



Deanne E. Benos
01/04/2000 04:55:06 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc: Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Subject: Helpful Roundup --

A much more detailed memo will be necessary for us to make any solid decisions. However, I threw this list together for you to put together the issues we discussed on licensing, registration, no gun no background check and supertracing for a quick reference. There are however, many, many other issues to vet on this. I thought that this might provide a better context from our conversation for reference:

(1) **Licensing:** These proposals consistently include photo licensing, state-based, safety courses and background checks. A license can largely be used to ensure that all gun owners are legally allowed to possess firearms, and are responsible and know how to safely use and store firearms. In the absence of a universal background check system at a gun show, for example, a license also provides an added layer of protection to ensure that the purchaser is not a felon or other restricted person (at least within the last renewal cycle for the licenses.) Right now, sales can be made to individuals with no indication of their restricted status. A phone-in check system could help make sure that licenses are valid in the absence of expanded background checks -- but this is still not a substitute for a background check that would also provide helpful tracing records.

(2) **Registration:** All guns must be registered by serial number and gun owner in a centralized location (this means that even people who currently have guns at home must come in and register them); and unless people are responsible for mailing in registration forms from their homes, it usually implies that all sales (including private sales/transfers) must go through a gun dealer with background checks and sales records and the dealer forwards on the sales record to be "registered."

(3) **No gun, no background check:** All gun sales -- including private sales -- go through a gun dealer so that a background check is conducted and so that a tracing record is made available for every sale. This proposal hits the secondary market on all fronts. It falls short of registration because not all guns/gun owners will be centralized in a database that would cut out a step in the tracing process.

(4) **Supertracing:** Whenever a gun is sold at a licensed gun dealer, the dealer must forward the sales record to a centralized state-based location to speed tracing. This does not include private sales. This is a few steps short of registration because registration requires every gun sale to go through a dealer and to be registered with a state or federal authority. Because registration includes private sales, it would also require people who aren't buying new guns to register their weapons -- this proposal only deals with new gun purchases only from licensed gun dealers. (This concept created by the VP.)



Anna Richter

01/27/2000 10:12:19 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP, Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject:

Clinton: Photo IDs for Gun Buys

By Sonya Ross
Associated Press Writer
Thursday, Jan. 27, 2000; 9:10 p.m. EST

WASHINGTON — President Clinton urged states Thursday to issue photo ID licenses for handgun purchases, much like licenses for driving or hunting.

The proposal was the last from Clinton's State of the Union agenda that was not revealed in advance of Thursday's speech.

Under Clinton's plan, anyone who wants to buy a handgun would be required to first obtain a license showing he has passed a background check and a gun safety requirement, such as a training course or an exam.

States could choose not to participate in the program, according to a White House official who discussed the proposal on condition of anonymity. In states that decline to set up the licensing system, a federally approved gun dealer or a federal entity would issue the license, the official said.

"We are not mandating this," the official said.

Tighter gun control already has emerged as an issue in the presidential campaign.

Vice President Al Gore has called for mandatory photo ID licenses for handgun buyers. He would require manufacturers and federally licensed sellers to report gun sales to state authority. Further, Gore would ban so-called Saturday night specials and expand background checks and mandate child-safety locks.

Former Sen. Bill Bradley, Gore's rival for the Democratic presidential nomination, has urged mandatory licenses for handgun buyers and gun registration. He also would raise license fees on dealers and ban "Saturday night specials."

On the Republican side, Texas Gov. George W. Bush has called for raising the age for handgun purchases to 21. He also supports instant background checks at gun shows. Bush opposes universal gun

registration.

Steve Forbes says he would let states set firearm standards.

© Copyright 2000 The Associated Press



Rita Bibbs <Rbibb@hci-cphv.org>

02/04/2000 05:34:50 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Keith Hall <khall.GUNCONTROL_PO.GUNCONTROL_DOM@hci-cphv.org>

cc: Rita Bibbs <Rbibb.GUNCONTROL_PO.GUNCONTROL_DOM@hci-cphv.org>

Subject: State Legislation Weekly Report

Colorado

HB1242, the bill to require background checks of all firearms at gun shows is currently in the House Appropriations committee. Pro Gun control activists are concentrating on pressuring swing votes to send the bill to the House floor. Republican Gov. Bill Owens has appointed former police chief of Denver, Ari Zavaras, to actively lobby for HB1242 and the other components of the Governor's gun control plan. The hearing on HB1242 is scheduled for Friday, February 11. Also, HB 1289, the NRA's preemption bill passed the House and will be heard in the Senate Judiciary next week.

Iowa

The Des Moines Register reported that Gov. Tom Vilsack's gun-safety proposal appears to be in trouble because of legislators' objections to gun-permit fee increases that would help pay for the plan. Governor Vilsack plan would hire two workers in the Iowa Department of Public Safety to work with weapons permits, training and a proposed firearms-safety initiative aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of children. He plans to pay for these positions by charging a new \$25 fee for permits to acquire weapons and by increasing the current permit fee for carrying weapons to \$25 from \$10. Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence is lobbying Iowa lawmakers Tuesday to pass Vilsack proposal. Governor Vilsack also is pushing for a state law requiring that trigger locks be provided with every handgun sold in the state.

Maine

Last week we reported that Governor Angus King endorsed LD 2484, a bill that would prevent police from issuing concealed-weapon permits to people whom the courts have permanently ordered to stay away from others who fear them. The first public hearing is expected to take place on February 7th in the Joint Standing Committee on Criminal Justice. Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence, which initially proposed the legislation, is spearheading support at the hearing.

Utah

A bill to ban concealed guns in schools (K-12) and churches, failed in its first hearing last week, thereby setting the stage for a ballot initiative in November. The House Education Committee tabled Rep. Dave Jones' House Bill 248 on a 7-6 vote after its first public hearing. The "Safe to Worship, Safe To Learn" coalition, led by Utahns Against Gun Violence, has already filed their initiative to ban guns in places of worship, schools (K-12) and in institutions of higher learning.

Vermont

Rep. Fred Maslack introduced two bizarre, pro-gun bills. HB 760 requires residents age 18, or older who do not own a firearm, to register their name with the secretary of state's office. Also, if this individual is eligible for military service and is not serving, would be required to pay a \$500 fee for the privilege of not owning a firearm. Last but not least, HB 763, this bill would force high school students to successfully pass a course in basic military training in order to graduate.

Rep. Maslack stated in press reports that he believes everyone should have the necessary military

training needed to act as a well armed citizen militia, should the need arrive. There are actually other lawmakers who support Maslack's proposals. They have also joined a gun-owners group to sue state officials over enforcement of the federal Brady law because it requires background checks on purchasers of handguns.

Virginia

Virginia lawmakers have introduced a number of pro-gun bills:

HB 1309, introduced by Delegate Watkins Abbitt, Jr., would provide reciprocity to virtually all out-of-state concealed carry permit holders. If passed this bill would be one of the worst reciprocity laws passed in this country. Virginia would have to allow out-of-state CCW license holders the ability to carry in Virginia even if their own state law is weaker than Virginia's. This bill will be heard in the House Militia and Police Committee on Monday, February 7.

In addition to the reciprocity bill, Delegate William (Billy) Robinson, Jr., a concealed weapons licensee, introduced HB 1479, a bill repealing the exclusion on carrying concealed guns in bars. The gun lobby and their legislative friends in Richmond have tried for several years to insure that guns could be carried into bars. This is another legislative attempt to subvert common sense and public safety by mixing guns and alcohol. Delegate R. Lee Ware, Jr. introduced HB 534, a city lawsuit preemption bill. Passage of this bill is a top priority for the NRA despite the fact that no city lawsuits have been filed in Virginia. In addition, this bill would prohibit localities from imposing any regulations on gun shows that would be more severe than those applied to shows of other types, such as arts and craft shows. In other words, if background checks are mandated at gun shows they have to be mandated at arts and craft shows as well. Rep. Dick Cranwell has also introduced a city lawsuit preemption bill, HB 905.

Wisconsin

This week, the Wisconsin Assembly began the debate on AB 246, the NRA's city lawsuit preemption bill which was carried over from last session. The Assembly is expected to vote on this bill on Tuesday, February 8.

News from the Administration

President Clinton and Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers today released a report from the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) that provides the most comprehensive overview ever of the firearms industry. The President also announced regulatory actions that ATF will take to bolster enforcement efforts, and focus on problem dealers, in order to prevent the diversion of firearms from these dealers into the hands of criminals. Among the report's key findings is that 1.2 percent of gun dealers account for 57 percent of the total number of crime gun traces. The report's key findings include:

- One Percent of Gun Dealers Account for 57 percent of Crime Gun Traces. The majority (57.4 percent) of firearms traced by law enforcement to gun dealers active in 1998 were sold by 1,020 (1.2 percent) of the 83,272 licensed retail dealers and pawnbrokers. Each of these dealers and pawnbrokers had 10 or more crime guns traced back to them, and 132 of these dealers had 50 or more crime guns traced.
- Handguns Account for Nearly Half of All New Gun Sales - About 2 Million Per Year. Fifty years ago, handguns represented only one out of every 10 new gun sales. Now they account for more than four out of 10. Handguns are the weapons of choice in the commission of gun crimes; two-thirds of all homicides are committed with hand guns.
- The Gun Industry Has Been Impacted by Stricter Laws. The number of licensed firearms manufacturers, importers, distributors, dealers and collectors peaked at 284,000 in 1994 and has declined to 104,000 today. This decline followed implementation of stricter manufacturer and dealer licensing requirements set forth in the 1993 Brady Act, which increased the fee for a license from

\$10/year to \$200 for 3 years, and the 1994 Crime Act, which mandated that FFLs comply with all state and local laws. Domestic product shipments in 1997 were valued at about \$1.2 billion.

The President also announced new enforcement actions that the ATF will take to focus on problem gun dealers in order to prevent guns from entering into the illegal firearms market. The report shows the need to focus resources on the relatively small number of dealers and pawnbrokers who are the source of *most of the traced crime guns*. With these new actions, ATF will target enforcement and inspection resources on those dealers who have high numbers of crime gun traces, whose guns quickly turn up in crimes after sale, and who have a poor record of cooperation with law enforcement. These actions include:

- Inspecting Disproportionate Sources of Crime Guns. While many gun dealers linked to large numbers of crime guns may be in full compliance with the law, the quick or frequent diversion of guns to illegal markets from some dealers is a cause for serious concern. Accordingly, the ATF will conduct focused inspections of the 1,000 gun dealers who had 10 or more crime guns traced to them in 1999. ATF will also require the 450 current dealers that had 10 or more crime guns traced to them with a "time-to-crime" of less than three years from the original sale to provide ATF with information on all used guns offered for sale. This will enable ATF to trace used guns if they are later used in crime. Strong enforcement action will be taken against dealers found to be violating the law. At the same time, ATF will also work closely with law-abiding gun dealers to develop new procedures to prevent illegal trafficking.
- Targeting Uncooperative Dealers. Some dealers fail to respond promptly to ATF crime gun trace requests, or keep poor records, severely eroding the ability of law enforcement to apprehend and prosecute gun criminals. In response, ATF will conduct focused inspections of the 50 dealers with the worst response records, and will issue demand letters requiring them to regularly submit all firearms acquisition and disposition records.
- Focusing on Stolen Firearms. In FY 1999, 1,290 crime guns were traced back to licensed gun dealers (federal firearms licensees, or FFLs) who claimed that the firearms were shipped but never received. To enhance reporting of theft or loss, and to better track stolen and missing firearms, ATF will propose a new rule requiring all FFLs to conduct regular inventories and report discrepancies to ATF. ATF will publish a second rule requiring FFLs who ship firearms to report any firearms lost or stolen in transit within 48 hours.
- Helping the Industry Increase Accountability. To help manufacturers and importers to monitor the distribution of their firearms and learn whether particular models are frequently used in crime, ATF will provide to manufacturers, upon request, a list by serial number of firearms they sold that were traced as crime guns during the previous year.

The NRA and the Second Amendment - Accepting Some Reality

The Legal Action Project of the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence has done an analysis of the NRA's amicus brief for the Emerson case (on the 2nd amendment) which was filed with the US Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit in the Emerson. In a serious retreat from their own rhetoric, the NRA actually concede many of our positions. While the NRA previously has supported a Constitutional right to machine guns, they now state that there is no Constitutional barrier to "reasonable" gun laws. They still maintain some of their usual propaganda like arguing that "unreasonable gun control policies would still facilitate the tyrannical oppression of political minorities." But, the NRA brief also contains a number of very interesting positions:

1. Even under the NRA view of the 2d Amendment, they recognize that "Nothing of this implies that the Second Amendment prevents Congress from adopting reasonable measures to prevent the misuse of firearms. On the contrary, [just as there are many permissible restrictions on free speech], there are numerous ways in which government may regulate exceptionally dangerous weapons and prevent

dangerous persons (such as juveniles, violent felons, and the mentally ill) from possessing guns at all."

2) The NRA also recognizes that some guns, such as machine guns, "appear to be particularly well-suited to criminal uses, and ill-suited to legitimate civilian purposes." That arguments suggests that the NRA would agree that civilians are not entitled to other guns that meet those criteria perhaps including assault weapons.

3) The NRA goes a step further when they state that the Miller case which is the Supreme Court decision holding that banning possession of unregistered sawed-shotguns did not violate the 2d Amendment "only becomes coherent when read as a decision about regulating weapons that are useful primarily to criminals." This suggests that the NRA recognizes that some guns are "useful primarily to criminals," and they can be subject to greater regulation.

MAIL-IT REQUESTED: JANUARY 27, 2000

100Y5T

CLIENT: OPD
LIBRARY: NEWS
FILE: MAJPAP,MAGS

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST AT THE TIME THIS MAIL-IT WAS REQUESTED:
DATE AFT 1994 AND SECTION(EDITORIAL OR OP-ED OR OPINION) AND HLEAD(GUN OR
HANDGUN OR FIREARM) AND HLEAD(LICENS!)
AND ATLEAST3(LICENS!)

NUMBER OF STORIES FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:
LEVEL 1... 256 LEVEL 2... 91

LEVEL 2 PRINTED

DISPLAY FORMAT: CITE

MULTIPLE DOCUMENTS ON A PAGE

gun licensing

SEND TO: CRAGG, JACQUI
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION LRSD
EOP- LIBRARY
17TH & PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
OEOB, ROOM 308
WASHINGTON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20502

*****06274*****



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

1. Los Angeles Times, January 23, 2000, Sunday, Home Edition, Page 4 , 352 words, REPORTING OF GUN SALES
- ✓ 2. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, December 17, 1999, Friday, Final Edition, 229 words, Letters: Instead of suing gun makers, require license for owners, Sylvia Rogers, For the Journal-Constitution
3. THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, December 15, 1999 Wednesday, Final Chaser, OPINIONS; Pg. B8, 134 words, CLINTON AND GUNS
4. The Gazette (Montreal), November 03, 1999, FINAL, Editorial / Op-ed; B2, 157 words, Not a hunter but a criminal
5. Sacramento Bee, October 11, 1999, METRO FINAL, EDITORIALS; Pg. B8, 414 words, HAIR BRAIDER HARASSMENT
- ✓ 6. The Plain Dealer, August 23, 1999 Monday, FINAL / ALL, EDITORIALS & FORUM; Pg. 8B, 198 words, COMPREHENSIVE GUN LICENSING MAKES SENSE, By EUDICE MARGOLIS TRACEY; Cleveland Heights
- ✓ 7. The San Diego Union-Tribune, August 18, 1999, Wednesday, OPINION Pg. B-8:1,7,8; B-10:2,3, 454 words, License gun owners; Tests are a sensible method of control
- ✓ 8. Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL), August 18, 1999, Wednesday, Broward Metro EDITION, Pg. 2A, 522 words, RENO RIGHT: LICENSE, TEST GUN OWNERS
- ✓ 9. The Plain Dealer, August 12, 1999 Thursday, FINAL / ALL, EDITORIALS & FORUM; Pg. 10B, 260 words, REGULATE GUNS JUST LIKE MOTOR VEHICLES, By JOSEPH P. MALLONE
10. The New York Times, July 22, 1999, Thursday, Late Edition - Final, Section A; Page 20; Column 6; Editorial Desk , 94 words, Gun-Safety Education
11. The Buffalo News, July 18, 1999, Sunday, FINAL EDITION, EDITORIAL PAGE, Pg. 2H, 385 words, WEAPONS FOR A WHITE SUPREMACIST
12. The New York Times, July 17, 1999, Saturday, Late Edition - Final, Section A; Page 12; Column 1; Editorial Desk , 527 words, Breaking a Gun-Control Barrier
13. The Washington Post, July 14, 1999, Wednesday, Final Edition, OP-ED; Pg. A22; LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, 171 words, Guns: The Limits of Federal Power
14. THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR, July 13, 1999 Tuesday, CITY FINAL EDITION, Pg. A09; 87 words, Selling to holders of right-to-carry licenses
15. St. Petersburg Times, July 13, 1999, Tuesday, 0 South Pinellas Edition, EDITORIAL; COLUMNS; Pg. 11A, 749 words, Gun laws with more teeth bite better, MARTIN DYCKMAN
16. Los Angeles Times, July 11, 1999, Sunday, Home Edition, Page 3, 2250 words LOS ANGELES TIMES INTERVIEW; CAROLYN MCCARTHY; A PARTISAN WAITS FOR HER SHOT



LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

AGAINST A WELL-ARMED GUN LOBBY, Gregg Easterbrook, Gregg Easterbrook is a contributing editor to the Atlantic, Monthly and author of "A Moment on Earth: The Coming Age of Environmental, Optimism." , WASHINGTON

17. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, June 17, 1999, Thursday, SOONER EDITION, Pg. A-24, 173 words, LICENSE, DON'T BAN, THEM, BOB RALSTON; PETERS

18. The Boston Herald, June 6, 1999 Sunday, ALL EDITIONS, EDITORIAL;; Pg. 026, 548 words, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

19. THE HARTFORD COURANT, June 1, 1999 Tuesday, 2 WEST CENTRAL, EDITORIAL; Pg. A12, 297 words, STOP THESE HOME SALES; ; OUR TOWNS: PLAINVILLE

20. The Seattle Times, May 12, 1999, Wednesday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;; Pg. B4, 469 words, SOME REASONABLE STEPS TO REDUCE GUN VIOLENCE

21. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 10, 1999, Monday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION, EDITORIAL, Pg. D14, 1492 words, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

22. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 24, 1999, Saturday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION, EDITORIAL, Pg. 3, 567 words, GRADUATED LICENSING SAVES LIVES

23. The Plain Dealer, April 11, 1999 Sunday, FINAL / ALL, EDITORIALS & FORUM; Pg. 4D, 1492 words, WILL CRIME DECREASE WITH RIGHT-TO-CARRY LAW?

24. The Plain Dealer, April 4, 1999 Sunday, FINAL / ALL, FORUM OF OPINION & IDEAS EDITORIALS & FORUM; Pg. 2D, 360 words, A CONCEALED-GUN SCORECARD

25. The Toronto Sun, March 23, 1999, Tuesday, Final EDITION, EDITORIAL/OPINION, Pg. 14, 764 words, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR COLUMN

26. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 21, 1999, Sunday, FIVE STAR LIFT EDITION, EDITORIAL, Pg. B3, COMMENTARY COLUMN, 809 words, PROPOSITION B: MORE SECURITY OR GREATER DANGER? : CLEAR EVIDENCE FROM STATES; WITH CONCEAL CARRY, John R. Lott Jr.

27. The Washington Post, February 06, 1999, Saturday, Final Edition, OP-ED; Pg. A19; FREE FOR ALL, 752 words, Licensed For Safety

28. Los Angeles Times, January 24, 1999, Sunday, Home Edition, Page 1, 1217 words, TWO VIEWS OF A BLACK MAN BEHIND THE WHEEL, David Dante Troutt, David Dante Troutt is an associate professor of law at Rutgers, Law School and author of "The Monkey Suit: Short Fiction on African, Americans and Justice." , BROOKLYN

29. The Irish Times, November 3, 1998, CITY EDITION, EDITORIAL PAGE; LETTERS TO THE EDITOR; Pg. 15, 473 words, Ban On Pistol-Shooting

30. The Detroit News, October 19, 1998, Monday, Opinion; Pg. Pg. A9, 672 words, Mistreating gays can be license to kill, By Deb Price / The Detroit News Washington Bureau

31. The Detroit News, October 19, 1998, Monday, Opinion; Pg. Pg. A9, 672 words, Mistreating gays can be license to kill, By Deb Price / The Detroit News Washington Bureau



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

32. The Washington Post, August 21, 1998, Friday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;
Pg. A22, 348 words, Strap on a Gun and Go
33. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, August 19, 1998, Wednesday,
CONSTITUTION EDITION, 387 words, Editorials; Measure carries hidden dangers
34. The Denver Rocky Mountain News (Denver, Co.), August 6, 1998, Thursday,
EDITORIAL; Ed. F; Pg. 53A, 1504 words, LETTERS PAGE
35. The Irish Times, July 20, 1998, CITY EDITION, EDITORIAL PAGE; LETTERS TO
THE EDITOR; Pg. 13, 680 words, Shooting Licences
36. The Toronto Sun, June 12, 1998, Friday, Final EDITION, EDITORIAL/OPINION,
Pg. 14, 865 words, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR COLUMN
37. The Dominion (Wellington), April 15, 1998, FEATURES; EDITORIAL;; Pg. 10,
528 words, Don't shoot from the lip
38. Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL), January 8, 1998, Thursday, FINAL
EDITION, Pg. 18A, 179 words, TO PROTECT KIDS FROM GUNS, ENFORCE THE LAW
39. THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR, December 14, 1997 Sunday, CITY FINAL EDITION, Pg.
D03;; 278 words, Firearms laws
40. The Baltimore Sun, November 29, 1997, Saturday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 12A,
353 words, Banned guns not preferred by criminals
41. The Washington Post, November 29, 1997, Saturday, Final Edition, OP-ED;
Pg. A21; FREE FOR ALL, 424 words, A Bad Gun Law
42. THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR, November 25, 1997 Tuesday, CITY FINAL EDITION, Pg.
A18;; 508 words, A law that works
43. THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, November 10, 1997 Monday, Final Chaser,
EDITORIAL/OPINION; Pg. B6, 211 words, ATF CAN'T BE TRUSTED
44. The Seattle Times, October 23, 1997, Thursday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;;
Pg. B5, 1123 words, PRO/CON -- INITIATIVE 676: HANDGUN SAFETY
45. The Seattle Times, October 23, 1997, Thursday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;;
Pg. B5, 1073 words, PRO/CON -- INITIATIVE 676: HANDGUN SAFETY
46. THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR, October 21, 1997 Tuesday, CITY FINAL EDITION, Pg.
A08, 1023 words, License to carry
47. The Seattle Times, September 07, 1997, Sunday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;;
Pg. B7;; 381 words, INITIATIVE 676 -- THE INITIATIVE IS UNWORKABLE
48. The Seattle Times, July 08, 1997, Tuesday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;; Pg.
B5;; 241 words, GUN SAFETY -- EMBARRASSING INACCURACIES
49. The Seattle Times, July 05, 1997, Saturday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;; Pg.
A11, 357 words, SOUND GUN PRACTICES: LOCKS, LICENSES, CHECKS



LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

50. The Plain Dealer, July 3, 1997 Thursday, FINAL / ALL, EDITORIALS & FORUM; Pg. 10B, 354 words, A BRADY LAW BULL'S-EYE
51. The Seattle Times, June 24, 1997, Tuesday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL;, Pg. B5;, 221 words, INITIATIVE 676 -- REAL PURPOSE OF INITIATIVE IS GUN REGISTRATION, LICENSING; WORK WITH NRA FOR GUN SAFETY
52. THE HARTFORD COURANT, May 13, 1997 Tuesday, STATEWIDE, EDITORIAL; Pg. A10, 236 words, A FLAWED GUN LAW
53. The New York Times, April 7, 1997, Monday, Late Edition - Final, Section A; Page 15; Column 5; Editorial Desk , 735 words, Foreign Affairs; Oops! Wrong War, By THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN , BRUSSELS
54. Daily News (New York), March 03, 1997, Monday, Editorial; Pg. 24, 793 words, TAKING AIM AT GUN TRAFFIC
55. The Columbus Dispatch, February 24, 1997, Monday, Pg. 6A, 446 words, LICENSE LAW REDUCES; NUMBER OF GUNSMITHS
56. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, February 23, 1997, Sunday, ALL EDITIONS, 619 words, South Georgia hospital war will soon spread, Jim Wooten
57. Omaha World Herald, February 6, 1997 Thursday, SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 27;, 872 words, Case for a Handgun-Carry Law, STAN SCHELLPEPER
58. The Columbus Dispatch, February 5, 1997, Wednesday, Pg. 8A, 411 words, GUNS AND DEATH; WHY HOMICIDE RATE HAS TAKEN NOSE DIVE
59. Omaha World Herald, January 31, 1997 Friday, SUNRISE EDITION, Pg. 10, 481 words, Tougher Rules for Gun Dealers Have Brought Positive Results
60. The Washington Post, January 29, 1997, Wednesday, Final Edition, EDITORIAL; Pg. A20, 436 words, Keeping a Bead on Gun Dealers
61. The Toronto Star, November 5, 1996, Tuesday, METRO EDITION, OPINION; Pg. A23, 744 words, Rock's battle for control over guns hasn't ended yet, by Rosemary Speirs TORONTO STAR, OTTAWA
62. The Gazette (Montreal), October 24, 1996, Thursday, FINAL EDITION, EDITORIAL / OP-ED; JENNIFER ROBINSON; Pg. B2, 779 words, Keeping men off Quebec's highways would save lives, but..., JENNIFER ROBINSON; THE GAZETTE
63. The Baltimore Sun, August 22, 1996, Thursday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 17A, 819 words, Banning guns in Britain finds widespread support, Richard Reeves
64. The Buffalo News, July 19, 1996, Friday, CITY EDITION, EDITORIAL PAGE, Pg. 2C, 249 words, JUST BECAUSE SOME ABUSE FIREARMS, DON'T RUIN IT FOR THE; REST
65. The Houston Chronicle, June 9, 1996, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition Correction Appended, OUTLOOK; Opinion; Pg. 2, 703 words, Gun ban on buses wounded by Morales, CLAY ROBISON; Staff, AUSTIN, Elections Texas Weapons Gun Control Buses
66. THE ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER, May 12, 1996 Sunday, MORNING EDITION, Pg. G04, 564 words, Shooting the wounded, The Orange County Register



LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

67. Sacramento Bee, May 11, 1996, METRO FINAL, EDITORIALS; Pg. B6, 800 words, KITCHEN-TABLE GUN RUNNER
68. The San Diego Union-Tribune, April 21, 1996, Sunday, OPINION; Ed. 1,2; Pg. G-3, 1330 words, Only those attending stadium events will pay for remodeling School dropout rate shouldn't be an ethnic or race issue It's a hypocritical Congress Eight-hour-day legislation is needed to protect workers Nuclear carriers here would pose a potential threat Gun-control debate continues There is a difference between licensing guns and vehicles Don't blame the gun Children should be taught respect for the environment
69. The Toronto Star, April 9, 1996, Tuesday, METRO EDITION, EDITORIAL; Pg. A20, 505 words, Another abuser turns killer
70. The Washington Post, March 30, 1996, Saturday, Final Edition, OP-ED; Pg. A16; LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, 207 words, Concealed-Weapons Laws: 'Knee-Jerk' Assertions
71. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 24, 1996, Sunday, FIVE STAR LIFT Edition, EDITORIAL; Pg. 2B, 385 words, IN TEXAS, A LICENSE TO KILL . . .
72. The Irish Times, March 19, 1996, CITY EDITION, EDITORIAL PAGE; LETTERS TO THE EDITOR; Pg. 13, 281 words, MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENT, From JACINTA RYAN
73. The Washington Post, February 29, 1996, Thursday, Final Edition, OP-ED; Pg. A22; LETTERS TO THE EDITOR, 371 words, 'Drink and Pack Heat' (Cont'd)
74. Journal of Commerce, January 22, 1996, Monday, EDITORIAL, Pg. 6A, 904 words, WASHINGTON REPORT EXPORT LICENSES UNDER THE GUN, WASHINGTON BUREAU
75. The Baltimore Sun, January 13, 1996, Saturday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 6A, 374 words, Brewing scandal; Kenneth Jackson: Politicians, liquor board claim not to know strip club manager's past.
76. The Houston Chronicle, January 7, 1996, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition, OUTLOOK; Opinion; Pg. 2, 651 words, Concealed handgun debate still loaded, CLAY ROBISON; Staff, AUSTIN
77. The Sun (Baltimore), December 24, 1995, Sunday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 2L, 446 words, Taking aim at handgun sales; Tough plan: Glendening faces uphill fight to set up licensing and training law.
78. Los Angeles Times, November 27, 1995, Monday, Home Edition, Metro; Part B; Page 5; Op-Ed Desk, 795 words, PERSPECTIVES ON THE 'TAGGER SHOOTING'; THE REAL VICTIMS ARE L.A.' GUN OWNERS; WILLIAM MASTERS' PROSECUTION FOR VIOLATING THE CITY'S IMPOSSIBLE CONCEALED WEAPONS LAWS WAS A TRAVESTY., By CHUCK MICHEL, Chuck Michel is William Masters' attorney. He is a former prosecutor and served as staff counsel to the Christopher Commission's investigation of the LAPD.
79. The Baltimore Sun, November 16, 1995, Thursday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 28A, 255 words, Cracking down on handgun sales; One per month: Licensing requirement, mandatory gun training are sensible steps.
80. The Washington Post, October 14, 1995, Saturday, Final Edition, OP-ED; Pg.



LEVEL 2 - 91 STORIES

A21; FREE FOR ALL, 498 words, Taking License With an Analogy

81. The Houston Chronicle, September 3, 1995, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition, OUTLOOK; Editorials; Pg. 2, 536 words, Guns and Buses III; Transit ban on handguns safe, nondiscriminatory, Staff

82. The Houston Chronicle, July 17, 1995, Monday, 2 STAR Edition, a; Editorials; Pg. 12, 625 words, More on Guns; Concealed pistols don't belong on mass transit, Staff

83. Sacramento Bee, July 16, 1995, METRO FINAL, EDITORIALS; Pg. FO5, 3174 words, LETTERS

84. The Toronto Sun, July 12, 1995, Wednesday, Final EDITION, EDITORIAL/OPINION, Pg. 12, 680 words, VIRGINIA GUN LAW A TARGET FOR VIOLENCE, PATRICK HARDEN, WASHINGTON

85. St. Petersburg Times, April 11, 1995, Tuesday, City Edition, EDITORIAL; LETTERS; Pg. 7A, 1798 words, A law-abiding, licensed gun owner is one of the good guys

86. THE ORLANDO SENTINEL, April 5, 1995 Wednesday, METRO, EDITORIAL; Pg. A14, 376 words, DON'T CONCEAL GUN-OWNER LIST, Indigo

87. Sacramento Bee, March 28, 1995, METRO FINAL, EDITORIALS; Pg. B7, 1134 words, LETTERS

88. Sacramento Bee, March 22, 1995, METRO FINAL, EDITORIALS; Pg. B6, 480 words SHRINKING THE GUN POOL

89. The Houston Chronicle, March 15, 1995, Wednesday, 2 STAR Edition, A; Editorials; Pg. 26, 405 words, DANGEROUS SECRETS; What is not known can harm on gun license forms, Staff

90. The Houston Chronicle, March 5, 1995, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition, OUTLOOK; Opinion; Pg. 2, 837 words, Better get set for pistol-packing Texans, CLAY ROBISON, AUSTIN

91. The Toronto Sun, February 25, 1995, Saturday, Final EDITION, EDITORIAL/OPINION, Pg. 11, 323 words, LETTER OF THE DAY COLUMN



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 7 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 The San Diego Union-Tribune
The San Diego Union-Tribune

August 18, 1999, Wednesday

SECTION: OPINION Pg. B-8:1,7,8; B-10:2,3

LENGTH: 454 words

HEADLINE: **License gun** owners; Tests are a sensible method of control

BODY:

You wouldn't know it from the shrill debate on Capitol Hill, but surveys show a solid majority of Americans -- about 70 percent -- support sensible **gun** control. Given that reality, Attorney General Janet Reno's call for **licensing gun** owners is not as far-fetched as the politically powerful **gun** lobby claims.

After all, hunters have been required to have **licenses** for decades. So, for that matter, have motorists and morticians and fishermen. Amid the plague of **gun** violence in our society, what's wrong with requiring owners of **firearms** to meet minimal safety and proficiency standards?

The goal of Reno's proposal is to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of irresponsible owners and to ensure that responsible owners know how to handle guns safely.

The plan might not put an end to violent rampages such as last week's shootings at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles. But it could save lives in a host of ways.

Mandatory background checks on prospective gun buyers are designed to keep firearms away from criminals or persons who are mentally ill and pose a danger to themselves or others. In the last five years, more than 250,000 felons and other unqualified purchasers have been prevented from acquiring weapons because of the background checks. **Licensing** firearm owners would take this common-sense approach one step further by requiring legal purchasers to demonstrate they have the knowledge and skill to possess guns safely.

Reno has suggested that, in order to get a **license**, a gun owner should have to pass a written and a manual test, just as drivers do.

Similarly, the reckless use or possession of a firearm -- such as leaving it within easy reach of unsupervised children -- would result in revocation of the **license**, just as motorists lose their **licenses** for reckless misconduct behind the wheel.

Although the attorney general's idea is eminently sensible, it is not likely to get a fair hearing in Congress under the politically charged atmosphere that currently prevails.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Two months ago, in fact, the House rejected a modest package of gun control provisions that the Senate had approved with bipartisan support. Instead, the House adopted a watered-down bill encouraging schools to post the Ten Commandments.

The vote was widely interpreted as a victory for the potent National Rifle Association, but it also raised disturbing questions about the extent to which lawmakers are cowed by a single special-interest group.

As the death toll imposed by gun violence continues to mount, Congress appears outside the mainstream of public opinion, which recognizes that curbing the proliferation of firearms, especially in irresponsible hands, is only common sense.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 23, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 8 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Sun-Sentinel Company
Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL)

August 18, 1999, Wednesday, Broward Metro EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. 2A

LENGTH: 522 words

HEADLINE: RENO RIGHT: **LICENSE**, TEST GUN OWNERS

BODY:

U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno isn't the first person to suggest that anyone who wants to buy a **gun** should have to prove he knows how to use it safely and legally.

A recent Time/CNN nationwide poll found 77 percent of Americans favor requiring a **license** to own a **handgun**. That poll was taken before Mark Orrin Barton, a frustrated Atlanta day-trade, went on a shooting rampage that left his wife, two children and nine co-workers dead. It also came before Buford Furrow Jr., a white supremacist, shot and killed a letter carrier, then opened fire on a Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles, wounding five.

It's a safe bet the support for **licensing** of guns would be even stronger after those incidents, which ironically are used to feed the arguments against **licensing** as well. Those wrong-headed arguments can be summed up in two words: Why bother?

If Barton had been required to **license** his two high-powered handguns, would that have stopped him from killing his family and co-workers? Probably not. Would the lack of a **license** have served as any sort of deterrent at all to Furrow, whose private arsenal included handguns, an assault rifle, hand grenades and thousands of rounds of ammunition? Not likely.

It's already against the law for teen-agers to buy guns, but that didn't stop Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris from getting their hands on the weapons they used to mow down 12 classmates and a teacher at Columbine High School in April.

But Reno wasn't thinking only of people like that when she said she would like to see states require written and manual tests before granting anyone a **license** to own a gun.

She was thinking of a friend, whom she did not name, who bought a gun to protect herself.

"Do you know how to use that thing?" Reno said she asked her friend, who said no. "Take it back," Reno told her. "You're going to be more dangerous with it than without it."

For all the horror and headlines they provoke, homicidal adolescents, day traders and white supremacists cause a tiny minority of e gun deaths. Far more tragedies can be blamed on careless parents of curious children, or



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale), August 18, 1999

trigger-happy homeowners shooting at "burglars" who turn out to be neighbors, or idiots who celebrate the arrival of the New Year by firing random shots into the air.

Licensing and testing gun owners on safe gun handling won't prevent anyone from using a perfectly legal weapon to kill someone, and the failure to obtain a **license** won't keep a truly determined killer from obtaining weapons illegally.

But it might prevent a parent from stashing a loaded pistol in a sock drawer, where a 10-year-old can find it. It might impress upon people the folly of using firearms instead of firecrackers. It might help ensure that a bullet fired in self-defense would strike its intended target instead of an innocent bystander. Once in a while, it might even slow down a would-be criminal long enough to cool off and reconsider.

There's no easy way to stop killings fueled by hatred and rage. But **licensing** and testing gun owners would go a long way to stop killings caused by ignorance and irresponsibility.

LOAD-DATE: August 18, 1999

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 49 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The Seattle Times Company
The Seattle Times

July 05, 1997, Saturday Final Edition

SECTION: **EDITORIAL;** Pg. A11

LENGTH: 357 words

HEADLINE: SOUND **GUN** PRACTICES: LOCKS, **LICENSES**, CHECKS

BODY:

When the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a key part of the Brady law, local safety advocates thanked their lucky stars Washington is already a so-called Brady alternate state.

In the last act of the session, the high court ruled the federal government cannot compel local police to determine if buyers are fit to own **handguns**. Police and sheriffs officers here will continue to conduct checks and notify **gun** shops if an applicant has a felony conviction because a Washington law passed several years ago requires such practices.

And the message for police departments near and far that don't have such a law is simple: Do the checks anyway. The evidence from three years of the Brady bill is in and it's compelling. The National Rifle Association et al. quibble with the numbers, but Brady checks have stopped as many as 250,000 felons and other prohibited purchasers from buying guns. If checks keep guns out of the hands of half that many bad guys, it's worth the hassle of conducting them.

As many pundits point out, the Supreme Court increasingly is ruling against a heavy-handed federal government ordering state and local governments to do certain things. Similarly, the court supports more local decision-making.

In that vein, a group of local citizens and activists wants our state to take further steps toward gun safety. Washington Citizens for Handgun Safety turned in over 230,000 signatures for an initiative aimed at the November ballot, Initiative 676, the handgun safety act.

This safe, sane measure asks voters a couple of simple questions most third graders could answer without pausing for a breath: Should handgun owners be required to take a safety course and pass a test for a handgun **license** much like the one required for a drivers' **license**? Should handgun owners take advantage of basic technology - trigger locking devices - to reduce the number of horrific incidents of children injured and killed with loaded guns found in drawers of bedroom night stands?

Though the gun lobby is gearing up for another classic never-give-an-inch opposition campaign, the answer to both questions is: of course.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 6, 1997

**LEXIS·NEXIS**
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group**LEXIS·NEXIS**
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group**LEXIS·NEXIS**
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 79 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1995 The Baltimore Sun Company
The Baltimore Sun

November 16, 1995, Thursday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: **EDITORIAL**, Pg. 28A

LENGTH: 255 words

HEADLINE: Cracking down on **handgun** sales; One per month: **Licensing** requirement, mandatory **gun** training are sensible steps.

BODY:

RECOMMENDATIONS from the Governor's Commission on **Gun** Violence are bound to disappoint advocates of tough controls on **handgun** ownership. Yet the panel seems to have come up with a well-balanced set of suggestions with a realistic shot of gaining legislative approval next year in Annapolis.

The commission was pragmatic, if nothing else. A conservative legislature won't go along with radical changes in handgun laws. More gradual changes, though, could win the required votes for passage.

Most of the recommendations are common-sense moves. For instance, limiting handgun sales to one per month per individual would cut down on gun running in Maryland (as a similar law is doing in neighboring Virginia) without imposing an onerous burden on legitimate handgun owners.

Setting up a **licensing** and registration system for handgun sales is also sensible. It would cover private handgun transfers not now covered by the law. And required firearms training for new gun owners is long overdue: If you are going to own a potentially lethal weapon, a safety training course is essential to avoid accidental shootings and other needless mishaps.

The panel's suggestions fall far short of what Gov. Parris Glendening pledged during his 1994 campaign. But the governor is dealing with a legislature less convinced of the need for major changes in gun legislation. Selling even these limited proposals to conservative leaders will be an uphill battle. But these modest proposals could help make Maryland a little bit safer.

TYPE: EDITORIAL

LOAD-DATE: November 17, 1995



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 85 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1995 Times Publishing Company
St. Petersburg Times

April 11, 1995, Tuesday, City Edition

SECTION: **EDITORIAL**; LETTERS; Pg. 7A

LENGTH: 1798 words

HEADLINE: A law-abiding, **licensed gun** owner is one of the good guys

BODY:

Re: Keeping **guns** secret, editorial, April 5.

I agree with you in that I see no reason to keep secret the identity of concealed weapon permit holders. However, perhaps a bit of a reality check is in order: In truth, there are good guys and bad guys in this world. Your concern that holders of concealed weapon permits will run amok and shoot up the state is unfounded.

Permit applicants are screened by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the FBI.

Since 1987, according to Crime in the United States, 1987 & 1993: The FBI Uniform Crime Reports, Florida's homicide rate has dropped 22 percent, while the national rate has risen 15 percent.

Since 1987, over 266,700 permits have been issued in Florida and only 19 (or 7/1,000ths of 1 percent) have been revoked for a firearms-related accident (according to The Florida Department of State, Division of **Licensing** Concealed Weapons/Firearms **License** Statistical Report for Period 10/1/87-1/31/95).

You wrote that you were worried that the guy at the end of the bar might be carrying a gun. According to Florida Statute 790.96 Section 12, it is illegal for a **license** holder to carry a gun in a bar, as well as several other locations.

Back to the good guys and the bad guys: People who hold concealed weapon permits have gone to the expense, training and background investigation so they can be armed for self-defense against the bad guys. A law-abiding, **licensed**, armed civilian is a good guy. Let's put the blame and the paranoia where it belongs - on the bad guys.

Henderson Talbot Jr., Clearwater

Concerning your editorial on April 5 against keeping the identity of law-abiding, background-checked, weapons-carrying, permitted citizens secret:



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

St. Petersburg Times, April 11, 1995

You start out by foolishly suggesting that knowing the names of people with weapons permits would let you know who in a crowd might be carrying a weapon. Surely you do not believe that. Any criminal who wanted to register himself as a weapons carrier would have to be severely retarded and, therefore, would be disqualified. The records prove that we with carry permits do not commit crimes; criminals do that. We're just trying to prevent them from doing it to us.

Jerry Doty, Pinellas Park

Missing the mark

Re: Owners defend their weapons before House panel, April 1, by David Dahl.

I listened to this testimony on TV, and this article, while generally accurate, seriously misquotes Todd Bridges stating that he bought a semiautomatic weapon because he felt its accuracy would allow him to wound rather than kill a robber. That sentence is followed by quoting him saying, "It would cut him in half." Prior to making that quoted statement, Bridges said he didn't want to use a shotgun because that would cut him in half. A shotgun could cut him in half rather than wound him. The semiautomatic weapon he chose, a Colt AR 15, would only wound him, not cut him in half.

The article goes on to state that the AR 15 (weapon) performed just as it was supposed to. The burglar was wounded and carried off to a hospital.

David Q. Stone, M.D., Largo

Stupidity revisited

In a letter on March 14, I commented on Bob Herbert's March 2 column, Drowning in a sea of stupidity. Subsequently, a reader took issue with my comment (Bonds aren't free, March 23) concerning an airport bond issue request that was defeated by voters. In the interest of brevity, I failed to adequately explain the bond issue in question.

The bond issue was to be paid for in full from airport revenue. Since the airport in question was, at that time, the seventh-busiest in the nation, there was adequate income to resolve the indebtedness of the bonds. Voters and/or property owners would not receive an increase in their taxes.

I cannot recall any explanation as to why voters chose to defeat this item on the ballot when airport expansion would bring additional money into the community and state.

It is for these reasons I considered the issue suitable for sinking "in a sea of stupidity."

Earl Johnson, Sun City Center

Fountain show will be missed



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 90 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1995 The Houston Chronicle Publishing Company
The Houston Chronicle

March 5, 1995, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition

SECTION: OUTLOOK; **Opinion**; Pg. 2

LENGTH: 837 words

HEADLINE: Better get set for pistol-packing Texans

BYLINE: CLAY ROBISON

DATELINE: AUSTIN

BODY:

AUSTIN -- If there was any doubt -- and there was virtually none -- that the Legislature would enact a concealed **handgun** bill this session, it was dispelled by the Senate Criminal Justice Committee's prompt approval last week of the so-called right-to-carry bill.

Supporters of the legislation insist it won't promote wild freeway shootouts by amateur Wyatt Earps but will offer law-abiding Texans who choose to apply for a **gun license** an important measure of self-protection.

They are probably right. The vast majority of people packing heat will probably be responsible.

But even Gov. George W. Bush, who supports the bill, and legislative sponsors, who boast of assuring the "constitutional right of law-abiding citizens to bear arms," cannot be sure they aren't making our lives potentially more dangerous.

If guns are such a good idea, why does the bill, for example, put so many places off limits to firearms?

Provisions against bringing pistols into schools, bars, prisons and the passenger areas of airports are understandable. And there may be an important property right -- as well as a device for building support for the bill -- involved in the decision to allow business owners to selectively prohibit the carrying of firearms on their premises.

But, while I wouldn't argue with any business's no-guns policy, parking lots and parking garages can be some of the most dangerous places in any city. How much protection will a **license** holder attacked by an assailant find in a pistol locked up in his or her auto three rows away?

The most interesting ban on guns would be in government



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

buildings, including the state Capitol. While we certainly don't want people packing guns into courtrooms where criminal defendants are being tried, what's wrong with a law-abiding tourist carrying a pistol into the statehouse?

"There are a lot of folks running around making threats to public officials and not to the general public," said Sen. Jerry Patterson, R-Pasadena, the bill sponsor.

