

FOX NEWS SUNDAY

APRIL 26, 2698

SPEAKERS: TONY SNOW, HOST, FOX NEWS SUNDAY

JUAN WILLIAMS, FOX NEWS

MARA LIASSON, FOX NEWS

BRIT HUME, FOX NEWS

COLIN POWELL, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF

STAFF

BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

WILLIAM COHEN, U.S. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SNOW: Battle-tested, battle-ready, battle-weary—how can we defend our borders without busting the budget? We'll ask William Cohen, the secretary of defense.

Israel at 50. Is that troubled region on the threshold of peace? We'll have an exclusive interview with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

POWELL: It's good to have an army again. I love it!

(APPLAUSE)

SNOW: The volunteer summit one year later. Do we have the moral fiber to build the America of our dreams? General Colin Powell responds.

And our panel—Juan Williams, Mara Liasson and Tucker Carlson—on the second anniversary edition of FOX NEWS SUNDAY.

Good morning. I'm Tony Snow. And welcome to the second anniversary edition of FOX NEWS SUNDAY.

(NEWS BREAK)

SNOW: Today we cast our FOX NEWS SUNDAY spotlight on morality. Is it DOA in the USA? If you ask General Colin Powell, he'll tell you the answer is no.

This week marks the first anniversary of the national summit on volunteerism and of Powell citizen-action organization America's Promise.

I sat down with the general Friday afternoon, and asked for an update on his group and its activities.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

POWELL: America's Promise, the Alliance for Youth, is alive and well. We are creating promises with corporate entities, nonprofit entities, government entities, religious entities around the country, creating promises that form alliances between us and them to bring resources in the lives of children who are in need.

So I think we're off to a great start.

SNOW: A lot of people expect a big boom in crime in the next few years. There's—there's sort of this—this baby boom of potential criminals. That obviously is a key point for you.

POWELL: Absolutely. And the way you stop this baby boom in crime from happening is early in the lives of these budding criminals, you surround them with a community that cares; you surround them with adults who put hope in their heart, who put faith in their heart, who tell them there are other ways to live your life besides turning into criminals.

But you have to have high standards. You've got to stay in school. You've got to study hard. And we're here to help you. And we're going to show you a better life than crime in the street and thinking that you have to do drugs. We're going to show you how to prepare yourself for a successful life in a great country that has opportunities for you like no other country on the face of the earth.

POWELL: It's simple.

SNOW: Your top goal is to create consciences.

POWELL: My top goal is to create a conscience mentality within our communities and within the mind of every child in America. But you know, it doesn't happen by just sort of having children and then throwing them out into the society where they're subjected to the pathologies, the bad pathologies, that exist in our society.

It comes from giving in—to each child a sense of purpose; a sense of worth; and a belief in an almighty; and a belief in oneself, that you can be successful in this country.

SNOW: Here, in Washington, there's a perception these days that morality is less important than performance. Is Washington clueless?

POWELL: Washington is not entirely clueless. I think most of the officials in Washington know that the country is very interested in performance. That's why they hire politicians. And that's why they elect them, more for performance than for any other thing.

SNOW: But they do want character?

POWELL: But they do want character. And I think any leader in Washington, from the president on down, who does not understand that the American people expect performance—that's why you get your paycheck—but there's a certain belief that our political leaders should also be examples to the country.

And in the current situation, we need to clear up all this underbrush that is out there that is contaminating this view of our political establishment in Washington. And the sooner we get that done, the better off we will be.

SNOW: Who's responsibility is it to clean the underbrush?

POWELL: Well, it's everybody's. I think it's the administration's responsibility, the president's responsibility to tell us as much as he knows and he can. And I think it's Judge Starr's responsibility to continue his investigation and try to conclude it as rapidly as he can.

I think the media has some responsibility to report all of this in a more balanced way and not to become hysterical and hyperbolic over little single thing that happens day after day in order to fill air time to sell soap.

SNOW: Let me read just a very couple—couple of quick poll questions we have. How important do you believe ethical behavior is to being an effective leader? Eighty percent of the American people say that's true.

POWELL: Yes, I agree.

SNOW: Second one.

POWELL: Should be 100 percent.

SNOW: On a typical day, how many little white lies would you say you tell? Forty-five percent of the people say one to two; 9 percent say three to five; 4 percent more than five; and 38 percent say none.

POWELL: I don't count.

