meant there was all
this
damn space to fill--but little of substance to put into that hole.
Consequently, the television networks aired meaningless footage of circling
ships that was reminiscent of the long-burning Yule log WPIX used to show
on
Christmas eve. Did we really need to see Daily News columnist Mike
Barnicle
outside the Kennedy compound, vulture-like, saying that at least Kennedy's
life was not taken by a psycho-killer? (Barnicle deserves special
attention
for his prattle-filled commentary. During the burial at sea, he observed
that
the Kennedy crash was "bathed in irony." Name one. Coincidences, yes. The
fatal accident did occur on the 30th anniversary of Chappaquidick. But
there's not much ironic about an airplane slamming into the ocean.)
Certainly, the Kennedy crash was a major story. But it again proved that
much
of the big media is incapable of proportionality.

This was a sad event--but one without much meaning. In itself,
Kennedy's death, as tragic as it was for those who loved and cared for
him,
does not bear deep cultural, social or political significance. It just
offered more evidence of the trite-but-true rule of life: shit happens
(and
it can happen to anyone) and each of us lives our days periously close to
non-existence. As the Kennedy clan returned to shore after casting the
ashes
of Kennedy and the Bessettes upon a choppy ocean, Time's Richard Stengel
on
MSNBC solemnly pronounced that in years ahead, "we will tell our children"
about this. It's no reflection on Kennedy, but I doubt it.

2. Done Deals

In Washington, both political parties have been trying to brand
the
other as responsible for a "do-nothing" Congress. But, as Russell Mokhiber
and Robert Weissman, the coauthors of Corporate Predators: The Hunt for
MegaProfits and the Attack on Demcoracy (Common Courage Press), point out,
Congress this year has been quite productive, with a bipartisan majority
churning out legislation sought by corporate lobbyists. Congress passed
Y2K
immunity legislation which would make it tougher for consumers and small
companies to seek compensation from businesses for problems associated
with
Y2K computer failures. The measure also would hamper the filing of class
action lawsuits related to Y2K glitches. The National Association of
Manufacturers and other business lobbies had drooled over this legislation
for months, and Congress delivered. (Clinton, who at first threatened to
veto
the legislation, has now agreed to sign a revised bill that closely
resembles
the original.) Both the House and the Senate passed a measure supported by
Democrats and Republicans that would allow investment companies, banks,
and
securities firms to merge. In this brave new world, Mokhiber and Weissmann
speculate, "The financial lobby would tighten its political stranglehold
on
Washington. Giant conglomerates would lock in a too-big-to-fail status,

ensuring a future marked by bailouts of mega-financial firms. The mega-companies will invade consumer privacy by trading insurance, bank and other personal data between affiliates, and then conducting intrusive direct marketing schemes accordingly." The House of Representatives also has passed the so-called "bankruptcy reform" bill, and the Senate is poised to do the same. This legislation, a gift to the credit card industry, would make it harder for consumers to file for bankruptcy and for debtors to prioritize food and housing payments ahead of credit card debt. On these fronts, a do-nothing Congress would have been a better alternative. The issue is not how much Congress does, but what it does.

3. It's Money That Matters

What's the one figure you need to know to understand this presidential election? The answer is \$100 million. That's how much money George W. Bush, the one-and-a-quarter term governor of Texas, may raise. He's already over a third of the way to becoming the first nine-figure presidential candidate. It's driving his Republican competitors nuts and, no doubt, freaking out Vice President Al Gore, who will have to spend many of his millions beating back ex-Senator Bill Bradley, while the Bush cash register will keep ca-chinging. Republican Lamar Alexander, the former Tennessee governor, has been wailing about Bush's money. At the start of this presidential season, Alexander was a contender--not a favorite but a candidate who had a shot. GOP yuppie, country-club suburbanites fancied him last time round. And it was only a few months ago that Alexander was boasting to political reporters of his fundraising prowess. He noted that in the 1996 presidential race the most generous source of individual campaign contributions was not New York, L.A., or Washington but Tennessee. That's because Alexander squeezed every nickel he could out of his neighbors, pals and cronies. Alexander told us political scribblers that he would easily meet the ante of \$20 million.

That's not happening. At last count, Alexander had \$90,000 in his campaign coffers. Bush had \$30 million. So Alexander is no longer talking up his cash-collecting skills. Instead, he's griping about the influence of money in politics. "They want to hold an auction on the White House lawn and sell the presidency to the highest bidder," he moaned last week. (Actually, the auction is taking place at Republican National Committee headquarters, not 1600 Pennsylvania.) "These moneyed interests," Alexander continued, "contend the so-called money primary matters more than the Iowa caucuses or the New Hampshire primary." In private, Alexander is probably not so upset about the auction as he is about the fact he doesn't have the bucks to be competitive on eBay, let alone within the GOP big--bucks primary contest.

Steve Forbes, the never-done-anything-but-inherited-a fortune publisher, also was playing the crying game. After Bush declared he would not abide by federal spending limits in the primaries and forego federal matching funds, Forbes' campaign whacked W. for sheer opportunism. Excuse me, but Forbes practically invented sheer opportunism. He dropped his 1996

anti-anti-choice position and became a born-again abortion foe for this campaign. Moreover, he is only in the race because his daddy's fortune allows

him the opportunity of pretending he's important.

Hypocrisy is not reserved for the jealous. The Bush campaign is not

accepting donations from tobacco political action committees. That comes across as a principled position. But--you knew there was a "but"--Bush pocketed \$50,000 from tobacco executives and their spouses during the previous three months, according to the Dallas Morning News. Here's the explanation, courtesy of Bush spokesperson Karen Hughes: "Individuals have the right to be involved in the political process, and Governor Bush is accepting contributions from individuals." That is some standard Bush has set. He won't take money from the companies of drug dealers, but he'll pocket checks from the pushers. He can't kick that GOP habit of mainlining tobacco money.

4. The Missing Clyde

Bill Bradley is rolling out the long guns. On July 27, the onetime basketball star was scheduled to hold a fundraiser in Chicago starring former

N.Y. Knicks teammates Phil Jackson. Dave DeBuscherre, Willis Reed, Cazzie Russell and Earl Monroe. Also signed for the event were former Celtics John

Havlicek and ex-76er Billy Cunningham. For an extra \$500, a donor could play

a game of B-I-L (a shortened version of H-O-R-S-E) with one of these basketball greats. This was an event tailored for a 40ish lawyer who would gladly part with two hours or so of billing to go mano-a-mano with the Pearl

or Hondo. But the line-up begs an obvious question: where's Clyde? Walt Frazier was the only starter from the championship Knicks lineup Bradley didn't corral. Could he be a Gore man? In any event, this fundraiser hinted

at what might be Bradley's secret weapon: Michael Jordan. The world's most famous athlete has already contributed money to Bradley's campaign.

(Jackson, who coached Jordan on the Chicago Bulls, has been a lead money-chaser for Bradley.) But imagine the boost Bradley would receive if he gets Jordan out

on the court--that is, in a television ad or on the campaign trail. It's too

early for Bradley to play the J-card. He ought to wait until it is closer to

voting time to be seen with Jordan. Gore better get his game together by then.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kirsten Silva Gruesz <ksgruesz@cats.ucsc.edu> (Kirsten Silva Gruesz <ksgru

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUL-1999 01:38:02.00

SUBJECT: conspiracy comedy

TO: Ted Widmer (CN=Ted Widmer/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: seacortezreview@hotmail.com (seacortezreview@hotmail.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: flint@seanet.com (flint@seanet.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rberwick@minerva.cis.yale.edu (rberwick@minerva.cis.yale.edu [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 0063cgrue@umb.sky.cc.umb.edu (0063cgrue@umb.sky.cc.umb.edu [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jfd6m@virginia.edu (jfd6m@virginia.edu [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nwatzman@h2net.net (nwatzman@h2net.net [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

OK, you know I don't usually pass stuff along over the internet, but this is too good to keep to myself. It appeared in last Sunday's Mercury News, though it can't be found on their website. A bracing antidote to the media overkill...

=====

"A plot for Camelot" (Michael Lindsay)

JFK Jr. died on the third anniversary of the TWA Flight 800 crash, which also took place off the Long Island coast. As everyone knows, the government or some other operation shot down that 747 (never mind the NTSB's laughable "exploding center fuel tank" conclusion). And what airport had that doomed jet taken off from? John F. Kennedy International, of course--one of the New York's three major airports. JFK and TWA each are known by 3 initials. JFK Jr. was the third generation of Joseph Kennedy's clan to be active in public life. And three people were aboard that Piper Saratoga.

So if JFK represents three "threes" (initials, generations, people aboard) and TWA represents three threes (anniversary, airports, initials), put them together and -- stand clear--you have the Number of the Beast. The two symbolic shoot-downs add up to 666, an indisputable threat from the Anti-Christ.

Further: the numerals 666-1 (i.e., "I am the evil I") are 1999 inverted.

Further: Who is more clearly the antithesis of "the Beast" than the most

"Beautiful" man on the planet?

The TWA jet was shot down by a missile, we all know. And what was

JFK

Sr.'s most notable confrontation in office? The Cuban Missile Crisis, my children. Obviously, a missile with JFK Jr.'s name on it wreaked some terrible vengeance.

Who is the chief prophet of the TWA-shootdown theory? Pierre Salinger, of course. And what was Mr. Salinger's most notable job? Hint: It was in the early 60s. Another hint: It was in the White House. Yes! He was press secretary to President John F. Kennedy. He clearly has a covert mission to warn the Kennedys of danger. And just as clearly has failed.

There's more. JFK Jr. vanished the day before the 30th anniversary of the Chappaquidick Island debacle. Certain people have passionately hated Ted Kennedy since that day. Could revenge have been in the air?