But the security level in the Capitol is already pretty high.

Uniformed, armed police patrol the legislative chambers and hallways, and the governor is always accompanied by a security detail.

Why then should a gun **license** holder, who is supposed to be a law-abiding citizen who poses no threat to anyone anyway, have to go to the inconvenience of leaving his gun in his car, parked two or three blocks away, and risk having it stolen if his auto is broken into?

That's because sponsors know the proposed gun law isn't foolproof. Some **license** holders -- maybe only a tiny fraction of the total, maybe a larger number -- will be too mentally or emotionally unfit to be armed but will slip through the screening process.

Any individual intent on harming a public official or any other human being isn't going to be deterred by a "no-guns-allowed" sign on the door or even by the lack of a right-to-carry law, but the added layer of protection that legislators want to provide for themselves doesn't boost my confidence in this law they are about to pass.

Each side in this debate likes to cite statistics, but most numbers are inconclusive. The murder rate in Florida has dropped since that state enacted a right-to-carry law in 1987, but other violent crimes have increased.

Florida, a state of 13 million people, has issued only 266,710 handgun **licenses** since 1987, and only about 150,000 of them are still valid. That means relatively few Texans may apply for handgun **licenses**.

But if **licenses** issued in Texas, a larger state, are proportional to those in Florida, that will mean millions of extra dollars in profits for gun and ammunition dealers, the driving force behind the National Rifle Association's lobbying effort for the gun law.

Most other states already have right-to-carry laws, and surveys indicate strong support for one in Texas. It already is legal here to keep a pistol in your home or while traveling, and many Texans violate other restrictions anyway.



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

The Houston Chronicle, March 5, 1995

A broader right-to-carry law likely will save the lives of some people who are alert enough to defend themselves and know how to use a gun effectively. But pistols will be useless for many other people because the bad guys, who already have lots of guns, will still choose the time, place and circumstances of their attacks and take advantage of the element of surprise.

And the minimum of 10 hours of handgun training, which is all the Senate committee bill would require, would ill prepare many new gun owners to avoid accidental -- and sometimes fatal -- misfirings.

"More guns, more bullets being fired. . . . More projectiles of steel and lead hurtling randomly through the walls of homes and classrooms," is the doomsday prediction of Sen. Royce West of Dallas, who is fighting a losing cause against the bill.

West may be overdramatizing his argument, but he has a point.

The prospect of this law hitting the books is still unsettling.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

TYPE: Editorial Opinion

NOTES: Robison is chief of the Chronicle's Austin Bureau.

LOAD-DATE: March 9, 1995



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 27 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 The Washington Post
The Washington Post*These turned
out to be
letters rather
than op-eds*
↓

February 06, 1999, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: **OP-ED**; Pg. A19; FREE FOR ALL

LENGTH: 752 words

HEADLINE: **Licensed** For Safety

BODY:

Your paper suggests that allowing Virginians to carry **firearms** in food establishments that also serve alcohol will create an uncontrolled homicidal frenzy [editorial, Jan. 30].

It hasn't happened elsewhere. Since 1987, Florida has allowed **licensed** citizens to carry concealed **firearms** into such places without a problem. The Florida statute states that "no **license** issued pursuant to this section shall authorize any person to carry a concealed weapon or **firearm** into . . . any portion of an establishment **licensed** to dispense alcoholic beverages for consumption on the premises, which portion of the establishment is primarily devoted to such purpose." That means you may legally carry a **firearm** into a restaurant that serves alcohol, but not into the bar portion of that restaurant, and not into any bar.

Lest the hysterics at your paper believe the measure merely moves the carnage from the bar to the restaurant, Florida law prohibits the use of a firearm ("use" is defined as possession, whether the individual has a concealed weapons permit or not) "for any person who is under the influence of alcoholic beverages, any chemical substance . . . to the extent that his or her normal faculties are impaired." "Any chemical substance," by the way, includes prescription medications.

If your paper thinks that no one would ever need a firearm in a restaurant, ask Suzanne Gratia-Hupp, the Texas legislator whose parents died in Luby's Cafeteria in Killeen, Tex., in 1991. Gratia-Hupp complied with Texas law and left her gun in her car, not in her purse, on the day a deranged madman drove his truck through the restaurant window and began shooting people. Unarmed people.

Florida has issued more than 450,000 concealed weapon permits since 1987, and fewer than 100 have been revoked for any reason. And there has been no increase in the kind of firearms violence your paper claims that guns cause.

-- Peter Gookins



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 17 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 P.G. Publishing Co.
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

June 17, 1999, Thursday, SOONER EDITION

SECTION: **EDITORIAL**, Pg. A-24, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LENGTH: 173 words

HEADLINE: **LICENSE**, DON'T BAN, THEM

BYLINE: BOB RALSTON; PETERS

BODY:

A fact **gun** control advocates overlook is that people with **guns** can stop violence. The 1997 school shooting in Pearl, Miss., was stopped when an assistant principal, who was an officer in the Army Reserves, ran to his truck to get his legal **handgun** and pointed it at the gunman. The teen-ager immediately gave up.

In Edinboro, the shooting of a teacher and several students occurred at an evening dance at a local restaurant. The restaurant owner hurried into his office and retrieved his shotgun, forcing the teen perpetrator to surrender before he could shoot more victims.

Some gun laws make sense. If we **license** drivers, street vendors and fishermen, we should **license** gun owners. And if people cannot be trusted with alcohol until they're 21 years old, the same may be true of gun ownership. But eliminating guns is not the answer.

All law-abiding citizens should be free to purchase a gun to protect themselves and their families from criminals who may end up loose in their neighborhoods or break into their homes.

LOAD-DATE: June 18, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 9 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Plain Dealer Publishing Co.
The Plain Dealer

August 12, 1999 Thursday, FINAL / ALL

SECTION: **EDITORIALS** & FORUM; Pg. 10B

LENGTH: 260 words

HEADLINE: REGULATE **GUNS** JUST LIKE MOTOR VEHICLES

BYLINE: By JOSEPH P. MALLONE

BODY:

Guns and motor vehicles have two things in common: Each is operated by a human being and each is capable of inflicting injury or death.

For the common good, we have many regulations pertaining to motor vehicles. For the common good, and perhaps for the salvation of a free society - we must treat **guns** similarly. To start with, we must require testing and **licensing** of everyone purchasing a **gun**. **Licensing** would include a photo and fingerprint, plus other information as required on a driver's **license**. Testing would be done by a police agency.

A certificate of title, similar to an auto title, would be issued to the buyer and recorded at the county clerk's office. Thereafter, the owner of that gun would follow the same procedure as for a car.

The auto title office could become known as the Auto and Gun Title Office.

We have a little more than 3,000 counties in the 50 states. Perhaps the sheriff's department could handle the testing of each gun applicant. The application process, including the background check, could be handled by the prosecutor. Each applicant would have to be 21 years of age and be a registered voter.

Details such as whether or not there should be co-existing federal and state statutes would have to be addressed, as would be the fees, renewals, etc.

Perhaps this idea will not be acceptable to many readers, but I feel that there is enough substance to it that it merits discussion.

Our society is afflicted by a variety of ailments that will require many different remedies. This could be the most important one.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: LETTERS



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 2 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 The Atlanta Constitution
The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

December 17, 1999, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: **Editorial**; Pg. 27A

LENGTH: 229 words

HEADLINE: Letters: Instead of suing **gun** makers, require **license** for owners

BYLINE: Sylvia Rogers, For the Journal-Constitution

SOURCE: JOURNAL

BODY:

Now, our enlightened president has jumped on the bandwagon against **gun** makers, claiming they are making the streets of this nation unsafe ("Clinton to file suit against **gun** makers," Page One, Dec. 8). Instead of clogging the courts with more lawsuits, what should be happening is a national trend toward **licensing** **gun** owners, rather like we **license** drivers.

It is not use, but abuse, of the gun that makes our streets unsafe. Passing a test that requires applicants to demonstrate understanding of how the gun works, how to clean it, keep it safe, shoot it accurately and providing proof that a gun education course has been taken and passed should be required.

Requiring a **license** before a gun can be purchased would replace a cooling-off period. Someone wanting to buy a gun to shoot their neighbor because they ticked them off wouldn't go to all the effort required to obtain a **license**. Anyone owning or using a gun without a **license** should be punished and the gun confiscated.

I never have owned a gun and never will, but these lawsuits are going for a quick fix at the expense of a perfectly legitimate industry, which is wrong. Education, testing and **licensing** would be a good start to making the guns we have more safe. How about trying that before eliminating an industry unnecessarily?

SYLVIA ROGERS

Rogers, a graphic artist, lives in Roswell.

LOAD-DATE: December 17, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 6 OF 91 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Plain Dealer Publishing Co.
The Plain Dealer

August 23, 1999 Monday, FINAL / ALL

SECTION: **EDITORIALS** & FORUM; Pg. 8B

LENGTH: 198 words

HEADLINE: COMPREHENSIVE **GUN LICENSING** MAKES SENSE

BYLINE: By EUDICE MARGOLIS TRACEY; Cleveland Heights

BODY:

In the 4 years since my daughter was shot and killed by a stray bullet fired in the air by a "celebrant" on New Year's Eve in New Orleans, I have read reams of material regarding **guns**, **gun** legislation and the NRA. Since the shooting at the Jewish community center in Los Angeles, much more has been written.

The Aug. 12 letter to the editor by retired Ashtabula County Common Pleas Judge Joseph Mallone covered all the bases. It is the most concise and logical piece I've read, and I commend him for coming up with an easy and respectable method for protecting our country from the wholesale and irresponsible usage of **guns**. People don't have problems with **licensing** their cars, why then should they feel differently about **licensing their guns**?

I stand behind Mallone's suggestion 100 percent. We must stop the senseless killings now.

The person who shot my Amy doesn't know his or her bullet killed her. That person was just celebrating a holiday in the "time-honored" tradition of shooting live ammunition in the air. The Los Angeles gunman, on the other hand, knew exactly what he was doing when he committed that heinous crime. It's time for all these "traditions" to end.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

COLUMN: LETTERS

LOAD-DATE: August 24, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 17 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

JULY 12, 1999, MONDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 4984 words

HEADLINE: THE WHITE HOUSE

REGULAR BRIEFING

BRIEFER: JOE LOCKHART, WHITE HOUSE SPOKESMAN

WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING ROOM

WASHINGTON, D.C.

BODY:

Q (Inaudible) -- he have plans -- (inaudible) -- the Australian that way -- no reportorial coverage of the meeting with the president.

MR. LOCKHART: Let me -- before you get on me -- having not been here for several weeks -- let me talk about a few things. (Cross talk, chuckles.)

Let me do a quick readout of the meeting with the Australian prime minister.

They had a 20-minute private meeting, this morning, before they went into their lunch. As the prime minister, I think, told you outside, they had a discussion of the lamb issue, the trade issue.

They also talked about the importance of China in the context of getting a WTO agreement. And I think the Australian prime minister accurately reflected the president's desire to get that done.

At lunch, the conversation first started on a light-hearted note, talking about the upcoming Davis Cup match between the United States Men's Tennis Team and the Australians, which will take place in Boston, I am told.

They then discussed for a brief period, Kosovo. The prime minister passed on his personal congratulations to the president for the U.S. role and his leadership in the conflict in Kosovo.

They talked a little bit about the WTO meeting that is upcoming in November, in Seattle; discussed Indonesia and East Timor about steps that need to be taken to create a positive security environment there.

And then they also discussed the agenda for the APEC meeting. I think Prime Minister Howard made the case, and the president agreed, that they need to build momentum, starting at APEC, to go into the launching into the new round of trade talks at WTO in November in Seattle.

Q Did they have lamb for lunch?

MR. LOCKHART: Hmm? (As a question.) (Laughter.)

Q They have lamb for lunch? (Laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: No, they did not.

Q (Inaudible.)

MR. LOCKHART: I'll let you barbecue me instead. (Laughter.)

Secondly, Thursday, addition to the schedule. Thursday morning, the president



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

will meet with a group of high school students from the Denver area to discuss gun-control legislation.

Handgun Control is bringing a group of approximately 80 students from the Denver area, including some from Columbine High School, to encourage Congress to enact gun-control legislation that was passed by the Senate last month.

The president will meet with the students and will make a statement at the South Portico following the meeting. Later in the day, the students will travel up to Capitol Hill to personally discuss their views and their support of this legislation, with members of Congress. Third, in a shameless attempt to get on ESPN Sports Center one more time before we finish covering this World Cup Soccer, the president and President Jiang of China exchanged messages of congratulations after the final, Saturday's final. Both presidents expressed their nations' appreciation for the two teams' exemplary skills, sportsmanship and friendship.

Q What did Jiang express congratulations for?

MR. LOCKHART: The same things.

Q He lost!

MR. LOCKHART: It was a good game.

Q But that's why he was congratulating --

MR. LOCKHART: There were no losers; there were only winners. (Off-mike comments and laughter.)

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: I'm selling. You don't have to buy, but I'm selling. (Laughter.) Finally --

Q I think you're putting down the wonderful women who won the United States championship.

Q But isn't that the day that Barak is coming?

MR. LOCKHART: They were just bigger winners.

Q Is that the agenda for Thursday?

MR. LOCKHART: That is an event that we will add in in the morning. The Barak visit will happen in the afternoon.

Finally, before we get to the questions, I have one personnel issue to deal with. Today is Michael Teague's last day in the Press Office.

THE PRESS: Ohhhhhhhh. (In disappointment.)

MR. LOCKHART: As you all know, as I told Michael at his -- the little party we had for him last night, when I joined the Clinton-Gore administration, the first two people I met were Michael and Kris Engscov. And I stayed. I mean, I didn't turn around and leave. But Michael has proved to be an invaluable asset to the Press Office here and, I think, to all of you have traveled, both in his role in the Travel Office and then in his role in the Press Office. I think his long-time college friend, Mr. Engscov, put it best yesterday. And I'll repeat a story he told, which was, he got Michael involved in 1991 with the president's -- or the governor's campaign for president, and they all went to Missouri to campaign for the president and try to win the primary there, and they did. And then Kris called again when he came and was working for the Travel Office, called Michael and said, "I want you to do some advance work. It's very important." And Michael said, "Where?" And Chris said, "Paris." And Michael said, "I'll get in my truck and I can be there in two hours." (Laughter.) And Kris said, "No, Paris, France." (Laughter.)

And as part of that trip, and in celebrating the success of that trip, I understand from "sources" that at one point they ran out of things to drink, and Michael got on the phone and called down, in a very fancy French hotel, and



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

said, "Send up a bottle of your best champagne," and, showing that he really knew how to get around, signed it to Kris's room. (Laughter.) So it's that kind of skill and leadership that has distinguished Michael. (Laughter.) To be serious, as I said to Michael and some of his colleagues last night, I think the test of anyone's abilities is to go into a job and leave the job with both the respect and affection of the people you work for, the people you work with.

I think Michael has that and has demonstrated time and again; and has been a real asset to us and to you. And we're going to miss you greatly as the new press secretary to the attorney general of Arkansas. (Applause.) Now, with all bad news, we have good news.

Q Do you happen to know the attorney general of Arkansas' name? Is there a precedent here?

MR. LOCKHART: Attorney General Pryor.

Q Ah, we know the family name.

MR. LOCKHART: We know the family name.

As with any bad news, we have some good news, which is the joining of the staff over here of Mark Bernstein, as you all know, who has been with the Travel Office now for some time. As a measure of Michael's achievements, we really had to set the bar high, and he was the only person who applied with both an MBA and a law degree. (Laughter.) So -- and we expect him to use both of them in the very difficult circumstances and challenges that face him.

But we welcome you. And I think everybody here already knows you and knows that you'll do a great job.

Q Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes?

Q To your -- (interrupted by applause).

MR. LOCKHART: Lester, that was for Mark, not for you. (Laughter.) Keep things clear.

Q I appreciate that clarification, Joe!

To your knowledge, did Mrs. Clinton ever, at any time, speak out for, quote, "Jerusalem as the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel," end quote, until after she set up her exploratory committee to run for U.S. Senate?

MR. FOLEY: I would put that question to her office. I'm not familiar with any writings or speakings. But I would put that to her. Q You don't have a -- was the president happy or sorry about this and her unprecedented call for the U.S. Embassy to moved to Jerusalem? And I have one follow-up.

MR. LOCKHART: I think the president is happy that she has a chance to go and listen to the views and opinions of New Yorkers and express her views.

Q Is Mrs. Clinton aware of two Jewish demonstrations this week to protest what they call her "pandering" and her being given -- (inaudible) -- a Zionist award?

MR. FOLEY: It's hard for me to know what she's aware of. I'd put that to her spokespeople.

Q Joe, does the president agree with her?

MR. FOLEY: No, the U.S. government's position on the issue of Jerusalem is quite clear; it's an issue of final status negotiations.

Q Joe, there's a hate-crimes meeting over in OEOB. Can you tell us a little bit about that and who's in attendance?

MR. FOLEY: Well, there's some -- I think 130 civil rights groups who have come together today to meet with some of the staff here, Bill Lann Lee and others, as part of an ongoing effort to promote the president's hate-crime legislation. The president put forward this legislation after the hate-crimes conference we had here in 1997.

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

And I think, unfortunately, we've seen since that time enough incidents to make the case that this kind of legislation is needed and has growing support among various groups, including civil rights organizations.

Q Well, Joe --

Q Were last week's shootings the catalyst for this --

MR. LOCKHART: No, this has been an ongoing effort to continue to push this legislation. The Office of Public Liaison here has been pushing this now for some time. But it's -- certainly incidents like that point out the importance of this legislation.

Bill?

Q If this is so high on the president's agenda, why is he not taking part?

MR. LOCKHART: Because we do a lot of things here, as far as building for support for things. The president spoke out on this last week. He will continue to speak out on it. But, you know, he doesn't attend every meeting we have here.

Q Well, what basically are you trying to do, then, with this meeting?

MR. LOCKHART: There are -- there's a lot of support among civil rights groups for this legislation. We are gathering and discussing with them how we can continue to make the case for the hate crimes legislation and the status of that legislation on Capitol Hill.

Q Are they coming to stake out after the meeting?

MR. LOCKHART: I think there will be some representatives. I don't think everyone will come, but there will be a good group that will come.

Yeah?

Q Did the American president express any regrets to the Australian prime minister about the lamb decision?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the president believes he took the proper and prudent steps. I think it's an issue that he consulted with both the Australian prime minister and the prime minister of New Zealand -- and so I don't think it was a matter of expressing regrets.

Yeah?

Q Joe, in terms of this meeting this afternoon -- which is supposed to, I assume, try to explore if there is some kind of a consensus that could be reached for a deal on Medicare and tax cuts -- why is it a good idea to start out by bashing the Republicans and accusing them of all the things that Gene and --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think it's important --

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: I think it's important that they understand what the presidents priorities are. The president wanted them to come down and invited them down to discuss his proposal for Medicare and how that fits into the budget debate that's ongoing this year. The president's priorities, I think, are fairly clear. We've put down a budget that's quite specific and quite clear on what he wants to get done. And I think that it's important that they understand that we think some of the things that have come out of the Republicans -- as far as what their plans are, we think they're headed in the wrong direction.

Q Was the president able to give the Australian prime minister any commitments regarding what he could do on behalf of the Australian aid workers that are imprisoned in Yugoslavia on spying charges?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think they had a short discussion on the aid workers and the process for their release.

I think there is an appeal that will be held tomorrow. So they discussed that



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

and discussed the continuing efforts to work for both the reconstruction of Kosovo with the U.N. civilian authority there and efforts to -- the ongoing efforts to secure the release of the aid workers.

Q Joe, are you saying that the briefing that we just had was actually timed to coincide with the meeting this afternoon?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think the meeting that -- I think it's probably more closely timed to the legislative calendar, which moves inexorably forward with, I guess, the chairman's mark tomorrow in the House and the fact that, you know, we're in July. It's -- you know, the year's half over.

(Cross talk.)

Q (Inaudible due to cross talk) -- invited them up today because of --

MR. LOCKHART: Pardon?

Q What's the difference? He invited them up here today because of the legislative calendar.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, yeah, and the fact that he -- we talked about before we left for our trip the Medicare proposal and wanted a chance to talk to them about it.

Q Joe, there's one thing --

MR. LOCKHART: They aren't mutually exclusive. I don't --

Q Joe, there's one thing I don't understand about your differences with Republicans, especially on Social Security. Aside from the intricacies of the lockbox proposals, isn't it true that both parties are setting aside \$2 trillion to deal with Social Security? So, I mean, it seems that both parties agree that there's a big chunk of money set aside for Social Security, so that's not really at jeopardy in what -- the argument over the remaining --

MR. LOCKHART: I think both parties agree on the principle of setting aside some of the surplus for Social Security, and that's something that the Republican leaders have joined the president on. There are some differences in how that's done, and I think the group that was here before me is -- are the experts in what the problems therein are.

I think, more broadly, if you look at the proposals that have come forward, particularly over the weekend, they leave Medicare alone. They budget out for the next 10 years without taking into account the need to extend the solvency, to strengthen Medicare, to provide for a prescription drug benefit.

And then there's a whole series of questions about what are the trade-offs. They have not stepped up to the plate yet in a serious way to talk about the trade-offs. So you have a situation where the Republican budget leaders say one thing, and the Republican appropriators say that what the budget leaders are saying is not realistic. So at some point in time there will have to be a -- you know, an end to moving the shells around on the table, and we'll understand what the plan is. And that's -- this is part of the process.

Yeah?

Q You're accusing them of walking away from Medicare, but you're not accusing them of walking away from Social Security?

MR. LOCKHART: I think there has been -- there's --

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: Yeah. There has been some commitment on their point (sic). There has not been what we need to see on extending solvency the way the president has talked about -- on Social Security.

But I think the other areas that we have talked about raise serious questions.
(Cross talk.)

Q You've taken them on, on the question of Medicare. Your -- basically, your economic team was up here basically accusing them of wanting to cut taxes rather



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

than save Medicare, not that they put it quite that baldly --

MR. LOCKHART: I think what we're saying here is that if you have an \$800 billion tax cut, you face choices and consequences from doing that which they haven't addressed yet. One of them is Medicare. Another is discretionary spending. Another is defense spending. Unless you want -- unless you're willing to revert to deficit spending, which they may be willing to do, you have to face these choices. And I think one thing we've learned in the last six or seven years is it's worthwhile and useful to put the numbers out on the table, let people make decisions, and get away from the smoke and mirrors that characterize a previous era.

Q Joe, Senate Democrats are putting together --

Q Joe -- (inaudible due to cross talk) -- expect to get out of this meeting?

MR. LOCKHART: (To first journalist.) We'll come back.

Q What does he expect to get out of this meeting --

MR. LOCKHART: I think he wants to build on some of the momentum we feel has been generated on the Medicare proposal. We received a lot of positive statements from Democrats -- and from some Republicans, too -- on the importance of that proposal and what it would accomplish. And then, I think, you know, we are entering a season where decisions are going to be made, as we move toward the end of the session. The president wants to use this as another time to reiterate what his principles are, what he thinks we can get done, how we can cut taxes the right way, how we can pay down the debt and secure this economic recovery for the next generation.