(LAUGHTER)

POWELL: I mean, there are some things you have to do in life, some little courtesies that require white lies from time to time. That's quite different from the total lack of ethics or a total lack of integrity. And I think most people know how separate the two.

SNOW: What's more fun...

POWELL: You look marvelous today, Tony.

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: That's one. I'm not sure it's a little or it's white.

(LAUGHTER)

POWELL: Very good.

SNOW: When we were growing up, we had authority figures—somebody'd say that's good, that's bad. That doesn't happen so much anymore.

POWELL: Well, in some homes, it does. I mean, we can't say that all youth are in trouble. Most of our young people are doing fine—in great homes, going to great schools, filling great universities.

But in too many situations—and we think up to 15 million situations—there are youngsters who are looking for that kind of authority in their life, a purpose in life, somebody who will not just scream at them and say "I am the authority," but show them a reason why they should listen to that authority, why this will lead to a better life.

And that's really what you were talking about. You had adults in your lives, in the old days who were living good lives and served as role models for the children. But if the children these days look to the adults in their lives, and they see drug users and pushers and people who aren't working—or people who can't get jobs, are unemployed—then they say, "Well, I guess that's what I have to look forward to."

And if the images in their daily lives are images that come in that show the most dysfunctional people in the world doing horrible things—some of our afternoon talk shows, the Jerry Springer-ization. I call it, of American television—if that's the model our children see, then that's not the model that's going to lead them to seek a better life.

SNOW: The core of your life really lies—it's kind of a tone poem to American values. And Americans, right now, seem a bit adrift. Is this an attempt, also, almost to be defiant in terms of the tide of things and to say, "No more, we're going to fight back"?

POWELL: I hope so.

POWELL: I hope that the America's Promise and—and what I'm trying to do with it, we send a message across the country that we can save these children, but to save these children, it's not just a matter of spending money. It's a matter of restoring in them a sense of hope, a sense of structure and discipline.

And I use my own life as an example. I use it rather proudly, but also somewhat shamelessly. I play to the mystic chords of memory. Being raised...

SNOW: Lincoln's second inaugural.

POWELL: You've got it—Being raised in a—in a home where there was an understanding of the difference between right and wrong, and a sense of shame that kept you on the right side; being raised in a

home where—where God was—was an active presence; to be brought up with the virtues of hard work and education; and then to be told that you are important, even though you're a black kid living in a country that treats you as a 10th-class citizen.

SNOW: You've travelled around the country. You've seen a lot of things.

Is there anyone that has just sort of stopped you dead in your tracks, that you get chills when you think about?

POWELL: A teacher who—who in Washington, D.C., after we watched a young lad read to us, a teacher who said, "You know, that young lad just started reading because of a tutor, a mentor, who came in. And generally what we need for all of our children is more lap-top time."

She stopped me dead in my tracks. She wasn't talking about computers. She was talking about lap-top time.

SNOW: Yes.

POWELL: When I see dedicated people like that—whether it's an individual, teacher, in this case, also a principal—in an inner-city school or the governor of a state that has had its economic difficulty over time, that stops me dead in my track.

SNOW: Let me throw you one geo-political curve about to close. Russia, should we be afraid?

POWELL: Afraid of what?

SNOW: Chaos in Russia.

POWELL: Sure. We should be afraid of chaos in Russia, because it is such a large and important country. But I at the moment see no reason to be afraid of Russia because we think it's going to come back and become the Cold War enemy again.

That causes me no—no loss of sleep at night. I do not see why any Russian leader of any stripe would wish a return of the Cold War. I cannot envision a new Russian leader who will come back, see the same Western strength, especially if we also see the same Western military strength, and think, gee, let's have a return. I just don't quite see that.

But with chaos, you never know what might happen. And that's why we should encourage democratization in Russia, economic reform in Russia, and hopefully, a more stable political system than—than the kind of perils-of-Pauline situation which we've seen in recent months.

SNOW: General Powell, congratulations on your first anniversary.

POWELL: Thank you.

SNOW: Now...

POWELL: Congratulations on your second anniversary.

SNOW: Thank you.

POWELL: On the occasion of your second anniversary, to present you and your Fox associates with your own little red ribbon.

SNOW: General Powell, thank you.

POWELL: You're welcome.

SNOW: When we return, the secretary of defense, William Cohen.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: The United States military faces some tough decisions about how much it can do, how much it needs and how many of its bases must go.

Here to discuss those topics and more is the secretary of defense, William Cohen.