And how about that moon shot? JFK Jr. vanished 30 years to the day after the "liftoff" of "Apollo 11," that government-created disinformation event that convinced gullible Americans that the United States actually won the "space race." Everyone knows the "lunar landing" was actually filmed inside a huge sound stage deep in the desert. JFK Jr. was just old enough to have heard Daddy talking about the government-planned deception--maybe he heard too much. The space race--please remember this-- was the very public creation of President John F. Kennedy.

Apollo 11's command module, named Columbia, was "piloted" by a Hollywood actor named Michael Collins. The space shuttle, which was to be "launched" on the 30th anniversary of the "lunar landing," is also named Columbia and is being commanded by Eileen Collins. "Columbia" is another name for "America."

The most famous Irish revolutionary was named Michael Collins. The Kennedy family is well known for meddling in Irish politics and is perhaps the best-known Irish-American family. Even now, Irish peace is crumbling for want of a powerful Irish leader.

The Kennedys are also referred to with eerie regularity as "America's royal family." The same anti-royalist elements who eliminated JFK and RFK and Michael Kennedy (the RFK son who "skied into a tree") --and who failed to kill Uncle Ted in that earlier airplane "accident" that broke his back-- are active in trying to exterminate the Kennedy bloodline altogether, before the true monarchs emerge from centuries of secrecy to rule first the United States and then a united Ireland. What better way than to eliminate the only surviving son of JFK, and his bride?

Further: JFK Jr.'s previous job was as a DA. In Ireland, "da" means father. Another clue to the once and future ruler.

The "moon shot" was the Kennedy bloodline's coded message that they were

born to rule the world. How better to define this aim than to use a rocket--not to exalt someone named John F. Kennedy, but to destroy him?

But who is behind this? And how much did JFK Jr. know about his own mission?

On the very day that JFK Jr.'s plane (a Piper Saratoga, named after a Revolutionary War battle that symbolized American freedom, thus was "flying" the flag of "freedom") was reported missing off the eastern end of Long Island, GOP Rep. Michael Forbes, who represents the eastern end of Long Island, abandoned the Republican Party, saying, and I quote, the GOP has become "a captive of extremists." This is a true fact!

Where might those extremists be? It's been right in front of the American

public's nose for years. Why do you think JFK Jr.'s money-losing magazine is still publishing with no visible means of support? And why do you think it's called "George"? (Forget that ridiculous cover story about it being named after George Washington. As if!)

The Kennedys are Harvard. Who, might I ask, represents Yale, the anti-Harvard? As in Skull and Bones Yale? As in Texas (Dealey Plaza) Yale grad? And which "George," having been robbed of the White House by a Kennedy liberal, is slouching toward the White House to be re-born?

JFK's "magazine" was no magazine at all: it was a covertly financed media assault weapon primed to open fire in the year of the millienium at George W. Bush, the crypto-Southerner whose father (a pilot who flew a plane called an Avenger) tried and failed to usher in the New World Order.

The sons took up the never-ending battle of the fathers, and this time

Yale has defeated Harvard, the Avenger has shot down Freedom, Texas has liquidated another Kennedy, the South has risen again and the Beast has conquered the Beauty.

It's all perfectly clear.

=====

Gosh, I wish I'd bought one of those Kennedy-Lincoln commemorative pennies they used to advertise in the backs of comic books when I was a kid. Or failing that, I wish I'd written this, instead of just reading it in the Mercury News ("Mercury" was the name of another "rocket" involved in the so-called "space race"). The Mercury News has been the centerpiece of the Knight-Ridder journalism empire (Knights of Camelot; "ridder" of evil, see?) since the decline of the Miami Herald. K-R (RFK backward, if you put "f-ing" in the middle, which many of us do) has relocated to San Jose. San Jose means "Saint Joseph" in the Catholic language, and I don't need to point out that the scion of the Kennedy empire was Joseph, a Catholic. As any reader of the New Yorker knows (JFK Jr. lived in New York!) the Miami Herald, a formerly liberal organ, was taken over by conservative Cuban interests epitomized by the late Jorge Mas Canosa. Jorge, as I don't need to remind you, means "George" in Spanish; "Mas Canosa" means "more BUSHy-haired" in that same language; and "Cuban" means "bad news" to all wishywashy Democrats. I need not mention to what family the current governor of Florida belongs. "Black Irish" is a term commonly applied to descendants of Spanish conquistadors who went the wrong way from the Azores and ended up in Ireland instead of Cuba. This is in fact a battle over the once and future *Spanish* empire.

And you wondered why George W. learned to say "Quiero ser su proximo presidente..."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Megan C. Moloney (CN=Megan C. Moloney/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUL-1999 07:28:42.00

SUBJECT: Talk Daily -- 7/28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Sharon Farmer (CN=Sharon Farmer/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: Victoria L. Valentine (CN=Victoria L. Valentine/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: Dorinda A. Salcido (CN=Dorinda A. Salcido/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: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP (LEAVY_D@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@EOP [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/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: Dominique L. Cano (CN=Dominique L. Cano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Camille Johnston (CN=Camille Johnston/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane (CN=Christopher S. Lehane/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Welcome to TALK DAILY, an online service of Talkers magazine.

Each weekday, TALK DAILY presents an overview of issues and quotes
excerpted from a cross-section of some of the leading
issues-oriented radio talk show hosts in America.

Rush Limbaugh
12-3pm (ET)
Radio Active Media - 550 Stations
ISSUE: Al Gore's Campaign
QUOTE:

RUSH: "Now, this little story here that I'm telling you about now the Al Gore campaign talks about how he's being overshadowed by George W. Bush, but that's really not his problem right now. His problem right now is he's being overshadowed by Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton won't even let him go to funerals. That's what vice presidents do. Clinton is so reluctant to have that spotlight shine on anybody else, 'cause he's busy building a legacy, he's got a lot of stuff to overcome. That...I mean re-introduce the Vice President, for crying out loud. This guy's going to have to be reborn before he's re-introduced at the rate they're keeping him in the background. I mean you have to wonder just how badly does Clinton really want Gore to be elected? And it's going to be interesting to see as all of this plays out, just how Clinton will get off the stage as we get closer to the real 2000 Presidential campaign season. Ahh...I for one will be watching extremely closely. Now, back to the President. This is interesting, it's amazing, and of course, is going to be a fun thing to follow and see how this, not only plays out, but how it's reacted to."

Don Imus
5:30-10am (ET)
Infinity - Westwood One
ISSUE: Ratings
QUOTES:
IMUS: "So what, ah...so we have this 'Washington Post'

article this morning we've been talking about."
CHUCK: "Yeah..."
IMUS: "Which, essentially...I guess the new Arbitron Ratings came out in Washington, and they indicate that...umm...our audience is...we are not...we're not among the top rated there in Washington, but our audience is."
CHUCK: "Ummhmm..."
IMUS: "Which has always been the case."
CHUCK: "Absolutely, I mean that's, that's..."
IMUS: "How ever long we've been on it in Washington...I mean...why this

is suddenly news, or....I don't know."
CHUCK: "Well, I think it's just...ah...I guess it's just struck somebody as interesting. The, ah, the level of the...ahh... the Imus audience, and the enthusiasm exhibited there by, for this program among a certain kind of a power elite."
IMUS: "In that it doesn't represent a mass audience."
CHUCK: "Yeah, it's not...just not huge numbers, but ahh..."
IMUS: "But it makes a lot of money for these various radio stations".

Howard Stern
6-10am (ET)
Infinity - Westwood One
ISSUE: Autographs at the Airport
QUOTES:
HOWARD: "Sometimes when I go to the airport, these guys literally...what they do is they go through the computer, they find out when you're flying. So you get out of your car, and you know how the airport is, anybody that has ever been to the airport, it's very confusing."
ROBIN: "Right."
HOWARD: "You gotta...you know...you want to make sure your luggage is getting on, you want to tip the guy who's giving the...so you try to..."
ROBIN: "Yeah, you're trying to get some business done."
HOWARD: "Yeah, and you want to make sure that...uhh...you, you, you know, it's always a nightmare at the airport. Anybody who goes to the airport knows that. So you get out, and there's these guys who are professional autograph guys."
ROBIN: "Ummhmm."
HOWARD: "And what they do is they take your...you can tell they're professionals because you've seen them in a million places; they have these pictures of you that...uhh...I don't know where they get □+ em. But you can tell they're eight by tens..."
ROBIN: "They're ready."
HOWARD: "They're ready and they want you to sign..."
ROBIN: "It's not the casual autograph."
HOWARD: "Yeah, they want to...they're all ready to have you sign. Okay, so I go...and if you stop for five seconds a mob forms."
ROBIN: "Yeah."
HOWARD: "And the same thing happens in the L.A. airport, even worse."
JACKIE: "And you're eventually gonna have to walk away

and leave

somebody unhappy anyway."

ROBIN: "You've gotta catch a plane..."

say....I'll sign a few

HOWARD: "So my attitude is, I see a bunch a guys...I

wants to make a

things, why not, okay I don't care what a guy...a guy

grateful somebody wants

living with my...I don't care if he does...I'm...I'm

three or four. I thinks

my autograph, fine. I'm glad I'm popular. So I'll sign

that's reasonable."

you sign one

ROBIN: "And I do notice that a lot of these people have

autograph."

thing after another. It's not like they want one

four things,

HOWARD: "Well yeah, let me tell you. So you sign three or

they're

and then all of the sudden someone goes, 'hey man,' and

got a sick mother,'

professionals at it. They start telling you 'you know I

not...I'm not a

and you know it's bull...you know, 'hey man, this is

professional...' so, I'm down trying to get my plane..."

start to travel

ROBIN: "And sometimes it's posters..."

HOWARD: "Yeah, and the guy travels with you. Now they

with you like a pack."

ROBIN: "Right. And you're still signing."

HOWARD: "I'm still signing. I'll sign..."

ROBIN: "As you walk, as you walk."

some point...then I

HOWARD: "I'm not trying to be a dick about it , but at

they never stop, they

turn to the at some point and I go, 'hey man...', and

have fifty things."