Q Joe, Senate Democrats are coming up with their own plan that will probably cost about \$350 billion. Does the White House -- was the White House consulted on that plan? And does that imply that there is some room for negotiation on the size of a tax cut? MR. LOCKHART: I think the president has said that we've got to get first things first -- secure Medicare, Social Security first. Then we can have tax cuts. The president has put down a targeted set of tax cuts that he thinks is the best way to cut taxes. We will talk to Democrats and Republicans about how we can do that once we've done first things first. I'm not familiar with the Senate Democratic proposal that you're referring to, but we're willing to talk to Democrats and Republicans.

I think what the president is not willing to do is to endorse an exploding, across-the-board \$800 billion tax cut before we've addressed Social Security and Medicare.

Q Joe, Governor Bush is going to be in Baltimore the same Wednesday afternoon as the president, and Governor Bush has said he'll be available for questions from the media. Will the president?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, maybe you can ask him where he stands on some of these tax and budget issues. I haven't heard much.

Q One follow-up on this.

MR. LOCKHART: Yeah.

Q Isn't the president at least grateful that for six months after his impeachment there was vice presidential "omerta" about what Mr. Gore now calls inexcusable conduct?

MR. LOCKHART: I think as the --

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, I caught that one. It took me a minute, but I caught that one. I think the president, as he said on this subject, there's no one who has said anything more critical of his personal behavior that's more critical than what he said about it himself.

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Q But he's grateful for the silence, isn't he, Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: I have no idea.

Q Six months of silence.

Q As far as the vice president is concerned, today he --

MR. LOCKHART: Is that what "omerta" means? I thought it meant something else.

Q -- he proposed --

Q What did you think it meant, Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: I know what it meant.

Q -- he proposed photo licenses for everyone in America who owns a handgun.

What is the White House view of that?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the president thinks the vice president put forward a solid package of new crime initiatives. The **president** has talked himself about the need -- his belief that there's value in having some sort of **gun registration**. I think the vice **president** actually put some details to a proposal like that. I think, unfortunately, these are ideas for the future. The president is very realistic about what he thinks we can get done this year, and that's what was passed in the Senate bill, and some of the things that were talked about on the House side. Very anxious to get a realistic gun control legislation through that he can sign rather than go into issues that in this Congress are just not going to go anywhere.

Q But, Joe, I mean, politically the **president** doesn't have a problem with getting photo licenses, registering all gun dealers?

MR. LOCKHART: No, philosophically he doesn't. I think he's talked about this.

Q Refresh my memory. Did the **president** ever call for **registration of handguns**?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the **president**, in a couple of media interviews, has talked about how he thinks it's a good idea, but he's also followed that with the recognition that that has zero chance in this Congress of passing. And what he's interested in this Congress is getting through the proposals that have passed the Senate and have languished in the House.

Q What does he expect the kids from Columbine to do, to lobby members of Congress?

MR. LOCKHART: Yeah. I think they're coming here as both students in Columbine and in the Denver area, they've got an important story to tell, and they want to make sure that members of Congress hear it directly from them, that they support the gun control legislation that the president has put forward, the ideas that he's put forward, because they've had real-life experience, to tell them how serious this is.

Q What's the status of the proposed meeting in Sarajevo?

MR. LOCKHART: The status is work continues.

As you know, in the aftermath of the G-8 meeting, the European Union, the United States and others have been working on putting together a meeting in Sarajevo for some time in the next month or so. The logistics are currently being worked out. And when I have an announcement, I will make it.

Q The president will attend this meeting, or is that -- (off mike)?

MR. LOCKHART: It's a leaders' meeting. I mean, they've talked about having a leaders' meeting.

Q Will it be a several-day meeting?

MR. LOCKHART: I think shorter rather than longer.

Q Is it looking good?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't handicap announcements before they come out.

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: Let me talk to you afterwards.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Q Joe, last question.

MR. LOCKHART: Yes?

Q Does the president --

MR. LOCKHART: Thank you. That was the last question; you heard that, right?
(Laughter.)

Q No, it's not.

MR. LOCKHART: Oh.

Q Does the president agree with Assistant Secretary of the Interior Barry in his comparison comparing both the Declaration of Independence and the Battle of Gettysburg to the Stonewall riot in Greenwich Village?

MR. LOCKHART: I would have to both look at what he said in its full context and then discuss it with the president. Q Joe, there's an article in the Washington Post today that some top Democrats, like Gephardt, are maybe more focused on 2000 and perhaps just as happy not to see some of this legislation, such as gun legislation, pass as they would be to see it actually pass. Do you sense any frustration here at the White House with the Democratic leadership?

MR. LOCKHART: No. I think the president has addressed that directly, and I think there's agreement between he and the Democratic leaders that the best politics for 2000 is promoting the best policies, to get as much as you can get done, because there are still substantial differences that remain between the parties. There will be enough to fight about in 2000 no matter how much we get done this year. So I think he's going to continue to work hard to get things done. And I think he looks forward to the leadership from the leaders of the Democratic Party in both houses in order to -- I mean, in the Senate this week, they're pushing very hard on a Patients Bill of Rights. We will continue to have these fights. And I'm certain there will be enough, no matter how much we get done, to fight about in 2000.

Q So there's not frustration with them here, though?

MR. LOCKHART: No, there's not.

Q Joe, to follow up on that, I mean, what are Democrats and Republicans to make about the two messages that are coming out of the White House today? One is, it sounds like you want to bash the Republicans for cutting taxes instead of saving Medicare, but then he's inviting them up for some talks that are supposed to end up with a big deal on taxes and Medicare.

MR. LOCKHART: I would not say we're bashing Republicans. We're taking issue with things we think are bad ideas. We've had a fundamental economic debate in this country for the last seven years, which it seems to me there's a lot of evidence on the side of the position the president's taken. We -- if you believe what you read in the newspaper, we're going to have this debate again this year. It's a healthy thing to do.

But we can disagree on ideas, whether they're economic or on other programs. That doesn't mean we're not going to work together and get the country's business done.

Q Joe, I still don't understand on this afternoon's meeting. I mean, the leaders who are coming up here know exactly what the president's positions are. They know exactly what he wants to do. Can you give us some idea, without putting words in his mouth, what it is he's going to say to them that will make any difference?

MR. LOCKHART: As you all know, sometimes the president can be quite persuasive in small groups. So he wants to make the case in a small group to the leaders about what his program is.

Q And he knows what they think.

MR. LOCKHART: And this is part of the way we get business done here in



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

Washington.

Q Will he veto it if they pass a big tax cut?

MR. LOCKHART: Let me just say I haven't seen any piece of legislation yet, so I'm not going to get into veto threats. But I can tell you the president won't

--

Q (Off mike) -- he would.

MR. LOCKHART: -- the president is not -- the president will not sign a large tax cut that squeezes out the military, that squeezes out important education and environment programs, and that squeezes out Medicare.

Q Are you going to have any kind of readout or anything like that after the meeting?

MR. LOCKHART: We'll try. We'll try to do something.

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: It's scheduled for an hour. It could go a little bit longer. In the back. April?

Q Yes. Going back to that hate crime meeting, President Clinton a year and a half ago started the race initiative, and there was no powder keg racial issue at that time. The initiative has been over for several months. Does the White House see any kind of relation with the fact that the dialogue on race is over and there have been several serious racial --

MR. LOCKHART: No, I wouldn't. And I wouldn't accept the fact that the dialogue's over. I think you'll find that the dialogue on local levels have perpetuated itself around the country. Those of you who attended the event we had at Georgetown University -- (to staff) -- What was the name of the organization at Georgetown?

Q/STAFF (?): Georgetown University.

MR. LOCKHART: Whatever. The person who introduced the president, the young woman from Alabama, mentioned to the president as they were talking that she got interested in Washington and what goes on here by participating locally, recently, in a dialogue on race relations. So I think the legacy of that kind of dialogue continues. So I don't know that there's -- you can -- I wouldn't draw any direct line between that and some of the unfortunate incidents we've had.

Q Joe --

Q Joe --

MR. LOCKHART: (Off mike.)

Q Yeah. I don't know whether it's the tour of depressed areas last week or maybe just my imagination, but you look a little older today.

MR. LOCKHART: Not today.

Q When? When's your birthday?

Q White House -- (off mike) -- Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: Something like that. This is actually the last briefing I'll do in my 30s, unfortunately. (Oohs and ahs from the press corps.)

Q Tomorrow?

MR. LOCKHART: And I'm not coming back tomorrow. (Cross talk, laughter.)

MR. LOCKHART: Yes?

Q Joe, is the president going to do a fund-raiser for the first lady in the Hamptons next month, or contemplating any other fund-raising for her?

MR. LOCKHART: I know the president's got a DNC -- the DNC traditionally in the summertime does a fund-raising retreat, and I think the Hamptons was the site last year and again this year. I'm not aware that there's a first lady fund-raising component there. I mean, I'll check.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Federal News Service, JULY 12, 1999

Q (Off mike.)

MR. LOCKHART: If that's what they believe is the best way to go out and raise the resources she will need for a campaign, if she runs it, then he will be there.

Yeah? Q Do you know the date of that Hamptons retreat?

MR. LOCKHART: It's the end of -- it's at --

STAFF: We haven't announced it.

MR. LOCKHART: Yeah, it's not for another month or so.

Q So the end of August?

Q Yeah --

MR. LOCKHART: Somewhere around there. And Barry reminds that we haven't announced that, and I probably shouldn't have said all those things I've said. Strike that!

Q Will we get a chance to speak with the president and Barak after they -- when they visit?

MR. LOCKHART: We're still working on the schedule for this week, so come back to me. Probably Wednesday I'll know for sure.

Q Joe, the meeting on Medicare reform, given that one of the main problems seems to be the scope of the prescription drug benefits, why is it that the administration is in favor of targeting tax cut proposals but is opposed to targeting prescription drug benefits --

MR. LOCKHART: Because we think that the Medicare program has always been universal and should continue so. And I think the vast, vast majority of those -- I mean, it is a program where you pay in proportional to your earnings and receive a benefit, and the vast majority of those who receive the benefit are those at an income level where they will actually need it. I think the president has said -- we -- this is kind of old ground, but I'll go over it again -- that he -- means testing has been an issue that he thought had some merit, but he also believes that getting a prescription drug benefit, reforming and modernizing and strengthening Medicare, is important. And there isn't support either on the Republican side of the aisle or the Democratic side of the aisle for any means testing at this point.

Q Thank you.

MR. LOCKHART: Thank you.

END

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 13, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS[™]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[™]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[™]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 21 OF 73 STORIES

Content and programming copyright 1999 Cable News Network
Transcribed under license by Federal Document Clearing
House, Inc. Formatting copyright 1999 Federal Document
Clearing House, Inc. All rights reserved. No quotes from the
materials contained herein may be used in any media without
attribution to Cable News Network. This transcript may not
be copied or resold in any media.

CNN

SHOW: CNN BOTH SIDES WITH JESSE JACKSON 17:30 pm ET

July 11, 1999; Sunday 5:30 pm Eastern Time

Transcript # 99071100V49

TYPE: SHOW

SECTION: News; Domestic

LENGTH: 3752 words

HEADLINE: President Clinton Discusses His New Markets Initiative

GUESTS: William J. Clinton

BYLINE: Jesse Jackson

HIGHLIGHT:

Last week there was a mission of congressman and corporate CEOs across America led by President Clinton, in an effort build a bridge and share the wealth, the growth and prosperity of America with the impoverished sections of our nation. President Clinton discusses the trip and the next steps he expects to take in his New Markets Initiative.

BODY:

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

JESSE JACKSON, HOST: Welcome to BOTH SIDES.

Last week there was a phenomenal mission across our nation led by President Clinton, a kind of journey from Wall Street to Appalachia to the Delta, Indian reservations to Watts, to South Phoenix, across the country building that bridge to share the wealth to growth and prosperity called the New Markets Initiative.

This week we have as our very special guest our distinguished president, President Bill Clinton.

Welcome.



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

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

JACKSON: In this trip last week -- Hazard, Kentucky, Appalachia, the Delta, East St. Louis, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Phoenix, Watts, Anaheim -- what stuck out in your mind the most?

CLINTON: That in all those places where our prosperity has not reached, there are good people, smart people, people with dreams and good opportunities for American business, that this is a moment when we can do what is morally right to give everybody a chance to walk into the 21st century together and do it in a way that will actually be good for the American economy and good for the people who invest there.

JACKSON: They've missed this booming prosperity. Is something wrong with the people.

CLINTON: I wouldn't say something's wrong with the people. A lot of them don't have as much education as they need, and that's a part of our strategy to do better. And you're going to have to have specific job training skills. But what happened is that all these places either never had a self-supporting economy or the basis of economic life which once was there moved away and nothing was ever brought in to replace it.

And now we've got a chance just to keep our own economy going, just to keep our own economy going with no inflation, we have a chance to bring investment to these areas, put these people to work, give them better lives and in the process help everyone else in America.

JACKSON: But last week there were Republican and Democratic congresspeople on the trip. There were corporate business leaders, Democrat and Republican.

CLINTON: Yes.

JACKSON: They seemed to have found a common accord on this idea of new markets. The war on poverty seems to have been divisive, poverty reaction of affirmative action, division, reaction. But New Markets seems to have bound Appalachia and Delta, black, white, red. What's kind of magic about this notion of New Markets Initiative?

CLINTON: Well, first of all it's not charity. It's a hand-up, not a hand-out.

Secondly, the people who are being asked to invest in these new markets should do so with the expectation that they will actually make a profit out of it, that by helping people in areas which haven't participated in this process, by starting giving people jobs, having these job training programs, they'll actually make money.

JACKSON: So it's a kind of war for profits, not just a war on poverty?

CLINTON: That's right.

JACKSON: And that, therefore, you incentivize broadening the base of investment.



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

CLINTON: We're not asking anybody to do anything that isn't a good business decision. It's a good business decision. That's one of the things, you know, we saw that everywhere. Every place we went -- remember that little -- that first place we visited in Appalachia, the guy starts out with 40 employees. A few years later, he's got 850.

And, yes, you know, Appalachia is fairly isolated. But he makes those parts and those various component electronic parts, and he's got 850 people. He's fixing to expand again because of those incentives that he had in our empowerment zone program that the vice president has run for us for the last six years. That's the kind of thing we want to go nationwide with.

We believe that if we give -- in the New Markets Initiative, if we give the same tax credit and loan guarantees to Americans to invest in America's new markets, we can get them to invest in new markets in Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Caribbean, that our people would do very well.

JACKSON: Say, for example, the black and brown market loan is maybe \$800 billion a year in consumer power. How has corporate America -- what has been missing? How have they missed these markets -- markets, money, talent, right under their noses?

CLINTON: I think there are two reasons. I think first of all, they've been doing very well by doing what they're used to do doing and expanding in ways they're used to expanding. So our economy's grown quite a lot in the last six years...

JACKSON: Even though they missed markets. CLINTON: Yes, by taking the nearest thing at hand, the thing they're used to doing.

Secondly, I think that there's something that the economists would call -- in truly economic terms -- "imperfect knowledge." That is, I think that a lot of people really don't know how well they could do if they gave people in inner city America, in rural America a chance.

I think they just don't know which is one reason that it was so important that these business leaders went on the trip. You know remember we started out the CEO of Aetna Life Insurance Company said, you know I may not be happy about this because I had this deal figured out. Now all my competitors are going to know there's money to be made out here.

JACKSON: Why are they so much more likely, say, to invest in Indonesia, Taiwan, South Korea, Eastern Europe than in Appalachia, East L.A. or in South Phoenix? What is the incentive factor there?

CLINTON: Well, I think that we look at Indonesia -- let's just take Indonesia. We look at Indonesia, and we say, gosh, there's a market of at least 200 million people. It's the biggest Muslim country in the world, fairly moderate country historically, although they've had some problems lately, and we'll invest there and we'll sell to that market. What we miss in America is that if you put people who are unemployed to work in distressed areas you create a new market, first.



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Second, as you just pointed out, even in places with very high unemployment, you go into an inner city neighborhood with 15 percent unemployment, that's high. That's three times the national average plus. That still means 85 percent of the people are working there. They've got money to spend. In almost every city in America, in the inner city areas, the people have more money to spend then they can spend...

JACKSON: Now that means breaking down stereotypes. For example, if you look at Hazard, Kentucky, you look -- you look at Watts, most poor people are not on welfare.

CLINTON: They're working.

JACKSON: They work every day. And most are not black or brown. They're white...

CLINTON: That's right.

JACKSON: ... female, young and visible. So perhaps when you speak of a market, you kind of transcend the color or cultural barriers that divide and make people terribly anxious.

CLINTON: Yes, I think that's really important. One of the things that we felt, I think all of us did in this week is that, you know, like there in the Mississippi Delta we're walking down the street in Clarksdale, you got an African-American congressman and a white mayor, and they're working together. We have a -- I met in a store with an African-American woman and a Chinese grocery that's been in that community for 40-plus years.

So, these things -- this is a way of bringing people together. It's about much more than money. It's about cementing a quality in the fabric of life that is absolutely essential.

JACKSON: More of my interview with President Clinton.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JACKSON: What was it about this trip that allows this mission to go from Hazard, Kentucky, Appalachia, to Clarksdale, Mississippi, to the reservation, and yet there was no evidence of racial rancor or division? What was about this period that allows at least that body of people to look for another -- another formation of problem solving?

CLINTON: Well, first of all, I think the American people -- it's a great tribute to the people in those areas, that they have -- they've kind of gotten beyond that, and they understand that if they can build a common economic framework, they can build a home together in their communities.

Secondly, I think the business leaders who went, the political leaders who went, were genuinely intelligent, savvy and humane people who saw that they could do the right thing and do very well.



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

JACKSON: You know, when you were speaking to the Native Americans in Pine Ridge,...

CLINTON: Yes.

JACKSON: ... and one of the corporate business leaders looked out and he saw these 7,000 people, and he said, I've only just seen Indian reservation -- which meant something -- and now I see two supermarkets. I see a car dealership. I see 7,000 people wearing clothes. I see a market. He had never seen them as a market, he had just seen them as "Indians."

CLINTON: Yes, and a lot of these people, if you -- if we put more stores, for example, in these Native American areas and hired the people there to work in the stores, then even in the -- and they're the poorest part of America, they have the highest unemployment rate. But you get their unemployment rate just down to 20 percent, then you have 80 percent of the people working, you make a whole market.

So by creating the jobs, you create the market to buy the product that the jobs provide.

JACKSON: Well, I thought it was kind of mystical to me frankly was when we left Appalachia and got to Memphis, and after we had eaten at the Blues Cafe and had big fun eating much too much and...

CLINTON: We did that. JACKSON: ... you, one of your sleepless nights, decided we were going to go to Lorraine (ph) Motel. We went through this whole museum, Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee. We ended up near the spot where Dr. King was killed, and there you stood. And we prayed and that was a somber spirit. What struck me about it was that what you did this past week was to fulfill Dr. King's last great mission.

(OFF-MIKE) to slavery labor was a race gap; denial of public accommodations was a race gap. We won that in the '64 public accommodations bill. The lack of a right to vote was a race gap. We've now argued that that was a resource gap, it was a North-South resource gap, not just a race gap.

So his last great movement was to pull together people from Appalachia, (OFF-MIKE), Jewish allies from New York, Hispanics from the farm workers, from the Chavez. He pulled all these groups together, and that was his last great mission was to tour these areas to focus on a shared resource gap. So in some sense, this week you fulfilled that last leg of his journey.

CLINTON: Well, if that -- if we can make that so, I would be very proud because he was right about that. You know, it's funny how much time we lost in the country after he and Senator Kennedy were killed, because both of them were trying to -- I remember when Bobby Kennedy went to Appalachia, went to the Indian reservation in Pine Ridge in '68. They understood that the last shreds of our racial problems would be mired forever in our economic insecurities until everybody had a chance to make it.

And now our country has this phenomenal prosperity, for which we're very grateful. But it is, interestingly enough, it has become in the enlightened self-interest of the investment community to keep this thing going so finally...



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

JACKSON: So, profits, not fear.

CLINTON: That's right. Finally, you give all these folks a chance to play again.

JACKSON: What must the Congress do to make this real? And then what must the business sectors -- we have focused, we need legislation and we need business. What's the next two pieces?

CLINTON: Well, the Congress should do two things. First of all, they should fund a second round of these Empowerment Zones. Because in the Empowerment Zones, you know, we give special tax incentives for people to put business there and to hire people from there. And we give the communities extra money to educate and train people. First things. That's what the -- and the vice president's done a great job of managing that program.

In addition to that we have some more money for these community development banks. They give capital to first-time business people who couldn't get it other places.

That's the first thing. The second thing the Congress should do is to pass the new markets legislation, which, as I said, basically gives American businesses the same incentives to invest in poor areas, urban and rural, in America that we today give them to invest overseas.

JACKSON: What do we give them overseas?

CLINTON: Well, we give them tax credits, we give them loan guarantees, we give them other things to try to lower the cost of capital...

JACKSON: OPIC and the like.

CLINTON: Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the export-import Bank.

JACKSON: You've proposed APIC, American Private Incentive...

CLINTON: Companies. And here's how it would work.

JACKSON: You think it would pass? Likely to pass?

CLINTON: Well, I think so. I mean, the Republicans ought to love it because it's a tax incentive thing. You know, it's not a big government program.

Here's how it works. Suppose you and I were trying to build a shopping center development in East St. Louis, where we visited, and suppose the costs of that were -- I'm making this up -- \$300 million. And suppose we could raise \$100 million in capital. Well, if we could do that, we could get a 25 percent tax credit with that \$100 million investment which takes our risk down to \$75 million. Right off the bat we've only got \$75 million at risk, not \$100 million.

We could then go borrow the other \$200 million from the bank with a government guarantee on the borrowing, which would dramatically cut the interest rate and save us another several million dollars on the price of the project.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

JACKSON: So you've got tax incentives, investment incentives...

CLINTON: And loan guarantees.

JACKSON: ... and loan guarantees and markets.

CLINTON: That's right. So you -- first of all, you've got a profit opportunity. Nobody -- we're not asking anybody for charity here. If there's no opportunity there, don't do it. But if there is an opportunity but you're worried a little about the risk, we will cut the relative risk of this investment and compare it with others with the tax incentives and loan guarantees. It's a real good deal.

JACKSON: We'll talk more with President Clinton in just a moment.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK) JACKSON: Now back to our interview with President Clinton.

Senator Bradley put an article in "The Post" this past week about proposals to reduce guns. Just briefly, he says that we should ban the distribution and sale of "Saturday night specials," **registration** for all 65 million **handguns**, a **licensing** and safety course for everyone who owns guns, ban gun dealers from selling guns in residential neighborhoods, insist on mandatory gun locks. Are these common-sense measures, from your point of view?