Good morning, Mr. Secretary.

COHEN: Good morning, Tony.

SNOW: This week in The Washington Post you had an op-ed piece. You were talking about the need to close down bases, and one of the things you said was "If Congress doesn't close the bases, the Pentagon will have no choice but simply to stop maintaining some of the facilities," basically, let them go to seed.

COHEN: That's one option. It's not an attractive option, because you would just see—simply see a denigration of the bases. You would see a loss of morale, obviously, for the civilian and military people who are there. And you will see no benefit going to the local community.

So it's not an attractive option for anyone, and it would be a last resort rather than, certainly, a first one.

And more importantly, if we don't get these kinds of savings that we need to achieve, then we're going to have to make some tough choices about the kind of modernization program that we have under way, or at least contemplating now.

COHEN: For example, we project that we will save roughly \$25 billion as of the year 2003 from the previous base closures, plus 5.6 billion each and every year thereafter on an annual basis.

Between the years 2008 — and that's important, because that's when we start having these new systems come online—between 2008 and 2015, we'll save \$21 billion and 3 ¼ billion every year. So we're talking about real savings here that will go to producing the kinds of systems that we're going to need to keep our forces the superior force in the world.

And so we could take that \$21 billion, for example, and we could buy all of the 450 joint strike fighters; or we could buy all of the two new carriers that are now currently being designed, aircraft carriers, or 12 of the new surface ships, combatant ships; or we could take the Comanche helicopter—the entire buy—some 600 helicopters.

SNOW: So we could buy a lot with that 25 billion.

COHEN: We could buy a lot. And if we don't get those kinds of savings, then those systems, in all probability, will have to be cut back or canceled in one form or another.

So, that's another type of option we're facing, and that's really what I tried to explain to my former colleagues on the Hill—no easy choices anymore.

SNOW: Some of your colleagues say: We have been through this before; the president stabbed us in the back in '96. He went and did political deals in California and Texas.

Is the president willing to make a promise that he'll abide by whatever decisions are made by a base closing commission, no political deals?

COHEN: Well, as I've structured the future BRAC rounds—and someone has suggested perhaps I should change the name—and maybe SOS, save our soldiers, might be a good acronym to use in this particular case. But what I've indicated is we're not going to have, or at least I'm recommending, the two or more base closures, the future base closures—one beginning in the year 2001, and 2005. So we're looking for two future administrations, potentially.

But secondly is the issue, if members of Congress are concerned about past BRAC proceedings and how they've been held, you can simply rewrite the rules in a fashion that would take into account your concerns. So it's not...

SNOW: In other words, rewrite it so the president has no latitude.

COHEN: Any president in the future, because these will not take place until we have at least done two future elections.

SNOW: Would you recommend that kind of change?

COHEN: Well, I found myself in a situation, when I was a member of the Senate, I was not happy in the way which one BRAC proceeding took place. I worked with Senator Sam Nunn to make changes in the future BRAC rounds to make sure that activities that I didn't agree with didn't happen again.

I think that members of Congress can do the same and should do the same thing rather than pointing back saying we're unhappy with past decisions and therefore no more base closures. And what that means is they're going to deprive our soldiers and airmen and Marines from the kind of systems they're going to require to keep them the best in the world.

SNOW: There is also a debate about an emergency processes to finance some of our ongoing operations, in particular Bosnia. If Congress doesn't come through with that, what are the consequences?

COHEN: If Congress doesn't pass the emergency supplemental without having any offsets, it's going to require a serious reduction in our readiness. We're going to have to cut back on training. We may have to furlough some of the civilian workers, and I'll have to make that decision soon, first week in May in order to give the appropriate legal notice that certain people will be without work for a week, two weeks, possibly even a month during this summer, well into September.

So it's a serious issue for us. Or else we're simply going to be in a position where we're going to have to start cutting back on various programs. And I think all of the members of the House National Security Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee and the appropriators, they understand the consequences of not passing a supplemental.

SNOW: So you get the votes?

COHEN: I hope so. The question is when and making sure there are no offsets. In both houses it's clear the members do not want offsets coming out of defense, but in the House they have recommended offsets from the domestic budget. And I'm sure that President Clinton would look very dimly upon that.

SNOW: Iran—I mean Iraq, first. Inspectors have been there. Have they found anything?

COHEN: Well, according to all the reports, they've not found anything in the so-called "eight presidential palaces." But I have tried to point out for some time now that we should not become mesmerized by the palaces.