You're not, 'oh hi,

ROBIN: "But you don't have a conversation with them.

how are you,' and 'what are you doing...'"

have time.

HOWARD: "R-right, well I'm in a rush. You know, I don't

So..."

ROBIN: "Well, you're no Gary Oldman."

what, it's

HOWARD: "Right, Gary Oldman, obviously....and you know

like Big Bird

very hard to recognize Gary Oldman. You see me, I look

walking through the airport."

G. Gordon Liddy

12-3pm (ET)

Westwood One-275 Stations

ISSUE: Freak Lawnmower Explosion

QUOTES:

His lawnmower

LIDDY: "An Alabama man has died in a bizarre accident.

folks. The coroner

blew up and killed him instantly. I'm not making this up

in Walker County says James Mc Connely put gas into his

rider mower
later the mower
the roof on
away in
explosion. There's
federal agents are
little gas in a, in a gas tank.
Mr. Mc
I'll have to see
ahh, remind me

yesterday, then got on and drove a few feet. Moments
exploded. The coroner says pieces of the mower landed on
Mc Connely's home in North Jasper, and up to 100 feet
neighbors' yards. He says people a mile away heard the
no word on the cause of the explosion, but police and
investigating. Yeah, that's quite a blast for just a
Jeese. Oh boy. You can just imagine what happened to poor
Connely. He's was sitting on it and just, boom. You know.
the follow up on that, find out what happened. Meanwhile,
not to cut the lawn."

Radio

Neal Boortz
News Talk 750 WSB, Atlanta and National Syndication - Cox
Network
ISSUE: The Panama Canal
QUOTE:
"You've heard me and some listeners making references to
a takeover of
deal. Believe
characters to contend
easy to understand form
signed a treaty with
which we agreed to
1995 there was
presence in the Canal
of 1999. Time to
granted a lease to
Hutchison
Pacific side. Panama
operate the port
Atlantic side. Panama has
control the
the pilots who will

the Panama Canal by the Communist Chinese. So, what's the
me, it gets a bit complicated. There's quite a cast of
with. I will try, though, to put the basics in a clear,
here. First □) you do realize that the United States
Panama in 1977, during the Carter Administration, in
give the Panama Canal to Panama at the end of 1999. In
some talk of developing a plan for continued military
Zone --- but nothing ever came of it. Well, it's the end
hand it over. Now we get to the leases. Panama has
operate the port facilities in Balboa to a company called
Whampoa Ltd. Balboa is the canal's only port on the
has also granted a lease to Hutchison Whampoa Ltd. to
facilities at Cristobal □) the primary port on the
also reportedly granted a right to Hutchison Whampoa to
anchorage on both ends of the canal, and to hire all of

Insight Magazine also reports that Hutchison Whampoa has the right to block all passage through the canal that interferes with the company's business. Three years ago William Hughes, the U.S. Ambassador to Panama, strongly protested these leases. The result? Bill Clinton tried to replace him with one of the architects of the original giveaway and a strong supporter of left-wing causes. Jesse Helms shot that one down. Hutchison Whampoa, by the way, is based in Hong Kong. It's Chairman, Li Ka-shing, is a power broker with the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Let's just cut to the chase and say that the Chinese Communist Government exercises operational control of Hutchison Whampoa."

Janet Parshall's America
Salem Radio Network
ISSUE: Prenuptial Agreements
QUOTE:
"After marriage, more couples are signing agreements that spell out the details of a divorce. Although prenuptial agreements are accepted by virtually every state, □+postnuptial' agreements are not so widely recognized. Some courts and lawmakers are standing up against postnuptial agreements as coercive to women, who have much more to lose after marriage. One divorce lawyer says postnuptial agreements are □+useful for people who want some certainty in their lives,' but he may find them useful for certainty in his livelihood. Did they give Francesca Pacelli □+certainty'?

She and her then-husband married in 1975. In 1985, Mr. Pacelli drew up an agreement that, in the event of a divorce, would provide Mrs. Pacelli with \$500,000 but no alimony. Against her attorney's advice, she signed it. Mr. Pacelli filed for divorce, but an appeals court didn't uphold the agreement, noting that refusing to sign it would cost Mrs. Pacelli □+the destruction of a family and the stigma of a failed marriage.' Mr. Pacelli protested, saying, □+When two people who are well-represented sign a document, it should be upheld.' Upholding the holy

covenant of marriage
requires that we disdain such less-than-divine
agreements."

KALEIDOSCOPE

with Bob Witkowski

1310 KXAM, Phoenix

ISSUE: Secret Society of Happiness

QUOTE:

BOB: "I think we've finally gone over the edge. Yes
indeed. I watched
CNN interview a Pam Johnson, chair of the Secret Society
of Happiness.
She's petitioned all 50 governors to establish a National
Right to be Happy
Day. Her society, which isn't so secret anymore, I guess,
feels that we've
become too uncivil, and too preoccupied with death, fear,
and anger.
Okay. I have no argument with that, but somehow a
proclamation to
□+Have A Nice Day' is pretty funny. Very Californian.
Actually, very funny.
So, I give up. I'm happy now that I've made fun of her
Secret Society of
Happiness. Way to go Pam!"

Tomm Looney

KLSX/Los Angeles

ISSUE: Ted Kennedy

QUOTE: Tomm: "I am happy that people have come to realize
that
Senator Ted Kennedy, a man whom I worked for at one time,
is a man of
great dignity who has gone through a hell of a lot. He's
not just a punchline
for Rush Limbaugh, the Simpsons or Jay Leno. He's
actually a person with
tremendous family values who has suffered a lot. If you
won't take my
words, take Dan Quayle's. He says the same thing in his
book, Standing
Firm. I also think it's great all the extra efforts and
tax dollars spent to find
JFK, Jr. I find that people who bitch about the coverage
and the tax
dollars spent are usually ignorant of history, and the
type of person who
finds themselves at the DMV, on the bus, or on the
treadmill at the gym
preferring to stare coma-like into space, rather than read
a book or a
newspaper.
I was born after JFK was President, but fortunately I've

always had an appreciation for history. Few seemed to care or remember that JFK Jr. lost a father, in a grotesque shooting, amid rumors of conspiracy, while his dad was in voluntary and ultimate service to his country. Therefore, we, the country, owed his father, the great visionary President John F. Kennedy, and his boy, JFK Jr., this differential treatment. A real national debt was paid by searching, recovering and scattering JFK, Jr.'s remains from the deck of a naval vessel under the same Navy flag at sea -- that great Navy flag that his war-hero father who lived in constant pain due to war injuries -- John F. Kennedy -- served under for our country."

The Group Room
KRLA Los Angeles and National Syndication
Sunday July 25, 1999
Hosted by Selma R. Schimmel
ISSUE: Reaching Out to African American Women with Breast

Cancer

On Sunday, July 25th, The Group Room hosted a live remote broadcast, in association with Los Angeles affiliate LA Talk 1110AM, from the House of Blues in Los Angeles. This special broadcast was to help launch the Denise Roberts Foundation for Minority Women Fighting Breast Cancer.

Host Selma Schimmel and guest physician Dr. Otis Brawley, medical oncologist and director of the National Cancer Institutes Office of Special Populations Research, discuss the importance of educating and creating positive role models for women of color and all women when it comes to their breast health.

Dr. Otis:
"Be a woman black, be she white, be she native-american, asian, hispanic...we all need to see women who have breast cancer who have battled this and who have succeeded. We all need role models.... be they rich or poor... of whatever race, who come forward and say 'I had this problem I took care of it and I succeeded'. That way many

women who have the problem will get rid of this... this fatalism
and go forth and succeed as well.

Later in the show Selma reads a poem from a book compiled
by photo-journalist Melissa Springer: "Breast Cancer
Survivors: a Tribe of Warrior Women"

Selma:
"A tribe of warrior women who destroyed one of their
breasts to increase their accuracy with the javelin and the bow....women who
knew that to survive, the aim of the arrow must be precise. Thousands
of women who are members of a fierce tribe of survivors. These
warriors...these breast cancer survivors... have found weapons to fight and
survive this dreaded disease: faith, courage, community, science, rage,
education and power."

Selma's comments continue: "And those last words: faith,
courage, community, science, rage, education, and power... must
resonate within a community if we can create change and inspire thinking
and reach out to newer levels of education."

JIM WALSH
REAL RADIO Saturdays 6-8pm
WMVB AM1440
Millville-Vineland, NJ
ISSUE: Bruce Springsteen
QUOTE:

right mind Jim: Would somebody mind telling me why anyone in their
up mediocrity would shell out a couple of hundred bucks to see a washed
overrated like Bruce Springsteen? This guy has got to be the most
performer in America. What is he but a Jersey bar-band
singer with delusions of being Woody Guthrie? I wouldn't walk accross
the street to see this guy. Furthermore, I'd lock the door and hide the
key in the one place he'd never find it - under a bar of soap...

GROOVY BABY: "I feel like Austin Powers in some kinda

sixties

concert at

time-warp this week; the three big stories are about a Woodstock, a new Kubrick film, and a dead Kennedy."