CLINTON: Sure. You know, we've got the gun locks provision in the Congress, and that still might pass. But I have said, you know, we ought to have registration. We register our cars. If your car gets stolen while you're doing this interview with me, and somebody drives it halfway across the country and leaves it in a parking lot, let's say in Lincoln, Nebraska, and the police find it, as soon as you report your car stolen, it'll go into an international computer system. As soon as he, the person who finds the car in Lincoln, Nebraska, says, here, I've found this stolen car, and here's the license plate, the registration, within 30 seconds the local police in Chicago will be able to call you and say, Reverend Jackson, we've found your car. This is -- so of course we should do these things.

JACKSON: Is the drive to reducing the access to **guns and gun registration and gun education** become factors in reducing violence?

CLINTON: Yes, but see, now I think -- it's interesting. I think the NRA ought to support this. I have -- you know, I don't think it's in their interest what they're doing, because nobody's trying to say we shouldn't have hunting and sporting, sport shooting, and if I were -- you know, they never listen to me, obviously, but I used to work with them sometimes in Arkansas. One of the best things they ever did was their hunter education program. They really tried to teach young people to safely use firearms. Why shouldn't we say, if you're going to have a gun and you're a young person, you ought to be licensed and you ought to be taught how to use it.

JACKSON: But you don't want...

CLINTON: And they would take it.

JACKSON: But you don't want rappers with AK-47s.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

CLINTON: No, you don't -- well, we ought to ban those. You know, I'm in favor of getting rid of all that and all those big clips and all that kind of stuff. But if they have those guns, they ought to be able to use them. They should -- and the NRA ought to be out there certifying teachers to teach them.

And if somebody steals your gun, you ought to be able to find it just like your car. And then the other thing I disagree with them about, we ought to close the loopholes on selling these guns at gun shows and flea markets in big cities so that these same background checks are done. These background checks work. We keep them out of the -- we keep those guns out the wrong hands by doing that JACKSON: In this dialogue, we've talked about all of the easy stuff. I mean, how to wipe out poverty without wiping out the poor, how to begin closing the resource gap and the skills gap. Now the ultimate question: Is Hillary going to run for the Senate?

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: I honestly don't know. She's having the time of her life in New York this week, and the people have been very good to her. And if she decides to do it, I will strongly support her in every way I can.

She would be a fabulous senator if she decides to do it. I honestly don't know what she's going to do, but she's obviously interested in it. If she were -- if the people of New York were to vote her and elect her, she would be magnificent.

JACKSON: You don't think the presidential issue will last in the heat of the campaign?

CLINTON: No I don't -- I didn't say that. I think that she believes that it is a legitimate issue. At least she believes that if she presents herself as a candidate, she would have to demonstrate to the voters of New York that she understands the state, that she is capable of learning about all the local issues, that she cares about them as well as the big national things on which she and I spent our lives.

And so she -- that's why she up there on her listening tour, why she's going to go back every week this summer.

JACKSON: How do you think she has done this week on her listening tour,...

CLINTON: She's been great.

JACKSON: ... because she's had to do some talking, obviously.

CLINTON: Oh, yes, yes. Well I come back at night, you know, from our tour. I'd come back at night and flip on the TV and she what she'd done and I think she's done really well. I'm really proud of her. And you know if this is what she wants to do, I'm 100 percent for it.

JACKSON: When do you think that she will decide?

CLINTON: I think she wants to complete this -- I think she at least wants to



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

complete her summer schedule and listen to these folks and, you know, assess where she thinks it is. But I'm happy for her. It's a very exciting thing.

JACKSON: When we come back, some final thoughts.
(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JACKSON: And now, our final segment with President Clinton. Your discomfort with the poverty-stricken is a great moral statement and challenge for all of us. I hope during this season, we can, in some bipartisan basis, move from the bickering racial, racial battleground...

CLINTON: Yes.

JACKSON: ... top economic common ground, a kind of -- when I looked in Mississippi and saw whites and blacks on a shared economic security agenda, you know, patients' bill of rights and increased teaching pay and cut the infant mortality rates. I mean, it seems that that is -- this is a certain pregnant moment of possibility...

CLINTON: Yes.

JACKSON: ... that all of us should seize.

CLINTON: Well, you know, the thing that was so touching to me, we got out there in the country -- you know, there were a lot of Republicans with us as well as Democrats. And in these areas we went we met a lot of Republicans as well as Democrats -- and these issues, these sort of common ground economic issues, I don't think they're partisan issues out there in America. And if we can keep them from becoming a partisan issue in Washington -- and I'm going to reach out to the leadership of the Republican Party in Congress next week to talk to them about this trip and ask them to help me pass something that will really make a difference out there.

JACKSON: So beyond the historic economic partitions and political partitions and racial partitions, you see this bridge building as ultimately your legacy, building bridges to the underserved, the under utilized, and the untapped...

CLINTON: Yes, I think that this country ought to go whole into the new century and we can't do it if not everybody has a chance to make a living, get an education.

JACKSON: I want to thank you, Mr. President.

CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you for going with me, you were fabulous.

JACKSON: Well, it was a great trip. It was the fulfillment of Dr. King's last mission. To me it was mystical. It was delightful to see Americans find in their American-ness their common ground.

Well, I thank you for watching a very special edition of BOTH SIDES this week, to be with the president of the United States as he shares his vision as we unfold now from focus to legislation to incentives for the one big American tent, where all of us are under one big tent, many races, many faces, many places, but we have a common bond that makes us essentially people of good will



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

and people of conscience.

See you next week, another special edition of BOTH SIDES, 5:30 p.m. Eastern.
Keep hope alive.

TO ORDER A VIDEO OF THIS TRANSCRIPT, PLEASE CALL 800-CNN-NEWS OR USE OUR
SECURE ONLINE ORDER FORM LOCATED AT www.fdch.com

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 11, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 26 OF 73 STORIES

Content and programming copyright 1999 Cable News Network
Transcribed under license by Federal Document Clearing
House, Inc. Formatting copyright 1999 Federal Document
Clearing House, Inc. All rights reserved. No quotes from the
materials contained herein may be used in any media without
attribution to Cable News Network. This transcript may not
be copied or resold in any media.

CNN

SHOW: CNN LATE EDITION WITH WOLF BLITZER 12:00 am ET

June 20, 1999; Sunday 12:00 am Eastern Time

Transcript # 99062000V47

TYPE: SHOW

SECTION: News; Domestic

LENGTH: 10323 words

HEADLINE: NATO Declares It's in Control of Kosovo; President Clinton Meets With
Boris Yeltsin

GUESTS: William J. Clinton, Jacques Chirac, John Ashcroft, Joseph Biden

BYLINE: Wolf Blitzer, Jill Dougherty, Jim Clancy, Steve Roberts, Tucker
Carlson, Susan Page, Bruce Morton

HIGHLIGHT:

President of the United States William J. Clinton discusses U.S.- Russian
relations, NATO peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo, gun control, and Vice President
Gore's presidential campaign. President of France Jacques Chirac discusses NATO
peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo. Sens. John Ashcroft (R) of Missouri and Joseph
Biden (D) of Delaware discuss U.S. foreign policy.

BODY:

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

WOLF BLITZER, HOST: It's noon in Washington, 9:00 a.m. in Los Angeles; 6:00
p.m. here in Cologne; and 8:00 p.m. in Moscow. Wherever you're watching from
around the world, thanks for joining us for this special 90-minute LATE EDITION.
We'll get to our interview with President Clinton in just a moment but first,
let's check in with CNN reporters covering our top story.

We begin here in Cologne, Germany, where leaders of the world's seven richest
nations in the world plus Russia have just wound up their economic summit an
annual event around the world.



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

The main focus of attention this year, of course, was Kosovo. President Clinton did have a private meeting earlier today with Russian President Boris Yeltsin. And joining me now with details, is our Moscow bureau chief, Jill Dougherty. Jill.

JILL DOUGHERTY, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, Wolf, President Yeltsin was here for only seven hours, but he put them to good use, trying to show that he could put Kosovo behind him.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DOUGHERTY (voice-over): Boris Yeltsin may have looked a little unsteady as he arrived in Cologne, but he quickly made up for it, elbowing aside his press aides and striding up to reporters.

BORIS YELTSIN, RUSSIAN PRESIDENT (through translator): Now, that the fight is over, we need to make friends again: That is the main thing.

DOUGHERTY: That fight was Kosovo, the conflict that pulled Russia and U.S. back to the brink of cold war. Now, that it is over, as one U.S. official put it, the two countries are back in business.

YELTSIN: Welcome, welcome, welcome.

DOUGHERTY: "A lot, a lot of issues": That is how Mr. Yeltsin described his one-on-one meeting with President Bill Clinton.

Seated across the table from the U.S. president, he pledged to push for Russian passage of the START II arms control agreement, and for laws the International Monetary Fund is demanding.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

DOUGHERTY: So, after seven and a half hours we'll see whether President Boris Yeltsin is satisfied. When he arrive he said he was actually, half satisfied, so we'll have to see whether the other half is filled up, Wolf.

BLITZER: Jill, you spent a lot of time obviously looking closely at Boris Yeltsin. What did you see today if anything different from his behavior -- his public appearance -- than you normally see?

DOUGHERTY: Well, I think he was trying to show that he was as strong as he possibly could be. That was one of the things that he wanted to really prove when he got here, and from his body language, to the things that he said, he was really trying to prove that he is still the person in charge, and that Russia still has a role that it can play. And it is to the exclusion, sometimes, of the United States, and NATO running the world. He wants the UN and international institutions to do that.

BLITZER: OK, Jill Dougherty, our Moscow bureau chief will be heading back to Moscow, shortly. Thanks for joining us.

DOUGHERTY: Thanks.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: Meanwhile in Pristina NATO has announced that the Serb military pullout has now been completed, joining us now with the latest is CNN's Jim Clancy. Jim.

JIM CLANCY, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Well, it is official: Kosovo is now in KFOR's hands, we had an announcement that was made a short time ago, and even as that was -- those words being uttered we had peacekeepers, hurrying in to place to fill the vacuum that was left. This departure by the way about 11 hours ahead of schedule, this is what Lt. Col. Robin Clifford had to say.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

LT. COL. ROBIN CLIFFORD, KFOR SPOKESMAN: At 1:00 this afternoon, commander KFOR, Lt. General Sir Mike Jackson declared to Admiral Ellis, the joint force commander, that with exception of a few stragglers, all Yugoslav uniformed forces have now withdrawn from Kosovo.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

CLANCY: For NATO peacekeepers there is now a lot of work to get underway a lot of work to be done. Particularly, in the countryside and the German and Italian sectors. The Kosovo Liberation Army still putting on something of a military show in those areas a heavy presence on the streets there.

Now, some of this, Wolf, maybe because the fighters in uniform are basking in glory of what every ethnic Albanian sees as an unprecedented victory for their rights here in Kosovo. But at the same time, some NATO officers are warning that they see some of the KLA commanders perhaps wanting to translate their military position into economic gain, as that aid money being approved by G-8 for Kosovo could benefit them in one way or another.

On another front, returning refugees, still by the tens of thousands all across Kosovo, one problem cropping up again and again, and that is boobytraps and land mines. Here in Pristina alone there are eight people that are hospitalized as a result of land mines. Groups like Medecins Sans Frontiers, Doctors Without Borders, calling on NATO to take a greater role to try to protect the refugees by de-mining on their private property, and at the same time mounting its own public awareness campaign. Wolf, back to you.

BLITZER: OK, Jim Clancy reporting from Pristina. Thanks for joining us.

For President Clinton, this economic summit was an opportunity for him to bask in his and NATO's victory in Kosovo. About an hour or so ago, I sat down with the president here in Cologne.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(on camera): Mr. President, thank you so much for joining us on this very special LATE EDITION from here in Cologne. There've been reports that President Yeltsin has been ill, erratic, that his behavior has been shaky. You just met with him a little while ago. What's your impression?

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Well, his behavior was



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

neither erratic nor shaky today. He was strong, clear, forceful, and looking to the future. And we actually had quite a good meeting. We got a lot done.

We set an agenda to continue to work on reducing the nuclear threat, to continue to work on reducing the likelihood of any kind of cooperation of Russian entities with Iran's missile technology development. We're working to help Russia comply with the IMF and get its economy going stronger again. And obviously, we talked about our commitment to fully implement the agreements we've made over Kosovo. So today, all I can tell you is I had good personal experience. He was clear, concise and direct and strong.

BLITZER: But a lot of people were concerned when the Russians sent those 150 or 200 soldiers into Pristina so secretively. With the Russians still having thousands of nuclear warheads, should Americans be concerned about the security, the safety of that nuclear arsenal if there's a problem between civilian and military control of the Russian military?

CLINTON: Well, so far, I can only tell you what our experience has been in six and one half years. We've worked very well with the Russian military to implement the system that was set up, actually before I became president, although we've tried to strengthen it, to strengthen the Russian security over nuclear weapons, to strengthen security over other materials that President Yeltsin and I agreed last year to destroy 50 tons of plutonium arising out of nuclear operations. We have great confidence in that, and it's working quite well. I have no reason to believe that it won't continue to do so. BLITZER: But will you concede, though, that the dash for the airport in Pristina, and grabbing hold of that piece of territory, helped them get a better deal for their peacekeepers in Kosovo than would have been the case if they had not done so?

CLINTON: I'm not sure that's right for the following reason. I felt that it was important myself, and I told all of our people this and several of our NATO allies, that Russia had a different role in Kosovo because of the importance of making clear our common commitment to protect civilians, both the Kosovar Albanians who are coming home, and the Serbs who remain. Therefore, I thought it was important for Russia to have its forces in more than one of these sectors. And of course, as you know, now they'll be working with us, and with the Germans and the French. So, they may believe that, the Russians may believe that, but in my own mind I had already determined that if our allies would go along, they should be in more than one sector.

BLITZER: But not necessarily in control of the airport, which originally was going to be the strategic headquarters for the peacekeepers.

CLINTON: Yes, but now the division of labor they've worked out at the airport is quite acceptable to us and guarantees that the mission can go forward. So I think that's the most important thing. We have to -- every decision we made, including the agreements made with the Russians, had one thing uppermost in my mind: will the mission succeed?

That is, today -- it's a very happy day. The Serbian forces will go out on schedule, the last of them. We have about 20,000 of our NATO peacekeepers in there. Sixty-two thousand of the Kosovars have already come home. Some of them before we wanted them to because of the de-mining operations. So I feel very



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

good about where we're going with this now. And I'm leaving here with real confidence that we are going to succeed in achieving all of our objectives.

BLITZER: But you have to be concerned about the potential for the KLA, the Kosovo Liberation Army, the revenge, the hatred. The fact that they're not going to be satisfied with autonomy. They're going to want full independence from Serbia. The potential for danger to those U.S. troops is very, very real.

CLINTON: There is potential for danger for all troops, from both disgruntled Kosovar Albanians or disgruntled or frightened Serbs in Kosovo. But I am encouraged that the leaders of the KLA have now signed on to the commitment to demilitarize. They've agreed to put away their uniforms, to give up their big weapons, their non-pistol weapons. To do everything we have asked them to do.

Might there be individuals or small groups who are full of anger and seek revenge? Of course. And we'll have to be very vigilant, just as we've had to be vigilant in Bosnia. I also think we're going to have to work hard to take initiative, to take some of that venom out of the atmosphere. When Elie Wiesel, our Nobel laureate who survived the holocaust came back from the tour I asked him to take of the camps, he talked about how troubled he was by the children, the families, how much we needed to work on that and how hard we'd have to work to get people, religious leaders and others in there, to try to get people to turn away from revenge.

But this is a problem everywhere where such things occur. And you look at these accounts that are just now coming out, even worse than we imagined about the mass killings and the graves and the unusual, almost unimaginable cruelty. So it will take them some time to get through that and we're going to work with them.

BLITZER: There are some in the U.S. military who are concerned that just as -- when the U.S. and President Reagan sent troops into Lebanon, there were high expectations. When you sent troops into Somalia, there were high expectations. Things could go sour quickly.

Is that realistic, or are you taking certain steps that will prevent another Lebanon or Somalia?

CLINTON: Well, I think we learned a lot about that. I mean, we went to -- to Bosnia, where all the same things were present. We knew that we'd had a quarter of a million people killed. We had 2.5 million refugees. We had all those horrible internment camps.

All of the hideous awful stories we're hearing now out of Kosovo we had in Bosnia for a longer period of time. So we did a lot of extra work on security, and we were quite careful about how we defined our mission and how we carried it out, based on lessons learned in both Lebanon and in Somalia.

And so, we have tried to carry those lessons through. I can't tell the American people there will not be any violent incident that no American will ever be harmed or killed. But I can say that we have learned the lessons of the last several years, and I think what we are doing is profoundly important.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: In your Oval Office address, you declared victory. Some of your critics, though, say that as long as President Slobodan Milosevic is in power, there is no victory.

CLINTON: Well, that's two different things. Let me first say that when I spoke to the American people, I said we had three objectives -- to reverse the ethnic cleansing and bring the Kosovar Albanians home. We are doing that. Sixty-two thousand are already back.

To do it in a way that would keep our alliance together. We're stronger than we ever were. And that I would seek a partnership with Russia as we had in Bosnia. We have now formalized that partnership so that even though our relationships with Russia were quite strained during this period of the conflict, I think that we're actually in a position to have a stronger relationship with Russia in the future than we had before the conflict started.

So I feel good about that. So that is victory. Now, do I think the Serbian people would be better off without Mr. Milosevic? You bet I do. He has been indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal, and every day now we see the vivid pictures which graphically demonstrate that it was even worse than we imagined.

There is no statute of limitations on that. The Serbian -- the leader of the Serbian church has now called for him to step aside, and I certainly hope that will happen. And we can -- we have time to focus on that.

But first, we've got to do the mission. We've got to bring the folks home in safety and self-government.

BLITZER: But what the critics also say is that the U.S. and the NATO allies have done nothing to go after other leading indicted war criminals -- Serbs Ratko Mladic, Radovan Karadzic, Arkan. Why should President Milosevic be any more concerned than they are? They're all still free men.

CLINTON: Well, in our sector in Bosnia, we have arrested people who were indicted, and so have the British. And we have worked with them. And I think that'd be a big mistake for Mr. Milosevic now.

We may not have an extradition agreement with Serbia, but he -- as long as he remains at large, there is no statute of limitations, and if I were in his position, I wouldn't take too much comfort from that.

But the best thing that could happen for the Serbian people is if he were no longer president.

BLITZER: Do you think that's realistic that that could happen anytime soon?

CLINTON: Well, I think that I shouldn't comment on that right now. But I think that there's a -- you know, with the church leaders calling for him to step down, with the people in the opposition in Serbia calling for him to do so and with the commitment we have made as allies to support humanitarian aid to the Serbs, but no reconstruction aid as long as he's there, I think that's a pretty clear message.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: Do you know about the reports that you've signed an intelligence finding to actively seek to undermine his regime?

CLINTON: But I don't comment on those things. I can't.

BLITZER: I knew you wouldn't, but I figured I would ask anyhow.

Let's move on to talk about under the category of "now the truth can be told." When you gave the order to launch the air strikes, did you ever believe, in your wildest imagination, it would take 78 days and all the devastation that it did take to finally declare victory?

CLINTON: I'll tell you what I thought. I thought that there was maybe a 50 percent chance it would be over in a week because once he knew we would do it, I thought he would remember Bosnia, and I thought he would understand what we could do. But I knew that if he decided to take the punishment of the air campaign, it could go along -- quite a long while. Because he would be trying all along to divide the allies or bring pressure from the outside to try to find some way to bring it to a close.

And so, I told everybody when we started, I said, "Look, if we start this and it doesn't work out in two or three days, we've got to be prepared to go on." I knew that we had, because of the facts of this case, the capacity -- with the sophisticated weaponry and the skill of our pilots -- I knew we had the capacity to essentially take down the military apparatus and the economic apparatus supporting him.

But I knew it could take quite a long time. I didn't have any specific deadline, but I knew it could take quite a long time.

BLITZER: Yes, Mr. President, some of your aides are now talking about a "Clinton doctrine" in foreign policy in the aftermath of this war against Yugoslavia. Is there, in your mind, a Clinton doctrine?

CLINTON: Well, I think there's an important principle here that I hope will be now upheld in the future, and not just by the United States, not just by NATO, but also by the leading countries of the world through the United Nations.

And that is that while there may well be a great deal of ethnic and religious conflict in the world -- some of it might break out into wars -- that whether within or beyond the borders of the country, if the world community has the power to stop it, we ought to stop genocide and ethnic cleansing.

People ought -- innocent civilians ought not to be subject to slaughter because of their religious or ethnic or racial or tribal heritage. And that is what we did but took too long in doing in Bosnia. That is what we did and are doing in Kosovo.

That is, frankly, what we failed to do in Rwanda, where so many died so quickly and what I hope very much we'll be able to do in Africa if it ever happens there again.

BLITZER: All right, let's move on to some domestic issues. Guns, a big subject this past week. Do you really believe it's realistic, it's appropriate



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

to register all guns in the United States, and if that were done, would that stop the violence?

CLINTON: Well, you asked two questions. Realistic in this Congress, perhaps not. Appropriate, should we register cars and if we did register them, it would be easier to track sales and easier to do comprehensive background checks. But that's not what I asked the Congress to do was to close the loophole for sales at gun shows and flea markets so we could do the same background checks we now do at gun stores. And I think that would make America less violent place -- yes, I think there would be less crime with guns if that happened.

We already, under the Brady Bill, we stopped 400,000 improper sales and we also have a 25 year low in our crime rate and violent crime coming down on average even slightly more than that. So, do I think violent crime would go down more? Absolutely I do.

BLITZER: Independent registration, are you going to hold off on for the time being?

CLINTON: Yes, I mean if we can't close the gun show loophole, we certainly couldn't pass that. But let me ask you this, that doesn't have anything to do with the right to keep and bear arms. There's a constitutional right to travel in America. Enshrined by the Supreme Court as a constitutional right, no one believes that registering our cars or proving that we know how to drive them undermines our constitutional right to travel. It facilitates our constitutional right to travel by making sure we're safe on the road and that we know what we're doing.

BLITZER: All right. But you will concede, though, that the Democrats have a potential political bonanza from this defeat of the legislation this past week going into the elections next year.

CLINTON: Well, if the public supports us, but you know, I didn't want a political bonanza, I wanted a safer America and our party did not seek political points on this. If we wanted a political bonanza, we would have gone in with a bunch of issues that we knew were popular that we had no chance to pass. We thought -- we went in there with an agenda, we thought we could pass that we knew would make America a safer place.

No one questions, no one seriously questions after the experience of the last five years of the Brady Bill. But if we close the gun show and flea market loop hole, that there will be fewer improper sales and it will make America safer at minimum disruption to the people who buy and sale guns and use them lawfully. What we've tried to do is to get things done that would make America a safer place.

BLITZER: All right, speaking about politics, let's talk about presidential politics. Do you think that Texas Governor George W. Bush is qualified to be president of the United States?

CLINTON: Well, that's a decision the American people have to make.

BLITZER: What do you think?



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

CLINTON: Well, I think -- you know, for one thing, we've got to see where he stands on the issues. So far, we know almost nothing of that except what we know from his record as governor.