It was important to establish the principle that no site is off-limits as far as the inspectors are concerned. But I think it was rather unrealistic for anyone to expect that Saddam Hussein, having had all these months to clean out whatever was in the palaces, would then invite the inspectors in and we should anticipate that they would find something.

SNOW: Do we have any actual evidence that—I mean, any evidence of any sort that he still has got biochemical weapons production going on?

COHEN: What we have is the report coming from the UNSCOM inspectors, the UN inspectors, and they will make that report public this week, I believe. And they indicate that Saddam Hussein has not fulfilled his obligation under existing resolutions, and indeed even the most recent agreement with Kofi Annan. Namely, he has an affirmative obligation to prove to the inspectors that he has destroyed what he had admitted in the past that he had.

Now, going back to right after the Persian Gulf War, he basically lied.

COHEN: He said he had no chemicals and no biologicals.

And then, once confronted with evidence that he did, he said: Oh, by the way, I do have 50 Scud missiles with chemical warheads. I do have another 25 with biologicals. And I do have VX, a very deadly nerve agent, one drop of which can kill you within a matter of minutes, and he had some four tons of that.

He has claimed he has destroyed all of that. The UNSCOM inspectors have indicated there is no credible evidence to support that. So he has an affirmative obligation.

SNOW: To prove a negative?

COHEN: He has to prove that he has in fact done what he claims he has done, to show where, when, how, under which circumstances all of these systems were in fact destroyed.

SNOW: Mr. Butler, the head of the UNSCOM, the inspection team, says the United States lost round one and Saddam Hussein won. Did he?

COHEN: I don't agree with that, after all, the inspectors are in where they have been precluded from going for the past seven years. So they're there. They're on the ground. They're doing their job. In the meantime, the sanctions are still in place.

Saddam Hussein has been contained in the north, in the south. And he basically is no better off than he was before. And I would argue that now that the inspectors are on the ground, that he has lost ground from that point of view.

Plus, the UN Security Council has passed a resolution based upon Kofi Annan's trip to Baghdad, saying that if he doesn't fully comply, the severest of consequences will result. And I think that's a pretty strong statement coming from them.

SNOW: The severest will be we will send troops into the region?

COHEN: It's left unclear, which is how it should be, signaling no specific type of reaction other than saying it will be severe. And it could take many forms. It could take much more stringent enforcement than currently exists, or a variety of avenues open for the enforcement of existing resolutions and penalizing Saddam Hussein.

SNOW: Iran has been—I mean, Russia evidently has been trying to transfer nuclear technology to Iran. What are we going to do about it?

COHEN: Well, we are all concerned about that. I know that the Israelis are concerned about it. I spoke with Benjamin Netanyahu earlier last week about this issue.

And we're concerned about it. We are concerned that the Chinese were also transferring nuclear technology to Iran. And they have agreed to cease and desist from that.

Vice President Gore has been very actively involved for several years now with Mr. Chernomyrdin, who is no longer in office, but nonetheless, there were great strides made in persuading the Russians not to transfer nuclear technology.

There is some evidence that there has been some leakage on that, but a very strong effort made by the administration working, with Russian counterparts, to shut down that transfer of...

SNOW: If it continues, should we consider sanctions of any sort?

COHEN: Well, that is legislation that is now pending. Our preference would be to try to work with the Russians to stop the flow of this technology to the extent that it is still continuing. There are always the options of—of sanctions. Sanctions, I think under the circumstances, are not the first option but rather the last one. So we're hoping that we can continue to work with the Russians to persuade them to

shut down those companies that may be circumventing their own declarations that they will not transfer this kind of technology.

SNOW: Got a debate on NATO on Capitol Hill. A couple of amendments up for consideration. You for them or against them?

COHEN: We're against them. We think that NATO enlargement ought to rest on its own merits. And we believe that we should pass or ratify a decision that's been made by NATO itself.

COHEN: And virtually all of the countries are going to be supporting this. And for the United States to impose any artificial deadlines in terms of how long we should wait before future considerations or any kind of restrictions on the ability of NATO to act in our—our interests, I think, would be erroneous and should be defunct.

SNOW: Last week on national television, Linda Tripp's attorney said she was afraid she was going to lose her job. Is she?

COHEN: She is not going to lose her job. As far as I'm concerned, she is performing a job by working at home for the time being. But there's been no indication on our part that—that she should have this fear. She's working at home in order to work out her particular arrangement, which is a sensitive one now—namely, she's still working with the independent counsel.