Monday July 26:

Rush Limbaugh
12-3pm (ET)
Radio Active Media - 550 Stations
ISSUE: Bill Clinton's Legacy
QUOTE:

Rush: "The President of the United States, Bill Clinton, just will not leave the stage--so consumed with his legacy, so consumed with building a legacy that can trump the impeachment and the year and a half that was the Lewinsky scandal. He will not leave the stage and therefore will not cede any traditional role for Vice Presidents to his Vice President, Al Gore. And now, it's really--I keep thinking I cannot be surprised anymore but I am continually shocked. The President has now taken to calling himself □+the Michael Jordan of politics,' but he says it's not him that came up with that, the Republicans are doing that. He said the Republicans are basically saying, □+Oh well, Bill Clinton's like Michael Jordan, he just jumps higher than the other guys.' This was a statement made to some very well-off Democrats Saturday at a picnic in Aspen. More of the President: □+The Republicans, after telling everyone for six-and-a-half years what a bad guy I was, are now looking forward to the time 18 months from now when I leave office,' Clinton said of himself. □+The Republicans figure that at that point, Clinton's gone so we'll put Democrats in the cellar again.' Clinton made a similar speech and a similar reference to Michael Jordan Friday night during a fundraising stop in Cincinnati. He paraphrased Republican thinking this way: □+Clinton's like Michael Jordan--he jumps higher than the other Democrats now, but the natural order of things will reassert itself and we Republicans will rule America again.' Clinton later told reporters that one of his Republican friends had made the Jordan analogy, he of course would never, ever be so presumptuous as to make such a comparison. No, I probably agree with that. If the President were gonna compare himself to a basketball star it'd obviously be Dennis Rodman."

Don Imus

5:30-10am (ET)

Infinity - Westwood One

ISSUE: Kennedy Tragedy and Media Greed

QUOTE:

Walter Cronkite (impersonation): "And we're reporting to you today from the morgue of the Massachusetts Medical Examiner, the most appropriate setting we could think of for perplexion on the cable television news networks that dominated coverage of last week's Kennedy story-- principally, CNN and MSNBC. We've chosen to title today's essay 'Diving for Dollars,' for never have so many fed on the remains of so few to stir up a little activity in the 'Accounts Receivable' department. No, there weren't just the occasional mollusk and spiny urchin down there with John, Carolyn and Lauren, there were sharks and lamprey eels, quite literally bottom-feeders smelling the sweet aroma of income-enhanced dividends of the dead. Pathetic. Permit me please, the dictionary definition of the lamprey eel--see if this doesn't sound familiar, and I quote--'any of various primitive elongated fishes characteristically having a jawless, sucking mouth with a rasping tongue.' Familiar? Of course. Rick Kaplan, President of CNN, who certainly is not without his counterparts at MSNBC and the debacle called FOX. For what was the Kennedy calamity to these individuals? No, not cash on the barrel head, cash on the casket lid! Indeed, one can only imagine the anguish and hand wringing around the old network sales departments when the search for the wreckage and victims concluded after mere days, rather than weeks, which they clearly would have actually preferred, in order that they might peddle to their tragedy-augmented audiences a few more Garden Weasels, another half-dozen gross 'Best of Zamfir' CD collections, and a couple more George Foreman Fat-Reduced Hamburger Fryers. The cameras were everywhere, the boom microphones ready to pounce on the most ancillary sound bite. Dazed-looking citizens who couldn't spell Kennedy suddenly were anointed 'life-long friends' if they'd even seen the guy at some point in the past a half-block away on his roller blades. Camera crews set up ambushes in the bushes near Caroline's house until the photo lenses stuck their avaricious snouts into every Kennedy corner possible. Sniffing out the story? No, we knew the story well enough. Turning bodies into

bucks? Precisely, by manufacturing a story so that the 24 hour tapeworm that is cable news would have its appetite satisfied by an invasion of privacy matched only Bill and Hillary Clinton's shameless exploitation of the Kennedy memorial service, to which they invited themselves. Amazing, I thought, that she wasn't wearing a Yankees hat as she waddled into the church with the TV cameras grinding away, waiting for the next computer-generated commercial break to sell another miracle scratch-remover. Pitiful."

Doug Stephan ands Ellen Ratner
Good Day
4-10am (ET)
Radio America-175 Stations
ISSUE: HMO Reform
GUEST: Peter Johnson, Legal Analyst
QUOTES:

Doug: "The latest from the world of HMOs..Have you studied, by the way, the Senate plan that was passed last week?"
Peter: "I haven't studied it but I looked at it."
Doug: "Yeah, what'd you think?"
Peter: "It's better than what we have."
Doug: "It is?"
Peter: "Yeah."
Doug: "But who benefits?"
Ellen: "But they're saying, Peter, that so few people really are under that clause, less than 2% of the people."
Peter: "Well, then 2% of the people are better off."
Doug: "Really? So all the hoopla about the way the Senate and the House are gonna fix the problem, all that hoopla, for just 2% of the population?"
Peter: "The issue is that was better than the fix itself. That way the Democrats can say the Republicans have withheld it, the Republicans can say that we did the plan and the Democrats are so beholden to the trial lawyers that they can't stomach it, and so everybody has an issue to pick on each other about and so the net is, as you folks point out, it affects 2% of the people that.."
Doug: "So isn't it--maybe the bottom line here legally is, that this bill that was passed is going to do nothing really to fix the number of suits that are being brought against the HMOs and health providers in general who are--the insurance companies too--who are denying treatments to people because arbitrarily they cut the thing at whatever--36 hours for a pregnancy?"
Peter: "I don't think you're ever gonna have a system where lawsuits are gonna be free and clear in terms of suing the HMOs about every decision that they make"

because then you'd have lawsuits about □+Well, I wanted Tylenol--my Tylenol with codeine and they wouldn't pay for it and they'd only pay \$10 of it' and it will go on forever, so there's gotta be some limitation to it, but I think it will turn out to be more expansive than it is now, but it's gonna take some time."

Howard Stern
6-10am (ET)
Infinity - Westwood One
ISSUE: Howard's Awestruck Fan
QUOTES:

Howard: "Misty, what is it, you're on the air."

Caller: "Oh my God Howard, I just love you."

Howard: "Thank you."

Caller: "Oh my God, I cannot believe I am talking to

Howard Stern!"

Howard: "Oh, there you go, Robin."

Caller: "Oh my God."

Howard: "Mmm hmm. It's alright, I'm a great man, there's no reason you shouldn't

be feeling these things."

Caller: "I just love you. I love you, I cannot believe it."

Howard: "See Robin, this is how you should talk to me in the morning."

Robin: "I feel that way, I just can't express it."

Howard: "Feel free to gush."

Caller: "Ahh...Oh my God, my boyfriend's never gonna believe this, he loves you so much."

Howard: "And of course, if I asked you for sex, you'd give it to me."

Caller: "Uhh... (laughing) probably!"

Howard: "Even with the boyfriend."

G. Gordon Liddy
12-3pm (ET)
Westwood One-275 Stations
ISSUE: Rap Music
QUOTES:

Caller: "It appears to me, talking to a lot of white Americans, that they feel threatened, or uncomfortable with rap music because they feel like it's violent and it's a bad thing. I wanted to know from you, why do you think that is?"

Liddy: "I don't think it's that, I think they are uncomfortable with it. But I think it is a cultural thing. It is so alien to their culture that they don't understand it at all, they don't see how anybody could possibly listen to it, and they feel that it's something

that separates blacks from whites. There's a number of things that are that way, but

I want you to understand that isn't a 100 percent thing. For example, I doubt very much that Thomas Soul listens to rap music and he

probably is just as
uncomfortable with it as some white person would be
because it's a cultural thing,
as he is a highly educated person who is fully integrated
into the culture of the
United States. It's sort of as if every person of Italian
extraction in the United
States was going around with one of those music boxes
they used to have on the
streets and going (does impression of music box) with
that Italian music all the time
and people would look at them like, what is the matter
with these people? Well,
that's kinda the way the whites look at the rap thing,
they're just like, □+what's the
matter with these people?' It's cultural, that's all it
is. You know why? Because,
you know, you talk about gangsta rap and it's so
dangerous well of course, what it
says, you know? White people don't know that it's gangsta
rap, they can't
understand it! It's gibberish to them! You know what it
is to a white person? It's
[speaks nonsensical words]! They don't know what it
means! They might be saying
prayers! They wouldn't know!"

Neal Boortz
News Talk 750 WSB, Atlanta and National Syndication - Cox

Radio Network

ISSUE: Kennedy Outrages

QUOTE:

"Ohhhhhhh ... the hate mail. You wouldn't believe the
nasty e-mail I got over the
weekend from people who didn't like my remarks on the
Kennedy tragedy. Most
were outraged that I questioned the propriety of the
taxpayers forking over nearly
one-half million dollars for the burial at sea ---
especially when war veterans can't
even get a damned bugle player for their funerals. One of
the letters is in my
Listener e-mail section below. The media overplay from
last week on the Kennedy
situation is still fresh in my mind. I guess I am so
outraged because I know what
would happen if the media were to spend this much time on
issues that really
matter to the American people. I won't go into that song
and dance routine again
here --- I just want to cover a few more outrages from
last week. First we have
the □+News for Kids' column by Bill Hendrick in last
Friday's Atlanta Constitution.
In that column we learned that JFK Jr. was our □+hope for
the future.' Say what?
We're telling our kids that their hope for the future
lied in John Jr.? We taught our

daughter that her hope for the future lied in her education, her character, her willingness to work hard to achieve her goals and her determination to use her power of choice wisely. Then the Constitution told our kids that dying of a drug overdose is just bad luck. Yes, that's right. The □+News for Kids' story said that two of Joseph Kennedy's grandchildren had a lot of bad luck. □+One was killed almost two years ago when he plowed into a tree while skiing. Another died of a drug overdose.' So, we want to teach out kids that if you take illegal drugs and die of an overdose it's just □+bad luck?' I'd put it more into the category of poor decision making myself. Hendrick also told the kids that Joseph Kennedy, Junior's grandfather, made his money selling candy and newspapers. Somehow he forgot to mention the bootlegging."