He said -- his announcement speech was very well crafted and was strikingly reminiscent of what those of us who call ourselves new Democrats have been saying since 1991, but on the specifics, you know, I just don't know. I mean, for example, he said nothing about this gun battle going on in the House. He signed the concealed weapons bill in his Texas legislature, but that's just been one example. The one thing I thought the vice president did particularly well when he said (ph), "I'm very proud of what we've done in the last 6 1/2 years. I've got all the relevant experience to be president, but the important thing is, what are we going to do in the next four years, and here are specific things I will do."

I think that Governor Bush owes it to the American people to say the same thing.

BLITZER: Well, why is Vice President Gore so far behind Governor Bush in the polls and what does the vice president have to do to catch up?

CLINTON: Well, I think in historical terms he's not particularly far behind. I think if you go back and look at this point in 1959 when candidate Richard Nixon, Vice President Richard Nixon was going to run as the Republican nominee, he was considerably further behind Adlai Stevenson who was the best known Democrat at the time.

I think the American people -- the encouraging thing to me is that two-thirds of them have said that they want to know more about all the candidates including the vice president. I believe when they look at experience, proven success and the program for the future. All elections are about tomorrow. I think he's going to do very well.

BLITZER: Do you think that he's trying this week to distance himself from you, the vice president (OFF-MIKE) that your behavior last year was inexcusable.

CLINTON: Well, I took no offense at it. He didn't say anything that I hadn't said in much starker terms along time ago. So there was nothing inappropriate about it.

I felt the most important thing he did, frankly by far, was to say, I've got experience in areas that matter and we have succeeded. Here's what I'm going to do specifically if you elect me and the real choice is whether you want to build on this record of success and go beyond it and you want to go back. I think people might -- the American people will view this election as they should, as they should. As about them, their children and their future. All elections are about tomorrow. So, if you've been a good vice president or a good governor of Texas -- to the voters at election time, that's only valuable if it's evidence that you'll be good tomorrow. They hire you, they give you a check every two weeks to do a good job, so I thought the most important thing he did was to talk about his future vision.

BLITZER: All right, let's talk about the first lady's potential run for the Senate from New York. When did you discover, when did you learn that the first



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

lady was a New York Yankee's fan?

CLINTON: Oh, when I first -- shortly after I met her because I'm a big baseball fan.

BLITZER: You know, a lot of people think she just...

CLINTON: Yes, I know that, but she was a, she said how it came to be. Her primary allegiance all her life has been to the Chicago Cubs. If you go to Chicago, basically most of the people on the North Side are for the Cubs, most people on the South Side are the White Sox. And she said, I remember back in the 70s, we were talking about other baseball, and she said but I like the Yankees, too. I said well, why don't you like the White Sox? She said if you're from Chicago, you're for the White Sox or the Cubs, and normally not both. So, our family always liked the Yankees. You know, I learned it a long time ago.

BLITZER: You know, there were reports out today in U.S. News and World Report that she's thinking of moving out of the White House and getting a place in New York in the fall.

CLINTON: Well, it's not true that she's going to move out of the White House. But let me answer the report. Months ago, we said that we intended to get a place in New York. We talked, we started talking not long after we moved to the White House about where we would live when we got out. She's always wanted to live in New York, so we said we'd do that. And I would divide my time between New York and going home to Arkansas, and finishing my library and doing my work there. Now if she runs for the Senate, she'll obviously have to spend a lot more time there. But it will be more like an incumbent member of Congress running for reelection, that is, she's not going to stop being first lady and doing her other responsibilities, but she'll have to spend a lot more time in New York, and we'll have to get a place there for her to be while she's spending the time there.

BLITZER: If she runs for the Senate, will you be eligible to vote for her in New York State? In other words, would you move your (AUDIO GAP) from Arkansas to New York?

CLINTON: Well, you know, I might, because I think every vote counts, and I'd certainly want her to win if she ran.

BLITZER: It could be that close?

CLINTON: I will say this: I think if this what she wants to do, if she wants it, if she decides to do this, I will be enthusiastically supportive, because I think she would be truly magnificent. I think she'd be great for the people of New York and good for the people of America. And all the years I've been in public life, of all the people I've ever known, she is, she has been the most consistently seriously dedicated to the kinds of public issues that I think are important today, to the welfare of children, the strength of families, the future of education, quality of health care. I mean, this is something, if the people of New York chose her, they would have somebody with 30 years of unbroken, consistent, committed dedication, who knows a lot and is great with working with people. So if that's what she wants, I'm strong for her.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: And so you're ready to move from...

CLINTON: I'm ready to do whatever she wants. I will be, whatever the facts are about her running for the Senate, I'll be dividing my time between New York and home, because I've got a library to build, I've got a public policy center to set up. And it's a real gift I want to give my native state, and I want it to be something wonderful and good. And I've spent quite a lot of time on it already.

BLITZER: Mr. President, you've always been someone who's looked ahead. When you look ahead to your personal life after you leave the White House, what do you see?

CLINTON: Well, it depends in part on what Hillary does. I'll be going, hope I'll be going to meetings of the Senate spouses club if she decides to run. But I want to continue to be active in areas that I care a great deal about. And I think that through my library, and through the public policy center, and perhaps through some other activities, I can continue to work on some of the issues of world peace and reconciliation of people across these racial and religious lines that I've devoted so much of my life to. I can continue to work at home on issues that I care a great deal about, including involving young people in public service. And whether it's young people in AmeriCorps or young Americans who are interested in running for public office, I've given a lot of thought to it. But I'll find something useful to do. I want to work hard. I'm too early to quit work, and I'm not good enough to go on the senior golf tour, so I expect I'll have to just keep on doing what I'm doing in a different way.

BLITZER: So what I'm hearing, more of a Jimmy Carter model as opposed to a Gerald Ford model.

CLINTON: Yes, that may just be a function of age and circumstance. I think President Carter has been the most effective former president in my lifetime, and one of the three or four most important former presidents in his public service and the quality of his work in the entire history of the United States. So what I would do wouldn't be exactly what he had done, but I think the model of what he's done and how he's done it is a good model for every former president who gets out and still has good health and a few years left.

BLITZER: OK, Mr. President, I'm told we're all out of time. I want to thank you very much for joining us for this special LATE EDITION here in Cologne.

CLINTON: This is your last trip with me, so I want to thank you for six and a half good years.

BLITZER: Thank you very much.

CLINTON: Good luck.

BLITZER: It's been an honor to cover you.

CLINTON: Thank you.

(END VIDEOTAPE)



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: Leaders of the world's major industrialized nations posed for cameras at the G-8 summit. The annual gathering has just concluded here in Cologne, Germany. Welcome back to LATE EDITION. Earlier today, I spoke with one of those G-8 leaders, French President Jacques Chirac.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(on camera): President Chirac, thank so you much for joining us on LATE EDITION. There seems to be a disagreement over the definition of humanitarian aid in Yugoslavia. Everyone recognizes food is humanitarian aid, medicine is humanitarian aid. Would rebuilding electrical power plants inside Serbia, would that be humanitarian aid, as opposed to developmental aid?

JACQUES CHIRAC, PRESIDENT OF FRANCE: Well, we are ready to give to the Serbs, of course, the humanitarian aid, but we are not ready to give economic aid. Then what is right? That is a problem. And of the electric plants, humanitarian maybe. Not all of them. Maybe, because of the heat, production of heat for the housing for winter. And well, we have to discuss all together, and have a position taken by all of us about what is humanitarian and what is not.

BLITZER: Would rebuilding bridges across the river, is that humanitarian?

CHIRAC: I wouldn't say so. I wouldn't say so.

BLITZER: Because people have to go to work, people have to...

CHIRAC: That's true, but you know, most of the bridges in Belgrade have not been broken. They're still there. That's, it's not a very important point. The electric plants, that's a problem, and we will have to see what is the situation, what should we do for humanitarian aid. But we cannot help a country that has no use for democracy. We cannot help a country to rebuild, I mean, economically speaking, if it's not a democracy.

BLITZER: Have the reports of atrocities, of the ethnic cleansing inside Kosovo hardened your position on this issue?

CHIRAC: I have always been pretty sure that they did, the Milosevic people, did massacres, and I'm not astonished by the reports you are talking about. And of course, it hardens our position about the aid.

BLITZER: Are the reports worse than you imagined?

CHIRAC: I wouldn't say so. I always thought that massacres were there.

BLITZER: The deadline is today for the Serb military and police forces to be out of Kosovo.

CHIRAC: I think they will, they will do it. They have to leave now. The last part, the fourth and last part, which is the French part, by the way, and we think that everybody will be out tonight, at midnight.

BLITZER: Many members of the U.S. Congress say the United States paid for, did most of the bombing in the air war, and now it's Europe's turn to pay for and do most of the work in rehabilitating the Balkans, in paying for the economic aid and the peacekeeping. Do you accept that argument?



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

CHIRAC: We have the same, the same will to make peace in the Balkans, which means that for the first time, we are all together -- the Russians and the allies -- with the same will. That means we have to help the refugees, which is going to cost a lot of money back home, to give peace to the Serbs of Kosovo. They have to stay there, and we have to protect them. And we have to rebuild Kosovo. And we have to make a great effort to have democracy coming back in Kosovo and around because through democracy, we shall have peace for the future. And we have to help all the Balkans, of course. It's in Europe. And we will pay, that's true. But I can't imagine that the Americans would just look at that and not have participation that is to be discussed together. We want peace. It's the interests of the United States and the interests of Europe, because it is a question of principle -- democracy.

BLITZER: How important is it for the NATO allies to aggressively try to arrest President Slobodan Milosevic?

CHIRAC: In Paris two days ago, President Bill Clinton said what he thought about it. And I agree with him, of course. The world court, the international world court asked for a trial about Milosevic. And we should do as much as we can to achieve this. But we are not going to go in Belgrade to get him.

CHIRAC: That's what Bill Clinton said, and I agree.

BLITZER: And, you agree with that.

CHIRAC: Of course, we are not going to do a war -- but we should do as much as we can to get him.

BLITZER: One final question, looking back on the 78 days of the NATO air campaign, could that have -- now knowing what you know now, could it have been avoided?

CHIRAC: I don't think so. I don't think so. The conclusion of this for me is that we won; have always been sure that we would won, that a strategy of strikes was a good one and the only one possible. Any other strategies would have been very, very dangerous for everybody, and for peace.

Now, we have the reconciliation of the Russians, and the allies which is a great success for everybody. Russia became -- become a real political partner political partner of the allies, which is very important part for peace and security in Europe for the future. And now we are going to help Russians to improve their economy and make the necessary reforms that they have to do.

All this is a global success, and for equilibrium of Europe and the world, but it is also, a great, great, great success for democracy which had not been weak, which has been -- many times the case. For democracy, against barberry and against racism. And for the first time, the democracy said no, we tried diplomacy first. Rambouillet. It didn't succeed. Then we had to go and we have been there and we won. That is a great page of history.

BLITZER: President Chirac, thank you so much for joining us on LATE EDITION.

CHIRAC: Thank you, Wolf.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

(END VIDEOTAPE)

BLITZER: And when we return, the view from Capitol Hill. We'll talk live to two leading members of the Senate foreign relations committee, Democrat Joseph Biden and Republican John Ashcroft. LATE EDITION live from Cologne, Germany continues, right after this. Stay with us.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: Welcome back to LATE EDITION. We now turn to two members of the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Joining us live in Wilmington, Delaware, is Senator Joseph Biden, the ranking Democrat on that committee, and joining us from Missouri, Republican Senator John Ashcroft.

Senators, welcome back to LATE EDITION. Let's get right to the issue of Kosovo. Senator Ashcroft, you heard President Clinton make the case, declaring victory, the Serb troops are now out of Kosovo, is this a victory for the United States and its NATO allies?

SEN. JOHN ASHCROFT (R), MISSOURI: Well, I think there's a real sense in which it is, the Serb troops are out, and I commend the president for sticking to the idea of getting this job done with the air war. I'd like to see us now set a date certain for bringing our troops home. It seems to me that given the stretching of our defense resources, we've got to be careful that we have enough to defend our interests around the world, but the president has achieved his own objectives. This is something he did, and I think the air wars been successful.

BLITZER: Senator Biden, is it realistic to impose a date certain now, for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Kosovo?

SEN. JOSEPH BIDEN (D), DELAWARE: I don't think so, Wolf, for three reasons. One, one of the real successes here beyond being successful in the ground and getting those Serbian troops out of Kosovo, was the alliance is now even more coherent than it was before and more relevant than it was before and for us now, in the face of the commitment of putting in a total 50,000 troops, only 7,500 or thereabouts are going to be ours. It seems to me, that it would fly in the face of this cohesion. I don't think we should make any long term commitments to either pull out or stay. I think we should get about the business of doing what we are doing and let events -- you know, dictate to us what we have to do.

BLITZER: Senator Ashcroft, I had asked President Clinton about what his aides are now calling the Clinton doctrine that the U.S. should intervene in these kinds of humanitarian situations, when it can do it without great cost to the U.S. where it is strategically feasible in interests of U.S. Is that something that is going to go down well among Republicans this notion that what the U.S. and NATO did in Kosovo is a model for future interventions?

ASHCROFT: I think you have to be very careful about sending our troops anywhere, and especially when forces are as thin as they are. This will strengthen the president's hand with what I would call smart bomb diplomacy, threatening to use these kinds of things because this actually worked and it was carried out, but I think we always have to be alert to the fact that if we do enough of this, and we don't have the right kind of defense capabilities sustaining and protecting our own interests, we could be in real serious



LEXIS-NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

problems. We've had about a 50 percent cut in defense over the last 15 years. We can't have just -- a program or a philosophy of sending troops anywhere there's a problem, and be capable of defending our own interests on a sustained basis.

BLITZER: All right, Senator Biden, we have to take a quick commercial break, but we have a lot more to talk about with you and Senator Ashcroft, plus our viewers phone calls for both of you.

LATE EDITION will be right back, live from Cologne, Germany. Stay with us.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: Welcome back to LATE EDITION. We're talking with two members of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations committee, Democrat Joseph Biden and Republican John Ashcroft. Senator Biden, this notion of a Clinton doctrine, is this something that is acceptable to you?

BIDEN: Well, it is, but let me make sure we're clear about this, because I've spoken at length with the president about this in private meetings, and I've spoken at length with Sandy Berger and the secretary of State about this, and that is number one, if there's a clear, a morally correct, two, if there's a clear U.S. interest, national interest involved, and there is the means, the means, in concert with others to do something, then we should push to establish the will to get it done. That's what happened here in Kosovo. That's not what could happen, for example, in Africa, or in Latin America, or many other places in the world where we do not have the means to deal with same kind of problems. So we shouldn't extrapolate this doctrine beyond what it's intended to mean. It means where we have the means, a national interest, and the moral imperative is clear, we should act in concert with our allies. That's what it means. That's the doctrine.

BLITZER: OK, Senators. We have a call, we have a caller from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Please go ahead with your question for our two senators.

CALLER: Good afternoon, Senators. I would like to know how can you actually say that it was the air war that won the victory for us, when it was actually the KLA involved in a ground war which forced the Serbians to retreat? And also, I would like to know how could America stand for the Russians coming in, into this, occupying this airport, and us not doing nothing about it?

BLITZER: OK, Senator Ashcroft, what do you say about it?

ASHCROFT: Well, first of all, I think to have the Russians involved is constructive. One of the problems I felt existed with this whole situation was the problem with our relations with the Soviet Union. I think the president is right that it's important that the Russians be involved. I was distressed about the way they initially took possession of the airport, but I think the compromise, with the U.S. controlling the air traffic there, and the Russians being a substantial guardian of the security of the airport itself turns out to be a good outcome there. And I also think it's a good outcome that the Russians are involved in the broad sort of peacekeeping effort there. I would just indicate that the Kosovo Liberation Army did do a number of things that were important to us. They forced the Serbs to concentrate their effort, and made the



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Serbs an exposed target that made the air war more successful. So I believe we were successful in the air war, and, part of the success was due to the Kosovo Liberation Army.

BLITZER: Senator Biden, very quickly, do you agree?

BIDEN: Wolf, I agree with John. The KLA were helpful. They weren't the reason why we prevailed, but it made it quicker than it otherwise would have been. But I agree with John on the Russians, and we agree on both these points.

BLITZER: OK, both of our senators stand by. We have to take another commercial break. For our international viewers, WORLD NEWS is next. For our North American audience, another 30 minutes of LATE EDITION. We'll have a lot more, including a discussion with our Senators, Biden and Ashcroft, including your phone calls for both of them, plus a check of the hour's top headlines with Gene Randall, our LATE EDITION roundtable, and Bruce Morton's Last Word. Stay with us live from Cologne, Germany.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: Welcome back to this special, live LATE EDITION from Cologne, Germany. We'll take your phone calls your phone calls for Senators Biden and Ashcroft in just a moment, but let's check in with Gene Randall for a look at the hours top stories.

(NEWSBREAK)

BLITZER: Thanks Gene. We now continue our conversation with Democratic Senator Joseph Biden of Delaware, and Republican Senator John Ashcroft of Missouri. Let's go right to the phones, I think we have a caller from Georgia, go ahead please with your question.

QUESTION: Yes, Senator Ashcroft, will the gun control legislation help the Republicans pick up seats in the House and the Senate in your judgment?

ASHCROFT: Well, I think, I don't know. What we need to do as a country is to stop children from killing children. And we also need to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. And I think there are ways to do that without infringing the rights of law-abiding citizens. I don't know what the political implications are going to be, for what happened in the House. There are some important things I did in the Senate like make sure that children don't possess semi-automatic assault weapons like Uzi's and AK-47's and I'm glad that was in the bill, and I hope that kind of balance is reflected in what we ultimately do.

BLITZER: Senator Biden, is additional gun control legislation dead for this year?

BIDEN: I really don't know, Wolf, this may be one of those cases where when the public lets the Congress know how dissatisfied I think they are, with not moving along at least in the modest things we did in the Senate, you may see a change over in the House, but I have enough trouble figuring out what the Senate's going to do let alone what the House is going to do. It's pretty clear they're in some disarray, and I wouldn't want to guess what they're likely to do.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

BLITZER: Senator Ashcroft, the Senate Democratic leader Tom Daschle was on one of the shows this morning. Listen to what he said, because I'd be curious to get your reaction.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. TOM DASCHLE (D-SD), SENATE MINORITY LEADER: It was such a tragedy, such a lost opportunity. It was a real victory for the lobbyists and a defeat for the American people, but we still have some hope. There is a glimmer of hope that we could put it back in and conference.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BLITZER: Is there a glimmer of hope that these loopholes for gun shows sales, flea market sales could be passed narrowly by one vote in the U.S. Senate can come back in a joint House-Senate conference committee?

ASHCROFT: Well, of course there's always that potential. I think we need to use technology. I think with the kind of computer and database technology we have now, we can do instant checks on computers. Those are the kinds of things -- we do need a bill. I think we will get a bill, I wouldn't be as dark in the forecast as some have been, but, time will tell whether or not we actually find ourselves with what we need to have.

BLITZER: Senator Biden, as far as you are concerned, is the Democratic fight for the nomination over. In other words, do you believe that the vice president has that nomination locked up?

BIDEN: No, I don't, I think Bill Bradley is a very credible challenger. I think Bill is making some good headway, I'm not -- I can't predict what will happen. But I think this is going to be a race, I think you won't really get a chance to know exactly how much of a race it's going to be Wolf, until if you ask me that question in November, before the February caucuses and primaries, we'd be better suited to know that answer. But Bill is very credible. People take him very seriously, he has the wonderful advantage of having a one-on-one comparison, with the with the -- with the likely nominee. I still think he is likely nominee, that is Vice President Gore, but both are really fine men in my view and both have strong similarities, and real streaks of -- of independent thinking. I think it's still open, although I think the front-runner is Gore. BLITZER: We only have a few seconds Senator Ashcroft, does Governor Bush have it locked up on Republican side?

ASHCROFT: Well he's certainly a front run they're is no question. But there are a lot of great candidates, and there's going to be a lot of discussion in this campaign, I think given the multiplicity of candidates, I think we're going to have a good, solid debate about issues and I think that will redound to the benefit not only of the American people but the Republican candidate who emerges.

BLITZER: OK, Senator Ashcroft and Senator Biden, always good to have both of you on LATE EDITION. Thanks again for joining us. When we return, it was a big week for President Clinton, but it may turn out to have been a bigger week for Vice President Al Gore. We'll go 'round the table with Roberts, Page, and Carlson, when LATE EDITION continues. Stay with us.



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: President Clinton is in the midst of a week-long trip to Europe. The highlight of his visit, the G-8 summit, which has just wrapped up here in Cologne, Germany. Welcome back to LATE EDITION. Time now for our roundtable, and holding down the fort back in Washington, Steve Roberts, contributing editor for U.S. News and World Report, Susan Page, White House bureau chief for USA Today, and Tucker Carlson, political writer for the Weekly Standard. Steve, from your vantage point sitting back in Washington, how is the president doing over here in Europe so far?

STEVE ROBERTS, CNN COMMENTATOR: Well, I think he looks pretty good. He can legitimately claim, as he did in his interview with you, Wolf, that this is, that there is a victory here. It came at a high cost. But he did get the Albanians back, peace seems to be returning, the Serb troops are leaving. So I think in all fairness this is a good moment in his presidency.

BLITZER: Tucker Carlson?

TUCKER CARLSON, CNN COMMENTATOR: I don't think there's any question about it. I think the president has claimed victory. I think it's mostly legitimate. There are outstanding issues, however. The KLA is one of them. The president said today that he had, in response to your question about the KLA, well I've sent Elie Wiesel to the camps, and he reports that there's some tension there. That's not, in the long run, going to be a good enough answer, I don't think. There are questions that he's going to be hit with on the Hill, for instance, about our relationship with Russia, and about the KLA, who it turns out is maybe not as, you know, a humanitarian a group as we thought it was.

BLITZER: You know, Susan, as you well know, it was only about a year or so ago that the State Department's annual report on global terrorism did include the Kosovo Liberation Army, the KLA, as a group that is a terrorist organization. SUSAN PAGE, CNN COMMENTATOR: And that's, of course, one of the reasons that the administration was so careful not to move for independence for Kosovo, that's not the administration position, they're for autonomy, and to not leave the KLA in charge of Kosovo. They hope to make a deal with the KLA, although it's a hard organization to negotiate a very firm agreement with, that the KLA gradually become more of a police force and less of a terrorist organization. But that's traditionally one of the things you have to deal with when you move from a rebellion to a situation that's more settled. Often the people who lead rebellions are not the people that you want in charge when that rebellion is over.

BLITZER: You know, Steve, one thing that I did notice on this presidential visit here to Europe, he was spending a lot of time talking and worrying about the gun debate back in Washington, and he lost the big one. Is that how it's perceived?