And so it was worked out between management and—~~and her~~ that she could work at home, at least for a temporary period of time. But there's no—

SNOW: Now—

COHEN: ... there's no plan to fire her.

SNOW: ... her personnel file was made public. That's illegal, isn't it?

COHEN: We think it's certainly inappropriate, if not illegal. And we called for an investigation as to how that occurred. And we know the individual that did release it.

SNOW: Was it Clifford Bernath (ph)? Was he the one who did it?

COHEN: Yes.

SNOW: And he was a public information officer.

COHEN: Right.

SNOW: So he—he knew the law.

COHEN: Well, I don't know if he knew the law. He was responding to a—~~an inquiry from the press~~. And frankly, I think that everyone has to exercise a lot more caution. Just because the press is inquiring doesn't mean the press is entitled. And so that matter is—~~is under investigation right now in terms of what the implications are—but certainly, inappropriate.~~

SNOW: OK. Secretary Cohen, finally, as you know, it's our two-year anniversary. We—we're showing some of our greatest hits from the last year. I want to show you something from our year-end show last year, Juan Williams, talking about the star of the year.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

WILLIAMS: I'm going to pick a surprise here. Bill Cohen, the secretary of defense, I think, is going to be a big winner in 1998. Clearly, the U.S. and military is the big issue. And I think the American people are going to look to Bill Cohen as a moderate leader.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SNOW: Do you think Bill Cohen then becomes a bona fide political prospect for the future?

WILLIAMS: Yes, he does—presidential contender.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: Now people like to come on this show and announce their presidential candidacies. Here's your big chance.

COHEN: Let me be very Sherman-esque.

(LAUGHTER)

I am not a candidate, will not be a candidate. And when my tenure at—at the office of secretary of defense expires, I will turn to private life.

SNOW: Secretary of Defense William Cohen, thanks for joining us.

COHEN: Thanks, Tony.

SNOW: When we return, is it finally the right time for Middle East peace?

NETANYAHU: I am prepared to go in and work at any time to try to advance the process.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: Later this week, Israel will celebrate the 50th anniversary of its statehood. Many people hope the Jewish state will also get to celebrate something else—a secure peace.

SNOW: To discuss these matters, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu joined our panel and me, exclusively, earlier this morning.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

SNOW: Prime Minister Netanyahu, thanks for joining us this morning. Juan Williams of The Washington Post will open our questioning.

WILLIAMS: Mr. Prime Minister, late last week, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said—I'll quote here for you—"I have to tell you, in all honesty, we're coming toward the end of the road. We're concerned about the deterioration, and I have to say one of the options is for us to just walk away."

Now, last night, you met with U.S. peace envoy Dennis Ross. Is he exhibiting this kind of frustration, anger, that Ms. Albright is talking about?

NETANYAHU: Well, all I can say is that we're all frustrated and we all want to achieve the breakthrough that we've been working at very hard, for many months. I very much respect Dennis Ross. I think he has an understanding of both our position and the Palestinian position. And we'll work with him to try to find a solution that is commensurate with two principles—one, that the Palestinians keep the obligations that they gave us and the United States, which they haven't kept, about fighting terrorism, about annulling the Palestinian covenant that is still there, calling for Israel's destruction.

And number two, other than their filling their—fulfilling their obligations, is that we must, at the end of the day, be left with secure and defensible boundaries. That is Israel's security is paramount.

These two considerations of reciprocity, if you will, and security are what are going to guide us into what I hope would be a successful negotiation.

SNOW: Mr. Prime Minister, you don't seriously think the United States is going to walk away, do you?

NETANYAHU: Well, I think—first of all, I don't think we'd walk away from each other. We're great allies. We have a special relationship that is a special alliance of the two kindred democracies.

The United States, you know, was founded by people who believed in the "City on the Hill." You know which city they meant. It is the city that is my city, Jerusalem. In many ways, the Holy Land was the model—the Promised Land was the model of the United States. And in many ways, American democracy is a model for Israel.

So we're so closely tied that—on occasion, we have our frustrations, and on occasion, we have our difficulties—but our interests and our values are so linked and so much alike, that I can't see us separating from one another. And I don't think we should.

LIASSON: Mr. Prime Minister, in about a week, you're going to enter another round of talks with the Palestinians. What do you think the reaction of your coalition partners in Israel would be if you agreed to an 11 or a 12 percent turnover of West Bank land?