Les Kinsolving
WCBM, 680 AM, Baltimore
ISSUES: WCBM and the Hadassah Protest
QUOTE:

"Delegates to the annual national convention of Hadassah arrived at the Washington Hilton Hotel Sunday afternoon and found a picket line of Jewish demonstrators covering both sides of the hotel and carrying signs such as □+HADASSAH:HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN YOU'RE A ZIONIST WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION'? The demonstrators, who came from New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington, spent three hours in 95 degree heat to protest the action of 62 Hadassah directors who voted to give the 300,000-member organization's highest award to Hillary Rodham Clinton. □+HEY, HEY; HO, HO--HILL SUPPORTS THE P.L.O.' they chanted, carrying other signs: □+HADASSAH--HAMAS(AH)' and □+RIGHTS? VALUES? HILLARY CLINTON ACCEPTS A SEX PREDATOR!' The overreaction to this demonstration, from Hadassah public relations director Roberta Elliott and her aide Lauren Galfond, clearly illustrated Hadassah's painful embarrassment. Leo Samit of Silver Spring, Md., told WCBM that when he went into the lobby of the Hilton to offer leaflets to incoming delegates, he was told by security police to leave the hotel. WCBM, which displayed press credentials as well as visible microphone tag, went to the Hilton lobby and then to Concourse One, where delegates were registering. There were no signs or security police to advise news media that this concourse was controlled by Hadassah. After a consensual

interview with an Hadassah delegate from Silver Spring, WCBM was confronted by a man in civilian clothes claiming to be a security policeman--but unwilling to display any credentials except one quarter of an inch of a card with a long number. This unidentified person ordered WCBM to leave the hotel. When asked why he was concealing almost all of his credentials he replied angrily: "That's all you need to see!"--while repeating his order to leave the hotel. When we declined to leave on the order of this unidentified civilian, he returned accompanied by two uniformed private police, and the three of them proceeded to escort WCBM to the hotel door."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUL-1999 11:10:42.00

SUBJECT: CNN Larry King, July 27, 1999

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TC: Michele Ballantyne (CN=Michele Ballantyne/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TC: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erica S. Lepping (CN=Erica S. Lepping/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 (Saladbar 23 <saladbar23 @ hotmail.com> @ inet [UNKNOW

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/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: Brenda M. Anders (CN=Brenda M. Anders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/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: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:
Larry King Live
Aired July 27, 1999 - 9:00 p.m. ET

Ann Richards Gives a "Lone Star" Perspective on the
World of Politics

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight, she's no longer in politics,
but she still shakes things up: the always colorful, never boring
former governor of Texas -- Ann Richards for the full hour next on LARRY KING
LIVE.

So much to talk about, so little time. The governor of
Texas, who once hosted LARRY KING LIVE -- former Texas governor in the
practice of law now and looking terrific. Lots of things to talk
about. Let's get right to it.
Where were you when you heard about the John Kennedy
Jr...

FORMER GOV. ANN RICHARDS (D), TEXAS: I was here in my
condo in Washington, and I had heard the night before. I was
flying in. I was going to that White House dinner for Barak. And so I came in
town for that, and I heard about it. And I was just stunned at how
desperately sad I felt about it.

KING: Did you know him?

RICHARDS: I didn't. I had a telephone conversation with
him about a year ago.

KING: About?

RICHARDS: He called. Well, he -- he was interested in
having a column of political humor, and he thought maybe I'd be interested
in writing that.

KING: You weren't?

RICHARDS: No. I -- no. That's not my talent.

KING: Could have been right up your alley though?

RICHARDS: It would have been right up my alley, but I didn't want the discipline of having to do it. I'm already overbooked, you know? And I loved getting to talk to him.

He -- he was a link for us, you know? He was -- he was kind of like a continuity between our years. You know, my husband and I -- my ex-husband and I worked here when his daddy was -- was the president. We moved to Washington, and I wrote Mrs. Kennedy a note. And I said, "My daughter, Cecile (ph), really wants to play with your kids." KING:

Really?

RICHARDS: Yes, because I kept telling Cecile they weren't going to let us come over to the White House and play with Caroline and John-John.

KING: Were you in Dallas when his father was killed?

RICHARDS: I was. I was waiting at the luncheon.

KING: You were at the luncheon?

RICHARDS: I was, where he was to arrive. It was...

KING: That famous luncheon that never came off?

RICHARDS: It was the awfulest day. And you know, one thing they don't talk about, Larry: We were sitting there at that luncheon. It was a peculiar hall. It was about three or four stories high on the inside, and there were birds that were loose in it, parakeets or something for decoration.

And when I went in that hall, I thought, oh, my god, these birds, you know, they're going to mess all over my food and all of these people here. There were people that had radios with them. This was before the days of the little cassette things, and they had brought these radios, and they were listening to the motorcade approaching -- approaching the hall. And that's what -- and the word started going out that John Connally had been shot. But then, of course, it was the president.

KING: Why do you think this fascination with John Jr.? He held no office.

RICHARDS: They -- you know, he was beautiful. We liked to look at him.

KING: We like the Kennedys?

RICHARDS: We like the -- we like the family. We feel like they're a part of our family. We know their kids, their aunts, their uncles. They're news-makers. They're in our living rooms on the televisions just like you are, you know.

KING: Did you object at all to the media coverage? Some people thought it was too much.

RICHARDS: Well, yes, it was too much, but I also know that the media has got to report something to pay their bills. And now the whole media notion is that they kind of get on one subject and they stay on it and don't get off of it.

KING: Would he have been a good politician, do you think?

RICHARDS: Oh, there's no question about that. Been fabulous, yes. KING: But he was not interested. That's what he told us. Maybe it would have when he got into his 40s?

RICHARDS: Well, he said he thought it was something that you did when you got older. And maybe that's the case. But he didn't seem like that's what he wanted to do.

KING: He spoke at the same convention that you keynoted, right?

RICHARDS: He spoke at the convention where I was the chairman.

KING: That's right -- 1988.

RICHARDS: Yes, in New York. And he was terrific. '88's the one in Atlanta where I made the keynote speech.

KING: He spoke at the one in...

RICHARDS: He spoke at the one in New York, which was four years later.

KING: '92?

RICHARDS: '92, yes.

KING: And you didn't meet him there?

RICHARDS: No, I didn't.

KING: Chairman of the convention didn't meet one of the speakers.

RICHARDS: You know, yes, but there's always so much stuff going on. There's so many people coming on and retreating and all that.

KING: What do you make of the women in the family coming forward now? We're going to replay on Saturday night our interviews with Maria Shriver, with Caroline...

RICHARDS: Yes. She's good.

KING: ... the lieutenant governor of Maryland.

RICHARDS: Right.

KING: Do you think she's got a big future?

RICHARDS: I think she has a very big future. I think Kathleen is terrific. She's smart. She's canny. She likes government. She likes governing.

You know, there's a difference between people who run for office. Some people like the running and the others like the governing. And when you find that magical combination where they like both -- and I think Kathleen has that.

KING: Were you a liker of both?

RICHARDS: Yes, I was.

KING: Do you miss being governor?

RICHARDS: No. Not for a second.

KING: Not for a second?

RICHARDS: Not for a second. And maybe I was motivated by the wrong -- by the wrong things. You know, I -- I didn't grow up at a time where I was supposed to be in a job like governor. That was a different generation, you know?

KING: And there was never going to be a lady governor of Texas?

RICHARDS: No, of course not.

KING: We're going to take a break. And when we come back, we're going to talk about the most talked about politician in America, a man the governor knows pretty well. He defeated her for the governorship. He's way out in front, is favored to be the nominee of his party and the next president. And a lot of people don't know much about him. Governor Richards does.

We're going to talk about George W. Bush, right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, OCTOBER 21, 1994)

RICHARDS: I appreciate the fact that Mr. Bush sincerely does want to do everything for our kids, as I do. But he's going to have to tell you how he's going to pay the tab. He's going to have to tell you which tax he is going to increase or which tax he's going to institute.

GEORGE W. BUSH (R), CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR: I intend to change how we fund the school system by determining what the mission is, the cost per pupil necessary to achieve the mission and to use my leadership skills to make sure that Texans understand that public school children is the No. 1 funding priority.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: By the way, there was lady governor of Texas, and we're going to ask Ann Richards to tell about her a little later in the program. And we also, of course, have an open invitation to Governor George W. Bush to appear on this program.

All right. What was he like?

I was having dinner tonight with William Safire, and he was fascinated to hear this. And if Safire is fascinated, we all are.

RICHARDS: Yes. KING: And what was he like to debate?

RICHARDS: Well, it wasn't, as I recall, much of a debate in reality. And I don't mean that snidely or unkindly. I think that the talent that George Bush

has -- and I say this with real respect -- is that rather than tell you the intricacies of what he knows or what he intends to do, he is very good at saying things that are rather all- encompassing. You know, if you -- if you said to George, "What time is it?" he would say, we must teach our children to read.

KING: Do you mean that as a compliment?

RICHARDS: I am saying it as a compliment. He is very disciplined, and he knows what his message is, and he's going to give you that message no matter what.

KING: Did that make it, therefore, difficult to debate him?

RICHARDS: Yes, it's difficult to debate him, and it's difficult to engage.

KING: Because he -- you won't pin him into a specific.

RICHARDS: And -- and it's because the -- the answer is -- is -- you already know what it is. And I must say, to my own detriment, that I'm the type, you ask me what time it is, and I'm going to tell you the history of the clock and how to make it.

KING: What -- therefore, he's going to be a tough customer?

RICHARDS: Oh, I think he's going to run, yes, a very tough race.

KING: Do you think he's going to be the Republican nominee?

RICHARDS: No doubt about it. And I'll tell you that because they're not going to nominate any of the rest of those people. He really has no opposition.

KING: And do you agree that he'll be the favorite?

RICHARDS: Oh, I think unquestionably.

KING: Why are people giving him so much money without specifics?

RICHARDS: Well, tell you the truth is, I think the Republicans think they own the presidency. I think they've been furious the whole time Bill Clinton

had that, and they thought, by gosh, that belongs to us and that guy has no right to be there. And I think that they see in Bush, young, attractive, easy name I.D., second generation, good family, and, yes, he's just -- the money is going to pour in. It poured in when I ran against him.