ROBERTS: Well, he lost the legislation, but he won the issue. And in many ways, Democrats are much happier with this situation. I don't want to be overly cynical. I don't want to say that the Democrats would have rejected any bill,



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

but the fact is when he says, when the president says he didn't, in his interview with you, that he did not want a political bonanza out of this, Democrats are loving this. They really don't want to give the Republicans a victory. They are planning a fall campaign which runs on two words, Wolf, that is, the fall of 2000. Those two words are incompetence and extremism. That's what they're going to try to pin on the Republicans. And the defeat of this bill plays into both of those. So they are delighted today to have this political issue, whatever the president said that he didn't want it. He's wrong, he does want it.

BLITZER: All right. Tucker, listen to what the House majority whip, Tom DeLay said earlier today.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

REP. TOM DELAY (R-TX), MAJORITY WHIP: It's really unfortunate that, as you saw, the minority leader wanted to talk about nothing but politics and no substance, because they're afraid to death of the issue.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BLITZER: Is this a winning issue or a losing issue for those Republicans who are on the sort of fence, who could go down to defeat, and the Democrats presumably could take over control of the House of Representatives next year?

CARLSON: I think it's a bad issue for the Republicans, and I disagree with Steve. I don't think it is possible to be overly cynical about this. You see that the rhetoric here has been really overheated. You saw Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York burst into sort of hysterical tears, talking about how the Republicans really don't care about children, don't care about women, don't want to protect the lives of American citizens. I mean, it really doesn't get more corrosive and more overheated than that. But ultimately, that works. If you get hysterical enough, voters after a while begin to think, well, gee, maybe the Republicans are evil. Maybe they do want to kill children. It's a shame it's gotten here, but ultimately, it's a real loser for the Republicans.

PAGE: Tucker, I guess I would maybe tend...

BLITZER: All right...

PAGE: Wolf, could I just break in? I guess I would tend to disagree with Tucker some. I think it's hard to figure the politics of this issue, because the reason this didn't pass is because the it takes a tragedy, you have to be really on the heels of some catastrophe to get the people who support gun control to really vote on that issue. That's why, by having just a delay of a few weeks after the school shootings, the two most recent school shootings, the NRA and the opponents of gun control were able to pull off this victory in the House. And you don't know what's going to be happening by 2000.

You know that the people who oppose gun control will be voting on this issue. I don't think it's clear whether the people who support gun control are going to continue to be as energized about it. It's going to depend upon what happens in the outside world.

BLITZER: All right, Susan, stand by. We have to take another quick break,



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

but when we return, it's finally official: Vice President Al Gore formally begins his run for the White House. We'll ask the roundtable how he's doing when LATE EDITION continues. Stay with us.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: In what was hardly the best kept secret, in his hometown of Carthage, Tennessee, Vice President Al Gore this past week formally threw his hat into the ring.

Welcome back to our LATE EDITION Roundtable. Susan Page, you heard the president say he agrees with Al Gore, who described Mr. Clinton's behavior during the Monica Lewinsky investigation as inexcusable. Mr. Clinton saying that Vice President Gore didn't say anything that he personally had not said about himself, but is the vice president trying to distance himself from Mr. Clinton right now?

PAGE: No question about it. And on the issue of character and personal behavior, clearly the vice president is trying to say I offer you Clinton policies without the problems with Clinton's personal misbehavior that caused the country anguish last year. We saw his very attractive family with him, featured his wife, Tipper, and his daughters and his son. And I think it is probably a somewhat difficult line for Vice President Gore to walk.

He has been very loyal vice president. I think it probably stings a little with President Clinton although he denied that in the interview with you.

BLITZER: What about that, Steve Roberts? ROBERTS: Well, I think that there is no doubt that Al Gore is trying to distinguish himself. He is trying to hit the family issue very hard. He's trying to talk about decency and values.

In fact, it's fascinating. Al Gore and George Bush are basically both running against Bill Clinton, in a sense. Both saying, I'm a more decent, I'm a more honorable person. And yet at the same time, they are following almost precisely the Clinton game plan, of running toward the political middle.

I mean, Bush is talking about compassionate conservatism, Gore is talking about pragmatic liberalism. You tell me the difference between those two, Wolf.

And I think that going back to the gun issue, that is the kind of issue where if George Bush -- he signed the bill this week banning lawsuits in Texas against cities -- I think that is one of those issues, particularly with suburban Republican women, where if he wants to run to the middle, he has to watch it, because if he listens to his right wing could it hurt him.

BLITZER: Tucker Carlson, even President Clinton said that Governor Bush seemed to be sounding like a new Democrat.

CARLSON: I think that is probably pretty fair. I mean, he's sounding like someone certainly in the center. I mean back to Al Gore, one has to feel sorry for him or any incumbent in his position. I mean, he has to argue simultaneously that things are wonderful and they need to get get radically better immediately.

It was interesting, Clinton said, well, this is the problem all vice



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

presidents face. And he gave as an example Richard Nixon in 1959 who was polling quite badly. Nixon, of course, went on to lose that election, so one does feel sorry for Gore. I have to say, though, he's not going to get much competition from Bill Bradley, who I followed around California last week, who really is probably the worst campaigner, nice guy, but the worst campaigner since Mory Taylor (ph) in '96. Really just not skilled on the stump.

BLITZER: You know, Susan, even some presidents aides squirming when they heard that comparison with Richard Nixon.

PAGE: It seemed like an odd one for the president to make, but before we get too concerned by the way Vice President Gore has some problems in polls, let's remember some previous elections. In 1996 at this point, President Clinton was a sure loser; in the 1992 elections at this point President Bush a sure winner. In 1984 at this point, Mondale was leading Reagan. So let's not be too sure we know what's going on right now.

BLITZER: OK, Susan Page, Tucker Carlson, Steve Roberts, I will be joining you back in Washington, next Sunday. Thanks again for joining us for our roundtable. And when we come back, we will take a look at what's on the cover of the major news magazines in the United States. And Bruce Morton's last word on Father's Day shares thoughts about those who live without Dads. Stay with us. (COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BLITZER: Time now for Bruce Morton's "Last Word." Today, something about Fathers Day.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BRUCE MORTON, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Lots of fathers in the news this week. George W. Bush was out the running for president, the job his father held. And everybody noticed the differences. W, easy and jokey in the crowds, the comfortable cowboy his father never was.

And then Al Gore, running, full of issues and positions, but without the ease that his father, like the son a senator from Tennessee, always had. Senior played a pretty good country fiddle. Hard to imagine Al Jr. Doing that.

Still, both Bush and Gore are serious, successful men, a reminder that having fathers, having two parents, is a good thing. Lots of children don't.

A report called "Turning the Corner on Father Absence in Black America," issued by the Morehouse Research Institute and the Institute for American Values, says that 70 percent of the black children born in 1996 were born to unmarried mothers. Eighty percent of black children born today will spend a significant amount of their childhood without a father.

It's a problem for all Americans, of course, not just blacks, and there's a whisper of good news: a decline, recently in teenaged pregnancies. Still, it's depressing, and it used to be better.

In 1960, before blacks had civil rights, before the voting rights act, back in those bad days, 78 percent of black babies were born to married mothers.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

I remember talking, a few years ago, with the man who then headed public housing in Chicago. He had not grown up in the projects, he said, but he had envied the children who did because the projects back then were full of families, with fathers who work in the morning as plumbers, bus drivers, insurance salesman, whatever, and came home at night to be with their kids. "Full of families," he remembered.

No longer. On that same story, I remember going to one of the projects to shoot a young mother who was moving into a apartment with her small children. She was a single parent; the place was full of them. And while we waited for her, 20 minutes, or so, we heard gunfire twice.

The residents reacted about the way most people would to a fire engine going by.

And then, from Kosovo, one other Father's Day reminder, that wars create single parents too. I'm Bruce Morton.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

BLITZER: Thanks, Bruce. Now, a look at what's on the cover of this week's major news magazines in the United States.

A pile of Kosovar Albanian identity cards is on the cover of "Time," calling its story: "Kosovo: The Awful Truth."

"U.S. News & World Report" has its annual retirement guide, "A 401(k) Nation," on the cover.

And on the cover of "Newsweek," "America Goes Hollywood: The Stars and Artists in Their Own Words."

That's your LATE EDITION for Sunday, June 20th. We'll be back in Washington next Sunday and every Sunday for the last word in Sunday talk. this programming note: in case you missed any of our interview earlier today with President Clinton, we will rebroadcast that interview at 10:00 p.m. Eastern tonight, on The World Today.

For now, thanks very much for watching. Enjoy the rest of your weekend and have a happy Father's Day to fathers all over the world, especially to my dad in Florida. I'm Wolf Blitzer, Cologne, Germany.

TO ORDER A VIDEO OF THIS TRANSCRIPT, PLEASE CALL 800-CNN-NEWS OR USE OUR SECURE ONLINE ORDER FORM LOCATED AT www.fdch.com

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 20, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 35 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 National Broadcasting Co. Inc.
NBC News Transcripts

SHOW: MEET THE PRESS (10:00 AM ET)

June 13, 1999, Sunday

LENGTH: 1425 words

HEADLINE: REPRESENTATIVE DICK GEPHARDT DISCUSSES WHETHER CONGRESS IS IN AGREEMENT WITH ISSUES LIKE THE BUDGET AND GUN CONTROL

BODY:

MR. RUSSERT: Congressman Dick Gephardt, welcome. Will Congress adopt gun control in the House this week?

REP. GEPHARDT: I hope the Congress will do some reasonable measures on gun safety for children. I think that's important. I think we can help with this problem. There are many other things we need to do with regard to raising children and the way we educate children. And those, hopefully, will come up later in the year. But right now we have a chance to do the kind of sensible, reasonable gun control, gun safety measures that the Senate did a few weeks ago.

MR. RUSSERT: The administration has been working very hard to try to cast this as the Democrats are for gun control; the Republicans against. And yet you wake up to this morning's New York Times, Congressman, headline: "Gun Proposal Takes a Turn as Democrats Show Divide; A proposal for mandatory background checks of buyers at gun shows. That has the blessing of House Republican leaders and reflects the preferences of the National Rifle Association, the NRA--is being sponsored by a group of Democrats, including the most senior Democrat in the House."

REP. GEPHARDT: Well, Tim, that's nothing new. Maybe the story is a little behind the facts. I've been saying for weeks that this would be a bipartisan issue. But the truth is there are about 80 percent of the Democrats who favor these gun safety measures, and about 80 percent of the Republicans are against them. And, in fact, the special interest groups, like the NRA that have been weighing in on this, have been working with the Republican leadership to get this the way they want it.

I think you're going to see the same kind of thing play out in the House that played out in the Senate, and that is a vast majority of Democrats are for gun safety measures for children and a vast majority of Republicans are not. That doesn't mean it's not bipartisan. We're going to seek Republican votes to do the right thing.

MR. RUSSERT: But why can't you, as Democratic leader, get those 30 wayward Democrats in line and vote with you on such an important measure as espoused by the president and the Democratic Party?

REP. GEPHARDT: Tim, you can never do that. I do not command people on how they should vote. This is a matter that people approach on their own. They



LEXIS-NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

make their own decision. But the truth is, once again, I'll say it, a vast majority of Democrats are for gun safety measures and a vast majority of Republicans are not.

MR. RUSSERT: President Clinton said last week that he believes that all guns should be registered, just the way Americans register their automobiles. Is that your view?

REP. GEPHARDT: I don't think we have to go to that level. I think what we're trying to do here is what makes sense, and that is to bring about reasonable provisions for gun safety with children. We ought to look at safety locks. That's another thing that's out there that ought to be looked at. We're trying to close this Brady loophole for the gun shows, where police tell me most of the handguns are being sold today. So these are the kind of reasonable things that need to be done. We should not go off into lots of other measures that are out there. And, again, we got to get back to the other things that are very important in this. I was out in Littleton. I hugged those parents of the children who had died. I cried with them. I had one parent look at me in the eye and say, "Congressman, don't let my child die in vain." I'll never get that face out of my head. We got to do what's right for our people, what's sensible, what's reasonable, and we got to do all the things that can be done to help parents raise their children so there's not this violence.

MR. RUSSERT: But you would not support legislation in the House that would call for the registering of guns?

REP. GEPHARDT: I don't think we need that. I think what we need is what's in front of us. I think that's what we ought to work on now. We should not go off into measures we haven't studied and looked at. The Senate has passed this measure on gun safety for children. Let's get this done.

MR. RUSSERT: As you know, Congressman, big debate in the House as to how much money should be spent, whether the budget caps should be honored as passed in 1997. What should happen to defense spending? What should happen to taxes? You've created a little stir with some comments in Philadelphia. Let me put them on the screen for our viewers and give you a chance to respond to them: "You've got to have a combination of taking it out of the defense budget and raising revenue." That is, finding money for education. "We can argue about how to do that, closing loopholes or even raising taxes to do it. ...I feel we can find some room in the budget to do what must be done without a tax increase."

But you go on: "But if we can't, well, this is the paramount challenge"--talking about education--"we face as a society, and I think the public shares that view. ...I'd be proud to vote for tax increases for schools. You bet I would."

Republicans have seized on that and said, "That's what Speaker Gephardt would do, cut defense and raise taxes."

REP. GEPHARDT: Well, that's nonsense. What I was saying, and what I believe, is that we can find room in the budget without changes in revenues in order to fund education. And that's what we ought to do. The other point is that education is not just money. We spend a lot of money on education, most of it at the local level, and that's as it should be. What we need to do is to improve our educational efforts. We need to better train teachers. We need to



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

better train principals. We need to involve parents in education. I've got a school here in my district where they have parent training, preschool, after-school. The school is a real family center. That's the kind of school that we need in every school in this country. Revenue and the budget is not the issue. It's how we go about this. That's the issue.

MR. RUSSERT: Well, you did say you would take it out of the defense budget. Where? What defense programs would be cut to pay for education?

REP. GEPHARDT: I think we can find room throughout the entire budget. We spend a lot of money, and I think in a repetitious matter, on intelligence. I think we could save money in that part of the budget. We have a Defense Intelligence Agency and we have one in every service plus the Central Intelligence Agency. I think there are other areas in defense where we could look at the bases that we've got out there that are no longer needed and make changes in that as we have in the past, in order to bring about savings that can be used in other parts of the budget. There's fraud and abuse in the way we procure items in the budget, and that ought to be looked at as well. So there are a variety of ways to find the means to do what we all know we need to do. But let me reiterate, this is not a matter of money. This is a matter of commitment and will and getting everybody involved. Every citizen has to take a role in helping to educate and raise our children so that every child in this country is a productive, law-abiding citizen. That's the goal.

MR. RUSSERT: So you would not raise taxes to pay for education?

REP. GEPHARDT: No, I would not. You don't need to do that. What you need to do is to reorder priorities in the budget and get, again, everybody involved in the effort here in St. Louis and all across this country. We can do this.

MR. RUSSERT: It's June. Congress, the House still debating, bickering over the budget and appropriation bills. Are we headed for more gridlock and perhaps even another government shutdown in the coming months?

REP. GEPHARDT: Well, I hope not. I surely think we ought to be able to get this done. But let me tell you what's going on. The Republicans passed a budget that now many of their members do not think is realistic, but they refuse to come to the middle and change that budget in a bipartisan way and get a new budget that reflects reality and what really needs to be done. So they're having trouble passing the appropriation bills that implement the budget because, frankly, the budget is unrealistic.

I've said many times this is their budget. They must be proud of it. If they're not, they want to change it, they ought to change it rather than fighting their way through appropriation bills that many of their members know are unrealistic.

MR. RUSSERT: So you'd be willing to open up or break the budget caps and allow more social spending?

REP. GEPHARDT: No, I'm not. The president sent a budget that has the right priorities, that keeps the budget caps, that assigns the right kind of priorities in education and health care and the various other areas, and it doesn't break the caps. The problem here is the Republicans have an unrealistic



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

budget. They didn't follow the president's budget. That's their prerogative. But now when they can't implement it because it's not realistic, they're not getting the bills done. And so there's a gridlock going on that only they can solve.

MR. RUSSERT: Congressman Dick Gephardt, we thank you for your views.

REP. GEPHARDT: Thank you.

MR. RUSSERT: Next up: We'll have David Broder here in Washington, Wayne Slater with George Bush on the road and David Yepsen in Iowa to give us the very latest on a very busy Campaign 2000 weekend, coming up right here on MEET THE PRESS.

(Announcements)

MR. RUSSERT: George W. Bush, Al Gore, the latest on Campaign 2000 with Broder, Slater and Yepsen after this brief station break.

(Announcements)

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: August 30, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 36 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 CNBC, Inc.
CNBC News Transcripts

SHOW: TIM RUSSERT (6:00 PM ET)

June 12, 1999, Saturday

LENGTH: 3518 words

HEADLINE: JIM AND SARAH BRADY ON THEIR SUPPORT OF GUN CONTROL

ANCHORS: TIM RUSSERT

BODY:

TIM RUSSERT, host:

And we are back with two of the strongest supporters of gun control in our country, Jim and Sarah Brady. Welcome.

Mrs. SARAH BRADY: Thank you.

Mr. JIM BRADY (Handgun Control Inc.): Thanks, Tim.

RUSSERT: Two Republicans and yet ardent supporters of gun control. Sarah Brady, how did this happen?

Mrs. BRADY: Well, it's good common sense. I mean, we want to save lives. This shouldn't be a partisan issue. I think years ago it never ha--it wasn't a partisan issue. We certainly do not believe in banning guns or disarming America, but we do believe in saving lives and in saving people from injury, such as Jim's. And it can be done through commonsense regulations that help keep guns out of the wrong hands. And that's how we got involved and over the years have just become more and more passionate about it.

RUSSERT: March 30th, 1981, clearly a day that shaped, in your mind, an image of guns and gun control when Jim was wounded while--assassination attempt on the president. How much of an effect or impact did that day have on your thinking?

Mrs. BRADY: Oh, a very terrific impact. I mean, to see that your life could be changed within a split second, and then over the years to meet other people, thousands upon thousands of other people, whose lives have been destroyed and damaged, the families ruined because of a split-second accident--or not accident, incident. And it--it breaks your heart when it--when it's preventable. And that's what we're about, is: How do we prevent these things from happening? How do you prevent car accidents? What do you do to help save people's lives?

RUSSERT: Jim Brady, when people say, 'Jim, you're a lifelong Republican. You were in the trenches working for conservative candidates. You worked for Ronald Reagan. How could you possibly be...'

Mr. BRADY: Who--who began as a Democrat, I might add, Tim.



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

RUSSERT: In Illinois, he sure did, your home state. But how could Jim Brady, a conservative Republican, be for gun control, against the Second Amendment?

Mr. BRADY: Well, the more I think of it, it's fairly easy, Tim.

RUSSERT: How so?

Mr. BRADY: Well, I'm not so sure that the Second Amendment isn't a sham anyway.

RUSSERT: There's a big debate about the Second Amendment, as you know, Sarah Brady, as to whether or not it gives people the right to bear arms or it's simply the state militia. And it--it's--one, it's being discussed in the Senate and the House as we discuss--have our conversation today. How do you approach this issue? What do you say to congressmen who are gonna have to vote next week, and they're feeling a lot of pressure from the NRA and other groups saying, 'The Second Amendment is absolute. You have a right to bear arms and keep arms, and don't let these gun-control advocates take your right away'?

Mrs. BRADY: I think it's a twofold answer there. First of all, you have to look at how the courts have interpreted the Second Amendment to this date, and they have been consistent in saying that the gun-control laws that have been passed to date do not interfere with the right--with the Second Amendment. They are regulations and they've interpreted it to be the states' rights to bear arms against the federal government rather than an individual's right.

But we say that doesn't even matter. We're not trying to take away a right or an ability to purchase guns if you're a law-abiding citizen. That's not--that's not what we wanna do. We want to be sure, though, that you are a law-abiding citizen and that you fit the requirements under the law before you're able to purchase one. So it doesn't have anything to do with the Second Amendment.

RUSSERT: When the Brady Bill was signed into law, which provided that there had to be a background check and a waiting period, Jim Brady, many sportsmen, gun owners, said, 'This is going to inconvenience me.' And you responded to that in your testimony.

Mr. BRADY: I was sitting in my wheelchair. I said, 'Those of you that want to experience inconvenience, spend a week in this damned thing. That's inconvenience.'

RUSSERT: And as people are now discussing this issue and talking about the Second Amendment, there is also a view put forward by the Bradys that you can have your guns and it's not inconsistent that you also should have to go through a background check or even a waiting period.

Mrs. BRADY: We feel that the waiting period is extremely important.

RUSSERT: Why is that, Sarah Brady?

Mrs. BRADY: Two--two reasons. Number--the most important is that I don't believe--and--and it's pretty much shown--that an instant background check is



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

not comprehensive enough and thorough enough. It doesn't give a chance for the local law enforcement to look over and see if there are any people with mental health reco--problems that shouldn't be getting it, any misdemeanors that--where the perpetrator had been guilty of a misdemeanor involving spousal or child abuse, people out on--who have restraining orders against them or who are stalkers on a local basis. Ultimately, local law enforcement knows best its constituency, and they're the--they should have the opportunity to be able to look over the application.

In addition to the wonderful national check, which I--I--I believe in very strongly--it's--it's a very good law enforcement tool...

RUSSERT: So you're advocating a two-step policy: one, the instant federal background check, but secondly, a waiting period so local officials can examine the background of an individual seeking a gun.

Mrs. BRADY: Yeah, and it only needs to be two or three days, and in some cases local law enforcement can look it over and immediately can pass off on it. It would be, you know, a maximum of three days. The other thing is there's--there's a lot of merit in not having impulse buying.

RUSSERT: A cooling-off period.

Mrs. BRADY: A cooling-off period.

RUSSERT: Why is that important to you?

Mrs. BRADY: Well, ki--suicides probably are one of the greatest things. People who are de--despondent and just--in despair will go in, purchase a gun, can get it instantly. A couple days gives them a chance to cool off, to get some help. The same with anybody who's angry and--and furious and wants to take it out on someone. It just--it--it's a deterrent. It's--it's not perfect, but it does help. So you've got those twofold reasons for--I think, for the...

RUSSERT: Jim Brady, what would you say to the people who'll say, 'I want to...'

Mr. BRADY: 'I think you're cheating me in poker last night and I want to get even,' (makes shooting noise), and you can't pull that bullet back. There's no way that the bullet can be pulled back.

RUSSERT: So if someone can go out and buy a gun in the heat of the moment, get it immediately, you think it will increase the chances of innocent people being killed.

Mr. BRADY: Well, not think; know.

Mrs. BRADY: And another thing about it, Tim, is that there's a--it's written in--or it was written into the original Brady Bill that anybody who had a specific need, who was being stalked and--need only go to law enforcement and they could get a waiver and get their weapon immediately for self-defense purposes.

RUSSERT: I read that the man who shot Jim and the president, John Hinckley,



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

had false information on his application for a gun.

Mrs. BRADY: He had lied on his form by giving a false address, he--he--where he did not live at the moment.

RUSSET: And so if that had been detected by a background check or by a waiting period...

Mrs. BRADY: He wouldn't have been able to purchase that gun.

Mr. BRADY: No. No.

Mrs. BRADY: Local law enforcement very often and in most cases check addresses to be sure it's a legitimate address 'cause you have to buy--purchase a gun in the state in which you live. And that could have easily been detected.