Do you think they'll go along with that? Can you deliver your coalition?

NETANYAHU: Well, that was a very clever way of asking that question because you asked me two questions. You sort of inserted a number, and then you want me to answer, by the way, an answer about the coalition.

Well, I'm not going to talk about numbers here. I leave that to my discussions with Dennis Ross, and of course, with Secretary Albright.

But I will say that I don't see the coalition's the issue. I think the issue is Israel's security.

You know, I came back from a visit—just before the weekend, I went to Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen (ph) on the 50th anniversary of Israel to commemorate the tremendous tragedy that took place there.

And it happened there because no one was there to act on behalf of the Jewish people. No one was there to protect them.

My 6-year-old son said to me, when they taught him about the Holocaust, in first grade, he said: "Daddy, didn't they have an army? Why didn't they have an army?" And I said, "That's the entire difference."

We have a state. We have an army. And we make the security considerations to determine which land we can give, which land we must not give, in order to be able to protect Israel. So, that is what guides us. And believe me, it's not a coalition.

I once said it's a coalition of one. I didn't mean that I am the government—you know, L'etat, c'est moi—that is not true. I have very able friends in this coalition, but we all share that same sentiment—that we must be satisfied, all of us, that our security is kept.

And if I'm not satisfied, then nothing will move. And if I am satisfied, I'll persuade my colleagues. I'm sure of it.

LIASSON: Well, how helpful do you think that the American proposal has been this time around? The Americans have said they want you to give back 13 percent—you don't have to answer what you think about the number. But how helpful do you think that kind of prodding, from the United States, has been this time?

NETANYAHU: Look, all I can tell you is that I very much welcome the assistance of the United States. And I think President Clinton and Secretary Albright, Dennis Ross and his team, they are trying to move this process forward.

NETANYAHU: I think they can have a certain perspective from, I would say, from the Potomac. The perspective is somewhat different than from the banks of the Jordan, because we live here, and we have to—to deal with the realities.

We—we haven't chosen our position by picking a number out of a sleeve. It's not a political number. It was a number that was painstakingly built from the ground up by our military commanders, our security chiefs and by the relevant ministers, in order to see what is it that is less important for Israel's security that we could give up?

SNOW: Mr. Prime...

NETANYAHU: And I can tell you that the number that we come up with isn't a number based on security. I hope that the United States sticks to its position that Israel, and Israel alone, must determine its security and its redeployment.

SNOW: Mr. Prime Minister, are you saying that that 13.1 percent number is a political number?

NETANYAHU: Well, I'm—I'm not talking about the process in the United States. I'm talking about their determining a number. And I'm not sure the U.S. has come out with that number.

But I can tell you that, on our side, the way we're building our position, it is based on security, the deeper security considerations, because at the end of the day, you know, suppose you give up—you give up too much land. When you give up too much land, you end up having 40,000 kids who are traveling on the roads of Judea-Samaria, and their bus gets blown up.

Look, the ticket comes to me. The responsibility is mine. The buck stops with me.

It doesn't go anywhere else. It doesn't go to London or Paris or even Washington.

I'm the prime minister of Israel. I must defend the lives of Israelis and the security interest of the state of Israel.

CARLSON: Well, speaking...

NETANYAHU: There are certain—there are certain problems that are created. You give up too much land, you begin to envelope communities. You begin to lose strategic positions. You begin to endanger early warning stations. You begin to endanger the two airports that we have.

I won't bother you with this—these details. But these details are what informs our position, what constitutes our position—how to give Israel security.

And I—I—I can assure you that we will do our utmost. But I will not go beyond those things that I think might jeopardize Israel's security.

CARLSON: Mr. Prime Minister, speaking of Israel's security, UN weapons inspectors are still unable to account, as you know, for certain weapons components in Iraq. Recently, the American administration has indicated that there will not necessarily be an American military response if Iraq becomes more belligerent and, say, expels UN weapons inspectors.

Now, considering that Saddam is obviously no fan, or friend, to Israel, are you made uncomfortable by the apparent lack of resolve on the part of the American administration to respond vigorously to Saddam?

NETANYAHU: Well, so far, I think the United States has kept a very firm position. I think that Saddam had backed off, not the—not the U.S.

I don't know what will happen in the future. But I hope that—I'm sure that the United States will maintain the same resolve when the test comes, because the interests—as I said, the threat is common to both of us and to many other countries, as well—indeed, to the Arab countries, too.