KING: He raised a lot against you, too.

RICHARDS: Oh, yes.

KING: Would you have run differently if you had to turn the clock back?

RICHARDS: I don't think I knew how, to tell you the truth. I had always run from behind. I had never run ahead. And I'll tell you what the issue was, or what I was defeated over, and that was guns. I was against concealed weapons. I still think it's insane that we allow people to put guns in their pockets and walk down the street.

KING: But a majority of Texans didn't agree with you?

RICHARDS: But a majority of Texans did not agree, and George Bush was, you know, four square in favor of concealed weapons.

KING: Didn't you though in '94 raise about the same amount of money or him, or did he outspend you? Ross Perot even attributed it to you.

RICHARDS: I can't complain about money. I raised plenty of money. I think if I had run the campaign as well as I ran the first one, I would have given him a better race, but I would not have won. You remember that was year that the Republicans and Newt Gingrich's contract on America swept everything, and I don't think I would have won.

KING: What would you say to Vice President Gore to Senator Bradley if they asked your advice? Let's say they're about to restart this race; they're going into a debate with him. What would you say?

RICHARDS: Well, I wouldn't pay any attention to the opponent. I would tell them, number one, get a message, and number two, light a fire.

KING: Don't run against him?

message is, RICHARDS: No, get your message out there, whatever that
what you're going to and tell the American people not what you've done but
what I'd tell him. do, and do it with some passion and some fervor, that's

defensive? KING: In debate, would you try to force him to be

the people have RICHARDS: No, I'd let him be who he's going to be. And
to make up their mind based on that.

He's very KING: Now I know him pretty well as a baseball owner.
sociable.

RICHARDS: Yes, sociable guy.

KING: Likable.

you know, arms RICHARDS: Really good, kind of gets up around you and,
around the back.

KING: Is that Clintonesque in a way?

like... RICHARDS: No, it's Lyndonesque. KING: Oh, explain. More

the arm right RICHARDS: Oh, you know, how Lyndon used to get you by
here and arm around here, and he whispers in your ear
how's your mama and all of them? That kind of wonderful personal
approach, and by the time he got through, you gave him whatever he wanted.

KING: How good a governor is he, honestly?

governor, and RICHARDS: Well, I have never talked about George as a
suspect, because I am here's, Larry: I am biased. No matter what I say it is
because George not going to think George Bush has done a great of job
Bush doesn't do what I would have done.

KING: You can't be objective?

RICHARDS: Yes, no, I can't be objective.

overcoming difficulties. He KING: You both, though, have one similar thing,
had a drinking problem that he overcame...

RICHARDS: Evidently, yes.

KING: ... and he admits it. You had one, and you admit it.

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: Does that kind of you an at least kindred feeling toward him of overcoming a victory?

RICHARDS: Well, sure, I am glad he did. I am very happy he did.

KING: Because that's not an easy thing to do.

RICHARDS: But I also think that overcoming your difficulty means that when you have the opportunity and you are in a position of power and responsibility where you can do something about other people's addictions, you do that. I would like it very much if we still had the aggressive programs that I put in place in the prison system, so that when you were a drunk or an addict, you didn't get back out on the street until you went through treatment.

KING: Do you like the idea of compassionate conservatism? Do you think that's an effective term?

RICHARDS: Well, I think its' what Ronald Reagan started out trying to do. I don't think that the church and government are the same thing. I think the government has responsibilities that the church doesn't have, and I think that the church has responsibilities government doesn't have.

KING: Isn't that what he's saying?

RICHARDS: No, he's really not. Everything I have read, what that means is that you're supposed to take the money of the government and give it to churches to do the programs, and I just couldn't disagree more.

KING: But something -- you agree that he's a big favorite, he's going to win his primaries and he's going to be favored to win it all.

RICHARDS: Absolutely.

KING: Will he have coattails, too?

RICHARDS: I don't know. We'll have to wait and see. I think that this

Congress is really troublesome. I think the Republican majority in the House and the Senate, they're like the dog that caught the truck. They got that thing and have no idea what in the world to do with it.

KING: I love your expressions.

We'll be back with more of Governor Richards. Lots to talk about. This is LARRY KING LIVE. We of course will be including your phone calls.

Tomorrow night, Imus.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, JULY 18, 1988)

RICHARDS: Poor George.

(LAUGHTER)

He can't help it.

(LAUGHTER)

He was born with a silver foot in his mouth.

(CHEERING)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: Good timing Richardson. Was that your finest moment?

RICHARDS: Oh, it was a great night.

KING: Nationally.

RICHARDS: It was a great night.

KING: Downhill after that, though. (UNINTELLIGIBLE) came on. Did you nominate the wrong guy that year?

RICHARDS: Actually, you know, we had a very good candidate, I think, in Dukakis. It just was not written in the stars, just wasn't meant to be. KING:

Let us now switch to the first lady.

RICHARDS: Yes, my friend.

KING: Your friend?

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: What's her chances?

New York

RICHARDS: I think they're good. I'm intrigued by what my friends tell me.

KING: Which is?

Giuliani is not the nominee, then maybe we've got problems.

KING: Why?

RICHARDS: I think...

Pataki in the state.

Richards: I think that they think he is abrasive, pushy, makes enemies, you know.

KING: So Lazio might beat her?

Richards: Yes, that Lazio might be the guy that is more troublesome. The gossip in New York is that Pataki and D'Amato are not about to let Giuliani be the nominee.

KING: What kind of candidate do you think Hillary will be?

Richards: She's going to be a fabulous candidate.

KING: How do we know that? I mean, we've never seen her run.

Richards: I know she is, because she likes it. She likes to be around people and that communicates itself, and it does on the TV. You know, people know when there's someone there they'd like to get next to, and she has that quality. She's going to be a very good candidate.

KING: Were you surprised that she survived all she did, that marriage and that...

Richards: No, no.

KING: Not surprised at all?

Richards: No, no. She is a very strong woman and very independent, and really smart. No.

KING: In other words, no one...

women do
RICHARDS: And for God's sake, Larry, you know, a lot of
that.

KING: Go through that?

and tough times.
RICHARDS: Yes, go through some kind of really difficult
That's our long suit.

person.
KING: She's not a Mr. Clinton, right? She's her own

whiner. She is a
RICHARDS: She is. That is exactly right. And she's not a
pick it up and let's go on from here.

that race in New York
KING: We'll talk about Al Gore in a little while. Will
it's Gore-Bush?
take away from the Gore -- let's say, Bush race -- if

RICHARDS: Well, I've heard that, but I don't get it. I
don't understand it. In
fact, I think if anything, that her candidacy ought to
help him in New York.
He's certainly going to turn out the Democratic vote.

do you make of
KING: He'll be on this show in a couple of weeks. What
Senator Bradley?

He's been my
RICHARDS: Oh, I love Bill Bradley. I adore Bill Bradley.
friend forever. Bill came...

KING: Are you going to endorse him?

on the telephone
RICHARDS: Oh, no. I endorsed Gore. I've talked to Bill
and I've told him I'd already endorsed Al Gore long ago.
But Bill came to
Texas and campaigned for me when I ran for governor. He
is intellectual and
smart and...

KING: Does he have a chance?

is wide open.
RICHARDS: Oh, absolutely. Oh, yes, I think the primary

KING: You do?

RICHARDS: Absolutely.

to -- well, we're
KING: So if you were telling Al Gore, you'd advise him
going to get to him in a while.

RICHARDS: OK.

KING: Run like he's losing?

RICHARDS: Absolutely. Always run like you're losing.

KING: We'll talk about the legacy of the president of the United States with the former governor of Texas, right after this.
(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: As you know, in a deposition in January, I was asked questions about my relationship with Monica Lewinsky. While my answers were legally accurate, I did not volunteer information. Indeed, I did have a relationship with Ms. Lewinsky that was not appropriate. In fact, it was wrong. It constituted a critical lapse in judgment and a personal failure on my part for which I am solely and completely responsible.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

KING: What's -- what do you make of this president?

RICHARDS: Well, there's something about men, Larry.

KING: Meaning what, governor? They're all like that? No, no, you're not saying that.

RICHARDS: Not all of them. But there are times when they let a drive that they have, overrule their brain. And this is a classic case.

KING: Were you surprised that this kind of, let's say, poor judgment, though, an intern in the White House, that kind...

RICHARDS: No, no.

KING: Not surprised?

RICHARDS: Oh, Larry, I've been around government so long. My God, I watched him get in the back of that pickup truck and go out there at the Broken Spoke and dance all night. It's a young girl working in the office with a big old potbelly legislator, you know? And do I like it? No. Did I like it when I was younger? No. Does it go on? Absolutely. And it still goes on.

KING: Why didn't it hurt him? Why...

RICHARDS: Because people understand it, because too many of us have been through all of that stuff. I could start ticking off for you now people that everybody in this town know that have been caught at some of the goofiest stuff. And you'd say what in the world would they get themselves in that position for?

We've got a legislator at home, got picked up for soliciting a hooker, and he was one of these holier than thou Jesus guys, and he said he was new to Austin, Texas and asking for directions. You know? Did -- it just happens. That's all. And people are understanding of that.

With this president, I think that history will judge him by what he did as president. And if you take the list of what he said he was going to do when he was nominated and ran, you could just check it off, because he has done or made a very serious attempt to do every single one of them.

KING: Why does he drive the right wing -- because we can make a case that this is hardly the most liberal president we have ever had.

RICHARDS: Right.

KING: Why does he drive the really right wing wacko?

RICHARDS: I think it really has to do with that business, not of just the right wing or the Republicans, they think they're supposed to own that office.

KING: Yes, but why him? They hate him. There are people that hate -- why would you hate him?

RICHARDS: I know he tells -- you know, he tells that great joke about the guy that falls over the cliff and he grabs on that little old twig that's hanging there and he hollers, why me, God, why me? And God hollers back, there's just something about you, boy, that I don't like.