RUSSET: We have to take a quick break. We're talking to Jim and Sarah Brady about gun control, the debate confronting our nation. A lot more right after this.

(Excerpt from 3/30/81 Reagan assassination attempt)

Unidentified Woman #1: God!

Unidentified Woman #2: God!

(Announcements)

Mr. BRADY: (From 11/21/89) I know many members of Congress don't want to stand up for the Brady Bill because of the aggregation they--the aggravation they get from the gun lobby. Well, their aggravation is minimal compared to the aggravation I face every day, every minute of my life. But I don't want sympathy. I want action on the Brady Bill.

RUSSET: Jim Brady, that was 10 years ago. You're looking younger, by the way. What's the secret here?

Mr. BRADY: You smooth talking devil.

RUSSET: I asked Charlton Heston--I said, 'What would you say to the Bradys?' He said, 'Tell them I respect them both. I just disagree with them.' What would you say to the NRA as we talk today?

Mr. BRADY: I disagree with them.

RUSSET: Sarah, the NRA will say that the Brady Bill really has had no big effect; that dangerous and irresponsible people still get their hands on guns, and that the federal government doesn't prosecute people under the Brady Bill who are denied access to guns. So why even have it?

Mrs. BRADY: Well, I'll tell you, since--since it went into effect, it has stopped over 260,000 people from purchasing guns over the counter. I'd say that's a pretty good record. Violent crime has gone down considerably, and it's probably at its lowest that it's been in years, over the last four of five years. And violent crime involving firearms has gone down at even a greater



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

rate. It has worked, and it has worked beautifully.

Is it perfect? No. Does it go any further than that? No, it wasn't intended to. But it does have loopholes, and that's very much what we're working toward now in the Senate--I mean, a bill has passed the Senate, and we'd like to strengthen it a bit in the House to plug up some of the loopholes in the Brady--the Brady law.

RUSSETT: Do criminals buy guns in a legal way? Don't they buy them in nefarious ways? So they don't even--aren't even governed by the Brady Bill.

Mrs. BRADY: Well, strangely enough, the NRA always said, 'Criminals don't buy guns over the counter.' Well, of course they did. Two hundred and fifty thousand, sixty thousand tried.

RUSSETT: Because they had a...

Mrs. BRADY: Because it's the cheap...

RUSSETT: Because they had a con--conviction in--on their record, they were denied the ability to buy a gun.

Mrs. BRADY: Exactly. That's correct. 'Cause--and--and--and they tried and--and were not able to. They do try, and that's the singularly cheapest place you can get a gun, unless you steal one, because if you try and buy one e--on a black market or in the illegal markets, you're gonna pay--the price is bumped up. So it's better--much cheaper to buy it from a legitimate gun dealer.

Well, we've cut out that ability. So then they find other ways. And one very obvious way has been the loophole at the gun shows, where you go to a gun show and you will have dealers and non-dealers selling their ware. An individual going to by a gun at a gun show, if they go to the dealer, they have to undergo--undergo the background check. If they go to a non-dealer, a non-federally licensed dealer, there's no background check. Well, if you're a criminal or know you...

Mr. BRADY: Where do you think you're gonna go?

Mrs. BRADY: Where--which are you gonna go to to buy your gun? Are you gonna go to the--the licensed dealer? No, you're gonna go to the people--the folks who...

Mr. BRADY: Do the business in the parking lot.

Mrs. BRADY: Yeah, and it...

RUSSETT: In the parking lot as opposed to the--the gun show because...

Mr. BRADY: Yes.

RUSSETT: ...you avoid the background check.

Mrs. BRADY: Yeah. Or the gun show--I mean, up until now, the gun shows legit--I mean, law-abiding or un-law-abiding citizens are selling--I mean,



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

either some are law-abiding and some aren't, but they're not dealers. They do not have to run the background check.

RUSSET: President Clinton seemed to take this debate to a new level last week when he said if he had his way, you would have to **register** your **gun**, just the way you **register** your automobile. When I asked Charlton Heston about that earlier, he said, 'This is just the first step. If the **president** can get you to **register** a **gun**, he would then have a list of people who own guns, and the next step is for the government to go to the house and arrest and take that gun away'--knock on the door, Jim Brady. You're doing it. Now you--are you concerned about that?

Mr. BRADY: No.

RUSSET: Why?

Mr. BRADY: No, we--we would have to double the size of federal government to go around and get 2.2 million guns.

RUSSET: Sarah, are you concerned about...

Mrs. BRADY: Oh, absolutely not. I mean, I can't imagine anybody not having any faith in our Constitution, our--our--our--our own government and our checks and balances system. No, that's ridiculous. There's a law enforcement reason for knowing who sells guns to who so that it--the gun can be traced, so that each gun owner accepts the responsibility of ownership. We do it with automobiles, and that's not the first step to confiscation of automobiles.

RUSSET: Do you think we're headed towards **registration** of all **guns**?

Mrs. BRADY: I am--I think the time will come, and I think it will be--it's an excellent law enforcement tool. I don't think it has to be the federal government. I think it can be done on a state-by-state basis, the very way we have DMVs in every state. I think there could be checks and balances in it. If these folks are panicky about Big Brother coming and knocking on their door, which is absolutely--I mean, it's really sort of an insane thought, but if they had those fears, there are gonna be checks and balances written in and still provide law enforcement the ability to trace guns and to instill a sense of responsibility on every gun owner.

RUSSET: We have to take another quick break. We're talking to Jim Brady, Sarah Brady, husband and wife and on the front line of gun control. Right--more after this.

President RONALD REAGAN: (From 3/28/91) And I'm going to say it in clear, unmistakable language: I support the Brady Bill and I urge the Congress to enact it.

(Announcements)

Mrs. BRADY: (From 11/21/89) It is time to stand up to the gun lobby. It's time to stop the hedging, the vacillation, the delaying tactics.

RUSSET: I have to say 10 years and you haven't changed a bit. Otherwise, I



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

get in trouble with all the women of America.

Mrs. BRADY: Thank you. That was very tasteful.

Mr. BRADY: That's you.

RUSSET: There you go.

Mr. BRADY: That's you.

RUSSET: Jim Brady, Sarah Brady talked about loopholes in the law, that you have to keep closing loopholes, closing loopholes.

Mr. BRADY: Because, Tim, loopholes lead to bullet holes, and we have enough of those.

RUSSET: You have an open letter to the NRA, the National Rifle Association, and you recommend certain things. You wanted to have the--as we talked about, the minimum waiting period, background checks, safety locks. No one should be able to buy more than one handgun per month. Why is that, Sarah Brady?

Mrs. BRADY: Well, I'll tell you, it's a very effective way of cutting down and doing away with trafficking--of illegal trafficking of guns. What we have seen happen in many states--Virginia used to be number one--people were able to go into Virginia and buy 100, 200 guns at one fell swoop...

Mr. BRADY: Cases.

Mrs. BRADY: ...and then, within hours, sell them on the streets of Washington, DC, New York City, Boston, places with tougher gun laws. They got tired. Virginia's a great old state, conservative, but proud of its heritage and was ashamed of being called the number-one gun trafficker, and they decided--a group of businesspeople got together and decided, you know, the best way to stop it: one a month, saying you can't go in and buy boatloads and traffic them into New York. It still provides for 12 guns a year, and it's a group of...

RUSSET: But what if you're a collector and you want to collect guns? Mr. Heston talked about he owns two guns owned by Thomas Jefferson. Why should he be denied--denied the opportunity to buy those over a course of a week or a month or whenever he sees them available?

Mrs. BRADY: Yeah. Well, he can--he can put a downpayment and wait and purchase it the next month.

RUSSET: And hold--hold the limit to 12 a year.

Mrs. BRADY: Yeah.

RUSSET: One of the more controversial aspects of some of the legislation was raising the age from 18 to 21 where you could purchase or possess a handgun. And the NRA and their supporters will counter, if you send a kid to Kosovo to fight at 18 with a gun in their hand, why can't they have a gun here in America?



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

What would you say?

Mrs. BRADY: Well, I'd say that--that gun ownership is a--it's a--it's a responsibility. There's--there are an awful lot of kids still in high school at 18 who haven't--who--who don't have the maturity to own a gun on their own as of yet. I do--I can understand that feeling, I mean, but we've raised the drinking age to 21. There are a lot of things that you cannot do till you're 21.

Mr. BRADY: It's a good thing they did that for me.

Mrs. BRADY: I think it just--it--it makes common sense that you can certainly own a long gun at 18, but a handgun, including many of these semiautomatic, ultrapowerful handguns, in the hands of a young high school kid is--is a rather scary thought.

RUSSERT: Jim Brady, do you want to take guns from people, just get rid of all guns?

Mr. BRADY: No. No.

RUSSERT: Do you think people have a right to have guns?

Mrs. BRADY: Jim, you thinking that one over?

Mr. BRADY: Yeah, because in a way it's scary 'cause we're up to our gee-gee in guns now, Tim.

RUSSERT: Almost 200 million.

Mr. BRADY: 2.2 million guns.

RUSSERT: When you were a little boy, didn't you want to have a gun, have a BB gun?

Mr. BRADY: Yes, and my parents said, 'You fool, you'll shoot your eye out.' I'm sure every young person in America's heard that from their parents. 'You fool, you'll shoot your eye out.'

Mrs. BRADY: See, I think...

Mr. BRADY: You'll notice I still have both eyes.

Mrs. BRADY: I think Jim expressed in his--in his hesitation on, 'Do you think a--people should have the right to have guns?'--in a way, it seems in conflict with the idea that we want some restrictions, and so he's--I think he's a little bit--it's--it's like a catch-22.

RUSSERT: Yeah. He was pretty clear about that, I thought. Sarah Brady, your dad was an FBI agent.

Mrs. BRADY: Yes.

RUSSERT: So you grew up in law enforcement and--and around guns, in effect. Why have you become so passionate about this issue? Because of what happened to your husband, Jim, or are there other factors as well?



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Mrs. BRADY: Well, really, I always have felt the same way. I haven't become--I haven't changed my views. Yes, I've become more passionate. I grew up with law enforcement. My dad walked into the house every night as an agent--walked in the door and went up to his bedroom before he said hello to my mother or to any of us, took off his weapon, put it in a locked box, changed clothes, came downstairs and said, 'Hi, Francie,' to my mom, 'I'm home.' That was a ritual. I never laid eyes on my father's service revolver. I don't even know if he wore a shoulder harness or a hip h--a hip holster. I never saw it. I was taught a healthy respect for guns. He took my brother to the NRA range here in Washington, DC, when he was of age, and my brother learned to shoot from an NRA range. It was a respect and an understanding that a gun was meant to kill and that when you shot a gun, you shot to kill.

RUSSET: Do you think that the gun-control advocates and the NRA can ever come together on common ground?

Mrs. BRADY: I'm hopeful that they can. There're always extremists on both sides. There are the true believers who will never want anything. They don't even want--they want no laws at all. They want no inf--in--infringes on their--what they think are their rights. And we have extremists who want to ban all guns. But I think the majority of commonsense people want the ability to purchase guns, but common sense in between restrictions. And I think we're beginning to see it come together again. We're--it's becoming more non-partisan.

RUSSET: Jim Brady, we have just a few seconds. I want to give you the last word. What would you say to the people of America tonight?

Mr. BRADY: I rarely get the r--last word, Tim.

RUSSET: Here it is.

Mr. BRADY: And, I mean, it's because of the woman sitting next to me. And I'm saying that what's wrong with keeping guns out of the wrong hands? Nothing. I'll answer my own question, not a damn thing. I mean, if you're a convicted felon, a fugitive from justice, a kid...

RUSSET: Jim Brady, Sarah Brady, thank you all.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: June 13, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 42 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 CNBC, Inc.
CNBC News Transcripts

SHOW: HARDBALL WITH CHRIS MATTHEWS (8:00 PM ET)

June 4, 1999, Friday

LENGTH: 1831 words

HEADLINE: WHETHER PRESIDENT CLINTON'S RECENT POSITIONS ON GUN CONTROL AND OTHER ISSUES WILL AFFECT AL GORE'S AND HILLARY CLINTON'S CAMPAIGNS NEGATIVELY OR POSITIVELY

ANCHORS: LAWRENCE O'DONNELL

BODY:

LAWRENCE O'DONNELL, host:

And it was a big morning for the Clintons, "Good Morning America" gave them just about the whole show. President and Mrs. Clinton talking to high school students about violence in the schools, gun control, video games, Hollywood's influence, all of that. Joining me now from Washington, Howard Fineman with Newsweek magazine.

Howard, there was some interesting, possibly revisionist history in there when the president was confronted about why he isn't going harder and stronger against the Republicans on gun control. He said he was going to work for what was possible, and he also said that in 1994, the Democrats lost everything. They lost the House and the Senate exclusively over the gun control issue. Is that the way you remember it?

Mr. HOWARD FINEMAN (Newsweek): Well, this is a revision of a revision of a revision, Lawrence. I--I mean, I--in a private meeting with a lot of House Democrats the other week, he said that now the tide had turned and that the American public--and he thought the political atmosphere had changed where they could move and move rather swiftly on gun control. But then when the Congress left for vacation without having dealt with it all the way, now he's coming back the other way. I mean, I--I think it's clear that a lot has changed and I think he was really upset in that interview because Democrats in his own party were saying he could have done more. And don't forget, there's a race for the Democratic presidential nomination going on between his buddy Al Gore and Bill Bradley who's a much more strident and strong gun controller. That may have been one of the things on his mind.

O'DONNELL: Well, you know, sitting beside him through most of the broadcast was his wife, Hillary Clinton, who had a little something to do with that health-care bill that ran the Democrats into the wall in 1994. Did you--did you expect any mention of that as a reason for why they lost in '94?

Mr. FINEMAN: No. No. Yeah. Yeah, I didn't expect any mention of it at all unless Charlie Gibson was gonna bring it up himself. I mean, there's going--it's gonna be very interesting because this Senate race, now that Hillary



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Clinton is in it, is going to be a review of the entire Clinton years. And Hillary Clinton's gonna want to talk about what she wants to do as a senator. But a lot of the media and certainly her Republican opponents are gonna want to talk about the highs and lows of the Clinton administration.

O'DONNELL: OK. Let's take a look at what the president had to say. He was on "Good Morning America" this morning talking about gun control.

(Excerpt from ABC's "Good Morning America")

President BILL CLINTON: You--you want to have an honest conversation? Let's have an honest conversation. I am the first president who ever took on the NRA. I got my party in Congress to stand with me on the Brady Bill which has made a difference on the assault weapons ban.

Now wait a minute...

Mr. CHARLES GIBSON (Co-Host): OK.

Pres. CLINTON: You talk about roaring in the aisle. Then I came forward with this legislation. Did this roar through the Senate? No. I think this is going to take years. We--we have--the Congress is out of touch with the American people.

(Announcements)

O'DONNELL: Joining me now from Burbank is syndicated columnist Arianna Huffington.

Arianna, I've seen that finger pointing somewhere before. He said, 'You want to have an honest conversation?' and then he starts pointing the finger. Was that an honest conversation this morning?

Ms. ARIANNA HUFFINGTON (Syndicated Columnist): Well, first of all, he should not be doing that. He should never point a finger for the rest of his term. It is kind of refreshing to see him lose it, because he's normally so controlled and normally so much...

O'DONNELL: But don't you think that is a controlled anger, a--a performance anger for his constituency showing what a strong, tough guy he is on gun control?

Ms. HUFFINGTON: I didn't think so. I thought he was really angry. I thought that Charlie Gibson got to him, not just about gun control, but about generally, the rumblings you're hearing in the Democratic Party, that he has abandoned the progressive agenda on many issues. And the--he fears--as Howard says, this is gonna a light motif during the campaign that's going to benefit Bradley, so he was attacking it from a very real place. But no, I didn't think it was a performance.

O'DONNELL: And joining us from the Washington studios, Charles Lane, editor of the New Republic.

Charles, was that a real discussion on "Good Morning America" this morning



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

of--of governing choices in the wake of the school shootings, or was that really a campaign appearance, Bill Clinton working for both Al Gore's campaign and Hillary Clinton's campaign?

Mr. CHARLES LANE (Editor, New Republic): Yeah, I think it was mostly politics. But I have to say, it might help Hillary 'cause she's running in a pro-gun control state. But I'm not sure it's gonna help Al Gore, who's gotta run nationwide and has got to carry a lot of states in the South. This statement, 'we should register guns like we register cars'--that might play up in the Northeast, but if I were the George Bush campaign come next fall, I would just hang that one around Gore's neck all across the border states in the South.

O'DONNELL: So you don't see gun control as a winning issue for the Democrats or for the Democratic nominee for president at least?

Mr. LANE: Well, I think it could be a winning issue for the Democrats sort of regionally in certain places. They're going to have to be very careful about where they sort of distribute the message. But in the sort of har--you know, hard line, sort of pro-gun control belt of this country, the South, big parts of the West, I think this will scare people away from the Democratic ticket.

O'DONNELL: But Howard Fineman, the Republicans have a gun control problem, too. I mean, are they in the same box as the Democrats? Do they have to play it regionally?

Mr. FINEMAN: Sure. Yeah. The Republicans do have a problem. They have a problem in a state like California, and, you know, when you get to the general election, it's all about these different regional battles for those 270 electoral votes. We're getting a little ahead of ourselves here, but you got to look at it from the back--from the end back to the beginning. California, a problem for the Republicans. Chuck's right, though, in the border states where Al Gore, presuming he's the nominee, would have to put up a fight and make the Republicans spend time and money. For the president to show that he was a lion roaring by saying, 'We got to register guns the way we register cars'--that's going to hurt in Kentucky and Tennessee and Georgia, North Carolina, states where the Democrats have been competitive, and by the way, states that Bill Clinton won both times, that they're basically giving away with this kind of statement.

O'DONNELL: OK. Arianna, the day has come. The day that a lot of us knew was going to come has come. Mrs. Clinton is forming an exploratory committee to run for Senate in New York state. Is this--is this good for the Democrats, bad for the Democrats? Good for the Republicans, bad for the Republicans? There's so many dimensions to this. Does--does it--does it create a surge of Republican fund raising for the Republican Senate campaigns across the country? Go ahead.

Ms. HUFFINGTON: Well, first of all, let me say, I didn't think she was going to do it.

O'DONNELL: You didn't?

Ms. HUFFINGTON: No, I really didn't. But she's doing it. And I really think it's gonna be bad news for Al Gore because she's going to be the star of the year 2000. And it's going to be probably bad news for Giuliani if he ends



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

up being the nominee, because I think if the progressive Hillary runs--and that's a big if, which Hillary is going to run? Is it going to be the Hillary of health-care reform, of children and the Children's Defense Fund, or is it going to be the Hillary, the kind of Lady Bird Johnson Hillary who's been going around the last two years talking about preservation--preserving the past, and imagining the future and all those softball issues? So if it's the progressive Hillary that runs, then Giuliani is very weak on many issues like homelessness going up in New York, like his neglect of the disadvantaged. This could be a real debate.

O'DONNELL: OK, Charles Lane, it's gonna be Hillary, the New Yorker who's going to run in this campaign. But i--her numbers in New York have dropped as much as 20 points since January, since this thing was first floated. She started in the 60s and she's now in the 40s. Explain to me how she gets that number back up.

Mr. LANE: Well, I've ne--I've always believed that she should run. And I've always believed that she won't win. And let me explain why she should run, and why she won't win.

She should run because it's high time this person who's been wielding so much unofficial power without ever being elected by anyone to anything, put her ideas and her pern--persona before some real voters and see what they think. And taking up what Arianna said, I think we're gonna see the unvarnished progressive Hillary because that's who she is at bottom. That's her real self. She's going to put that before the people of New York. And I think, particularly if she runs against a relatively moderate Republican, somebody like Giuliani, she will lose because that persona will not sell in the suburbs and it will not sell upstate. This race is not just about New York City where all those disadvantage folks live.

O'DONNELL: Howard Fineman, I look at Hillary's numbers as that of an incumbent. A hundred percent of the population knows who she is and what she's done. With her numbers down in the 40s, that looks a lot like Al D'Amato's numbers when he--when he was this distance from his last election.

Mr. FINEMAN: Well, this is gonna be a tough race all around. It's gonna be very personal. Don't forget that Hillary Clinton made it her goal in the last election to defeat Al D'Amato. Now D'Amato's back in politics in New York. He doesn't have a candidate, though. Giuliani's not his candidate. So one chance that Hillary has is that the Republicans still may be fighting with each other for months to come. But it's fascinating, Hillary is well-known all around upstate new York. Rudolph Giuliani is not, and I think that's an advantage for Giuliani because I think most upstate conservatives are gonna like him. The real battle will be in the suburbs, and it's gonna be education vs. crime. Hillary talking about education, Rudy talking about crime. And that's the shape of the race as I see it.

O'DONNELL: OK. Let's hold it there. We'll talk more with Howard, Charles and Arianna after this. You're watching HARDBALL on CNBC.

(Announcements)

LANGUAGE: English



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓢ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 44 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 National Broadcasting Co. Inc.
NBC News Transcripts

SHOW: NBC NIGHTLY NEWS (6:30 PM ET)

June 4, 1999, Friday

HEADLINE: **PRESIDENT PROPOSES MANDATORY GUN REGISTRATIONS**

ANCHORS: TOM BROKAW

BODY:

TOM BROKAW, anchor:

President Clinton took another shot at the gun lobby today, saying he believes people should have to **register their guns** like they **register** their cars. The National Rifle Association has long opposed **gun registration**. It said today it will fight any proposal to put gun owners, their names, in a federal database of some kind.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: June 5, 1999



LEXIS•NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS•NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS•NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 54 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Video Monitoring Services of America, L.P.

Video Monitoring Services of America

SHOW: NBC Nightly News

June 04, 1999, Friday 6:30
PM (ET)

NETWORK: NBC Network Programming

MEDIUM: Television

TYPE: Network

LENGTH: 46 words

BODY:

START: 16.14

Gun Registration.

Reader - **President Clinton** said today that people should have to **register their guns** like they **register** their cars. The NRA (National Rifle Assn.) said it will fight any change that puts gun owners into a Federal data base.

END: 16.36

SEGMENT-ID: 11

PROGRAM-ID: nbc18300604

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 15, 1999



LEXIS-NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS-NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 2 - 63 OF 73 STORIES

Copyright 1999 Video Monitoring Services of America, L.P.

Video Monitoring Services of America

SHOW: Morning Edition

April 27, 1999, Tuesday AM

NETWORK: NTLI-TV Cable CH 12 New York

MEDIUM: Cable

LENGTH: 86 words

BODY:

START: 31.45

Clinton to Introduce New Anti-Crime Bill. President Clinton will unveil a new anti-crime bill today which calls for the expansion of gun control measures. The bill calls for longer registration periods on all handguns. Clinton announced his intentions during an address to Jewish leaders yesterday. Clinton Sound Bites - our hearts go out to the families of the victims in Littleton as well as the families of the two young men who did the shooting. Pam Fessler reporting.

END: 32.54

SEGMENT-ID: 31

PROGRAM-ID: rnpr05000427

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 28, 1999



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group