KING: So, you're saying these people just don't like him?

RICHARDS: They don't like him, no. And I think they

think, and I don't

know how to...

KING: They blame him for wind storms.

He's not

RICHARDS: ... psychoanalyze it, but he's a Southern boy.

supposed to be this way, you know?

KING: Did you ever talk to him during this crisis?

RICHARDS: I have talked to him.

KING: And were you...

president, is what I told
him.

KING: And you didn't...

RICHARDS: And I think that.

KING: And you didn't criticize him for...

criticize him, then I've
got a whole lot of other people on that list I've got to
go after.

young and many
years...

to do. Do I
think he'll ever run for
anything again. He could if he wanted to, but I don't
think he will. Do I think
he'll go back to Arkansas and sort of sit in a hammock?
No, he'll never do
that.

KING: In other words, we will hear from him?

RICHARDS: Oh, no question about that.

some other things,
and we'll take your phone calls for the former governor
of Texas, Ann
Richards. I'm Larry King, don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

might George W. Bush
choose her as a running mate?

RICHARDS: I hope so.

KING: You want her to run?

RICHARDS: I like Elizabeth. And I'm not going to vote for her, but I like her. And I'm proud of her for running. If -- I think Bush will nominate whoever he thinks is going to enhance his ticket the most.

KING: OK. Al Gore...

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: I could ask that as a question -- why is the campaign apparent -- now, it's still a long way off. I know that Ronald Reagan fired his campaign manager...

RICHARDS: Right.

KING: ... during the campaign in 1980...

RICHARDS: Right.

KING: So we forget these things.

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: But why does it seem to be drifting?

RICHARDS: I -- I think that they have been at it so long that it's really hard for them to be fresh. I think that, you know, he's been the vice president. He's been the heir apparent, and everybody's been focused on Al as being the next president that they are all off -- and -- and they don't have focus. They're all over the place.

You know, one day it's mental health. The next day it's more money for cancer. All of these real good causes, but you have got to have discipline. You have got to have focus. And when you run against George Bush, he is going to have one message. He's going to say that message until the world gags and everybody else is going to be able to say it back. KING: Dick Morris said he should stay with the big thing, environment. If he's right on the environment, everything else is moot if we're going to drown in a sea of bad air.

RICHARDS: Well, I really wouldn't give him advice about

what the issue is.

The environment is his issue.

KING: But he should pick a...

away from it.

KING: What about hiring people who don't like each other to be...

RICHARDS: Well, that's OK. I think that kind of sometimes creates a little -- a little creative tension. I don't have any problem with that.

What I've got a problem with is that you -- that -- that you pick a course and then you stay on it.

KING: What about -- do you attach closer to the president, separate yourself, what? It's hard to be a vice presidential candidate.

RICHARDS: I think it's very, very difficult.

KING: And run?

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: So what do you do?

been the guy
people get that
never -- and it's very
You could never be in
I've ever seen, on the

RICHARDS: Because, you know, for eight years, you have that was standing right, you know, right back here, and mental image of you as the guy behind the guy. They hard then to assume that position of getting out front. front of a guy as good as Bill Clinton is. He's the best stump, with people. I've never seen anything like it.

be Al Gore and Al

So it's going to be hard for him to pull over here and Gore's campaign.

and she's the

KING: Does the president -- let's say Hillary's running nominee.

RICHARDS: Yes.

Gore want him to
election?

KING: Does the president go around with Al Gore? Does go with him? What role does the president play in the

RICHARDS: I don't know. I think what they'll do, though, is they'll do a whole lot of polling and focus groups and all of the stuff that they do do and try to find out if it helps. And if does...

KING: But Clinton's a great campaigner. Wouldn't you want him there?

RICHARDS: Yes, but I think what they'll more than likely do is have Clinton go out on his own and raise money for Al Gore.

KING: Which he's very good at.

RICHARDS: He's really good at it. I saw him in Aspen this last weekend. And as many times as I've heard Bill Clinton, he got up and spoke at lunch, and it was mesmerizing. And you know, and I'm an old pol. I'm hard to impress. And he's the best I've ever seen.

KING: Are you saying if we had a third term allowed, he'd be favored?

RICHARDS: Yes. And he'd win too.

KING: Tell us about this -- we're going to break in a couple of minutes, then go to some calls. Tell us -- a couple of other areas I want to cover.

Who was the lady governor?

RICHARDS: The lady governor was Ma Ferguson. She was married to...

KING: Ma?

RICHARDS: Ma Ferguson -- she was married to Pa, who was the governor.

KING: Sounds like a comedy team.

RICHARDS: And Pa was impeached for selling pardons to guys in prison. And here's the good line. And when Ma was asked about whether kids ought to be punished for speaking Spanish in the public school, she said if the English language was good enough for Jesus Christ, it's good enough for the school children of Texas.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: She inherited the governorship?

RICHARDS: She ran on her own.

KING: She did?

There were
two other
was a heck -- heck
of a woman.

RICHARDS: After he was impeached. And she was elected.
two-year terms. Then she was not elected, and there were
governors, and she ran again and was elected again. She

KING: You work for Bob Dole's law firm?

RICHARDS: I do, I do.

KING: A lot of people work at that law firm. George...

RICHARDS: George Mitchell.

KING: But you're not a lawyer?

RICHARDS: I'm not a lawyer. I am a great adviser.

KING: You're a lobbyist?

RICHARDS: I'm a lobbyist.

KING: You're a signed lobbyist?

RICHARDS: I'm a signed lobbyist.

industry...

KING: Who do you lobby for? Tell me the tobacco

much.

RICHARDS: Southwestern Bell Communications I like very

Lockheed aircraft I like very much.

they didn't get the

KING: They just lost. They would have made this plane;
budget. Did you lose on that one, Ann?

RICHARDS: Well, the day isn't out on that.

KING: Ah, we never give up, do we?

RICHARDS: The day is not out.

piece, but I hope I will
be soon.

Actually, I wasn't directly involved in that particular

KING: The F-11, right?

RICHARDS: F-22.

KING: F-22. I went in half.

RICHARDS: That's all right.

how many death
warrants?
KING: You, before we went on, told me that you signed warrants?

went to their
death while I was governor.
RICHARDS: I think altogether there were 33 people who went to their death while I was governor.

signed them?
KING: And you favor the death penalty and were glad you signed them?

night.
RICHARDS: No. I -- I was never -- it's never an easy night.

KING: So you're not glad.

RICHARDS: No. KING: But you favor the penalty. .

RICHARDS: Yes, because they don't commit murder again.

KING: What happens the night that you signed that and
the pope calls and
others call and the pleas and the people are outside the
gate?

RICHARDS: Here's the deal. In Texas, the governor has no
authority to
pardon anybody. That may go all the way back to Pa
Ferguson. But you do
have the right to give a 30-day stay. That is, you say,
we're not going to do it
tonight; we're going to give you 30 more days to see if
you can come up
with something else.

KING: And can you keep doing that?

RICHARDS: No. You can only do it once.

KING: So you have no power?

RICHARDS: So you really have very little power to affect
it.

KING: But you're saying if you did have it, you would
have signed them
anyway?

RICHARDS: I gave a 30-day stay one time, and I won't
tell you the
circumstances. It's a very complicated case. But I gave
a stay of 30 days
one out of those 30-some odd and all hell broke loose.
You would have
thought I had opened the door of the penitentiary and
let every rapist and
murderer out on the streets. They went nuts.

The district attorney had a cannipion (ph) fit, and it

was one of those cases
where the pope and the Catholic Church asked that the
guy get the 30-day
stay. And I had always said if the victim's family came
to me and asked for
the stay, then I would really consider it. And in this
case, the victim was a
nun and the only people to speak for her as family was
the Catholic Church.

KING: But the guy was eventually...

RICHARDS: Oh, let me tell you, they went bananas.

KING: But the guy eventually was executed?

RICHARDS: Yes, he was executed.

KING: So since you had no say, why did you lose sleep
the nights of the
occurrence?

RICHARDS: You just never -- you just never feel good
about knowing that
someone, regardless of who it is, is about to go to
their death.

KING: And you did sign it?

RICHARDS: Oh, absolutely. KING: We'll take a break and
take your
phone calls for the former governor of Texas, Ann
Richards. This is LARRY
KING LIVE. Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, FRITO-LAY COMMERCIAL)

RICHARDS: Mario, I haven't seen a change like this since
I was knee high
to a June bug.

FORMER GOV. MARIO CUOMO (D), NEW YORK: Ann, I was as
surprised as you are.

RICHARDS: Well, I should have seen it coming.

CUOMO: Maybe so, but now I think we ought to accept this
change,
embrace it, be positive about it, because change can be
very exciting.

RICHARDS: You're probably right, Mario. I guess I'll get
used to Doritos'
new bag.

CUOMO: There you go.

NARRATOR: This year's big change is Doritos' more great

taste, brand

bag.

CUOMO: Too bad about the Cowboys, Ann.

RICHARDS: They always won when I was governor.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(LAUGHTER)

KING: Did you take to that right away? Did you like that idea right away to do that? Yes, we had the best time. We did that all day long. And I told Mario, I said, Mario, just because you get that out of the bag, you don't have to eat it, you know.

Let's go to some calls for Governor Richards.

Tustin, California, hello.

CALLER: Yes, for Ann Richards.

KING: Yes.

CALLER: What are your future political plans? Are you interested in elective office again. Maybe even, how about vice president nominee with Al Gore or maybe get appointed to an office in the new Democratic administration?

KING: OK, let's run, let's run them down.

RICHARDS: Oh, you're really nice. No, I've done my due. I've said earlier that I always thought I was kind of inspired by the wrong thing. I always ran because I looked at who was running, and said, my God, surely we can do better than that. And I think unless people with hair the color of mine get out of the way, the young generation can't come up, and we need that new blood and fresh ideas.

So I'm very -- I'm happier than I've ever been in my life and I intend to keep it that way in the private sector, and I'll help my friends run for office.

KING: You're also making more money than you ever made.

RICHARDS: I'm also making more money than I ever had in my whole life. I will not be in a trailer in my daughter's driveway. That's the goal.

KING: What about a cabinet post?

RICHARDS: I don't want to do that. I just feel like I've been there and I've done mine.

KING: Westchester, Pennsylvania, hello.

CALLER: Hi, Larry, to you and your super guest.

KING: Hi.

CALLER: My question is, now that JFK Jr., what role do you think Caroline will take on, as far as keeping Camelot alive?

RICHARDS: What a very sweet way to put that. I think it's a really terrible responsibility for that young woman to feel that she somehow must carry on that legend of Camelot and the Kennedys. I just hope for Caroline a good life and a happy life and know that we love her, and she doesn't owe us anything really.

KING: We touched on it earlier. The licking of an addiction is one of the toughest things a human being faces.

RICHARDS: Yes, it is.

KING: You are an alcoholic, right?

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: You never say you were?

RICHARDS: You're never recovered.

KING: How long have you been sober?

RICHARDS: Twenty years this year.

KING: Do you ever want a drink?

RICHARDS: Never. And I'm a lucky one. I think I'm one of the lucky ones. You know, I go to AA meetings and I listen to those who've been sober for a shorter period of time, who talk about sometimes they wish they had a drink, but it -- Larry, when I went to the hospital, it was such a trauma, it was such a wrenching shock to my life and I was so frightened, so scared of everything that I have seriously never wanted a drink since then.

KING: But you had been drinking for a long time, right?

RICHARDS: Oh, yes, you know, since I was in college.

KING: So you remember your last drink?

RICHARDS: Yes, it was on the airplane on the way to the hospital.

KING: And what were you scared of?

RICHARDS: I was scared I wouldn't be funny anymore.

KING: Oh, you were scared of licking the habit?

RICHARDS: Yes, and I was afraid I wouldn't be married anymore, and I was afraid people would look down on me. You know, I was afraid of all the unknown. I think you're more afraid of what you don't know than what you do know.

KING: The glass crutch.

RICHARDS: Yes. I was lucky, though, Larry. My drinking was a night drinking, you know. I was never one of those that had to have a drink when I got up in the morning. And the other saving grace was that when I had enough to drink, I went to bed and went to sleep. I wasn't one of those that could stay up all night, you know, and drink more and more and more.

KING: So then how did it affect you? That seems -- a lot of people have that. They drink at night. When they have enough, they go to bed and they don't drink during day.

RICHARDS: Well, it depends on how much they drink and how much they need to drink. And I needed that drink at night. I wanted that drink. I depended -- I counted on that drink.

And you know, there's always a reason to drink. You drink to celebrate. You drink because you've had a bad day. You drink because you've had a great day. There's no reason in the world why you can't have another drink, and it was a very, very difficult time.

KING: Back with more of Governor Ann Richards of Texas.

Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: Before we take another call, two other questions
on drinking: How
who planned
a friend's house, and
that intervention was
to read that said,
somewhere, and you
that if you hadn't
KING: Were you shocked?

RICHARDS: I had friend
an intervention. I walked into a living room one day at
there were all of my friends and some of my family, and
very carefully planned, where each of them had something
for example -- that would say: Ann, I was with you
said this to me, and I know you would never have done
been drinking. And they each went around in a room...

RICHARDS: Well, I thought they were a bunch of
hypocrites, that's what I
thought.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: But you went to get help and smoked on the plane?
RICHARDS: And they said you -- we've made arrangements
for you to go
afternoon...

KING: Oh, they did it.

RICHARDS: Yes, they had all the arrangements.

KING: Would you say to people, if someone's got a friend
who drinks...

RICHARDS: Yes, intervene, intervene.

KING: Don't let them drive; take away the keys.

RICHARDS: Intervene.

KING: But do what else? Send them to a hospital?

RICHARDS: Absolutely.

KING: But don't you have to want to be helped?

RICHARDS: No, absolutely -- that's the biggest -- you
know, that is so --
that's a crutch. That's an excuse, that I can't do
anything because he doesn't
want to be helped. No, you intervene. They may go the
first time, and they
may not make it, but they'll go the second time or the
third time, and you just

keep doing it until they sober up.

we're very

KING: Would you gather all the friends together and say worried?

RICHARDS: Yes, we're really worried.

KING: Bronte, Texas, hello.

CALLER: Hello.

KING: Hi. CALLER: Ann Richards...

RICHARDS: Yes ma'am.

CALLER: I just admire you and respect you so.

RICHARDS: Well, how nice.

voted for. You're the first.

RICHARDS: Well, bless your heart.

CALLER: (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

KING: Do you have a question?

that you could or any campaigns that you would report?

Dole. You like her.

Republicans that I could name that I would tell you that I liked. But here's the reality of it. When it comes to Congress and comes to the Senate, the way the system up here works is they all club up together just like a covey of quail and you can't break -- you know, you can't break them up.

Republican just became a Democrat.

RICHARDS: Wasn't that amazing?

KING: Another Republican became an independent.

government --

and I can't say I think it's the best. It's rare when that happens. By and large, they move as a clump. They vote as a clump. And so I'm going to vote for those people in the party that I believe best represent my -- my issues.

KING: You'll vote the party, not the man, because the man becomes a part of the club -- the man or woman becomes part of the club when elected?

RICHARDS: That's right.

KING: We'll be back with our remaining moments with Governor Ann Richards, the former governor of Texas, right after these words.

This week on LARRY KING LIVE, tomorrow night, millions of people tune into him every morning. Don Imus will be my guest for the hour. Thursday night, ABC "Nightline's" Ted Koppel will join me and take your calls. And on Friday night, a very special show: a look back at my interview with John F. Kennedy Jr. All ahead on LARRY KING LIVE, 9:00 Eastern on CNN.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back with former Governor Richards. Hampton, Virginia, hello.

CALLER: Hello, Governor Richards.

RICHARDS: Hi, how are you?

CALLER: I'm a Texan calling for you.

RICHARDS: Good.

CALLER: Now living in Virginia.

RICHARDS: Yes. Well, why in the world did you leave home?

CALLER: Well, it was a big mistake, I guess.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: What's the question?

CALLER: Anyway, why -- what do you think led to your defeat...

RICHARDS: Yes.

CALLER: ... against Governor George Bush? And the second question is, what do you think of -- the major things that you accomplished in Virginia --

I mean, in Texas as the governor?

RICHARDS: Well, I think that the thing that I accomplished that I guess that I'm the proudest of is that when I went into office we were approximately \$4 billion in the red, the government was, and we were an oil-dependent economy. And so I really do take credit for turning the economy of Texas around. When I left office, what I gave George Bush was \$2 billion in the black.

I lost...

KING: Why did you lose?

RICHARDS: I lost the race really over guns. That was the No. 1 issue. The second reason I lost it is because I -- I kept telling people what I've done, not what I was going to do. And the third reason was it was 1994. And it was just the worst year anybody could run and be a Democrat.

KING: How did the Republicans slip from that '94 juggernaut to -- to being a slim majority? RICHARDS: Well, I tell you -- they're -- they're not used to being in charge and they don't know how to do anything up here. I mean, really -- I mean that sincerely, that they do not know how to pass a bill. And they've got so many nuts that are in there now.

KING: Nuts?

RICHARDS: Yes. That -- that don't want to seriously solve a problem. I'll give you an example, Larry. And this is just reason now.

KING: Are you including Tom DeLay?

RICHARDS: I'm not going to pick specific people, how about that?

KING: Would you say you're not a big fan of Congressman DeLay?

RICHARDS: Well, let's just say that I just think these people are really misguided. I don't think you're going to keep people from killing each other by putting the Ten Commandments in a school room.

Now, nobody's going to want to vote against the Ten Commandments, because they don't want to have to fool with the next election with this guy saying, oh, they don't even believe in God and they're not going to give the Ten Commandments to these children. But that's not going to address what is the issue of violence and problems in -- in our school system. But that's the way they spend their time over there.

On that House floor, I saw an old friend of mine who's a Republican and I like him a lot. I said: "What have you all been doing today?"

"Reading the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments? Yes."

We're paying our tax dollars for these guys to solve problems. I told you they're like the dog that caught the truck.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: Are you -- have you ever been happier? You seem so happy.

RICHARDS: I am just gloriously happy. I have a wonderful life. I have had a wonderful past. I have fabulous grandchildren, and my children love me. It's such a big thing.

KING: Can't beat that. Are you in good health?

RICHARDS: I'm in fabulous health. In fact, I talk to women about their health. I go around and make speeches about talking to your doctor after you go through menopause because I have osteoporosis, which men also get...

KING: Bones.

RICHARDS: ... where you begin to have your backbone and your neck bones collapse. Talk to your doctor about it. There are drugs you can take. And I've started lifting weights.

You know, when I was a kid and you saw Charles Atlas on the back of the...

KING: 96-pound weakling.

RICHARDS: Absolutely. Well, I am in that gym, man, lifting those weights.

KING: You ever think of quitting, I mean, retiring, just watching the birds?

RICHARDS: If I do, it would last about three seconds. I can't figure out what I'd do if I didn't work, you know?

KING: Retire to what, as Milton Berle says.

RICHARDS: Yes.

KING: Thank you, Governor.

RICHARDS: I am -- I'm having too much fun.

Well, I love you. You're making a good daddy too.

KING: Oh, I love him.

Richards, the former
night. Lance
Another good daddy tomorrow night, Don Imus. Ann
governor of Texas. Ted Koppel will be with us Thursday
Armstrong -- an incredible bicyclist.

RICHARDS: From Austin, Texas.

KING: Texas.

of us here at
RICHARDS: All right. Thanks for joining us, and for all
LARRY KING LIVE, good-night.

END