Saddam is a general menace, not just an Israeli—an anti-Israeli menace.

SNOW: Well, Prime Minister, there were reports that Iran has been receiving material from— from Russia. What's your reaction to that?

NETANYAHU: We're very concerned with the transfer of ballistic missile technology and other technology of weapons from Russia to—to Iran. We've been in touch with the Russian government. We've been talking to the United States. They've been talking to us.

We think, again, the problem is not a local problem. Iran, with ICBMs, tipped with nuclear weapons, or biological weapons, is—is a problem for the world, for all of us. And I hope that there are ways found, including by the Russian government itself, to stop the flow of this technology of death.

SNOW: Prime Minister, Yasser Arafat has said that if there is no move to final status negotiations by May 4th, he may declare an independent Palestinian state. What will you do if that happens?

NETANYAHU: Our concern is that if something is done to create a Palestinian state, it could turn out to be another Iran, another Iraq on our doorstep. And you can imagine that we feel more than uncomfortable with that unhappy thought.

What we want is a negotiated solution that will give the Palestinians the ability to run their own lives, but none—none of the abilities to threaten our lives. And we think such a balance could be struck.

SNOW: Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, thank you for joining us. And congratulations on the upcoming 50th anniversary of Israeli statehood.

NETANYAHU: Thank you.

I want to say that we are very proud of everything that we've achieved through a very difficult struggle. And we've brought the Jewish people back to life—indeed, back—back from the pit of death.

But I think we're also fortunate to have had in the last half century the United States of America as the leading power in the world. You've stood by our side, time and time again. We may have our differences here and there, but not over the big thing.

And all the people of Israel, and this prime minister of Israel, also thank the United States on our 50th anniversary.

SNOW: Sir, thank—

NETANYAHU: So thank you.

SNOW: Sir, thank you again.

When we come back, our panel on the president's night out with Mrs. Jones.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: It's panel time for Tucker Carlson of the Weekly Standard, in for the vacationing Brit Hume, and our Fox News regulars—Mara Liasson of National Public Radio and Juan Williams of The Washington Post.

Now, Tucker, you were our man at the party last night. Paula Jones, the big celebrity, what did you think?

CARLSON: Indeed.

It was like Oscar night. It was amazing.

There was a throng of onlookers as you walked into the hotel. Paula Jones was followed by Donna Rice and Marion Barry, oddly enough. She was surrounded the whole night, so far as I could tell, by television cameras, people coming up saying crude things to her.

(LAUGHTER)

CARLSON: It was—it was—it was amazing. I—In fact, Paula Jones, singlehandedly, created a traffic disturbance.

CARLSON: You couldn't walk from one party to another, because there were so many people crowded around her shouting questions at her. It was fascinating.

SNOW: Marz, what's interesting is the White House Correspondents Dinner—it's an annual event—it really has become sort of an out-of-town event.

LIASSON: It really has.

SNOW: The insiders are now the strangers.

LIASSON: It really has. And I don't really know how this happened or why. I think it's kind of silly, but all of a sudden, you know, movie stars get invited—Tom Selleck and Barbra Streisand. So Paula Jones to me is just one small step from that.

But you know, it's—it's a real contrast to the way these dinners started, where you invited members of the White House staff or members of Congress or—or people that you covered. That was the whole point of this dinner, to be able to relax and socialize with people you cover. And it's turned into People Magazine.

WILLIAMS: Well, I mean, tho—the thing is that it—it's sort of our—our fault as reporters and journalists in this town...

LIASSON: Sure.

WILLIAMS: ... because we got star-struck. And the idea was that you invited even—not only just a Cabinet secretary, but someone who was a star in the nation. The idea is that you would cozy up and suddenly they'd have a better relationship with the press.

But now, it's gotten to the point where I think people around the country see it as an event more so—you're lucky if you see a reporter—a working reporter at the White House Correspondents Dinner.

SNOW: Speaking of relations with the press, Dan Burton made headlines this week. He called the president an unpleasant name. He got a response from White House Press Secretary Mike McCurry.

We've run McCurry's comments through the FOX NEWS SUNDAY Spinterepreter. This is what he had to say.

MIKE MCCURRY, WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY: I suggested that Chairman Burton's use of a two-syllable vulgarity was rather ambitious.

One of the things we cherish about our democracy is that you have the right to be as bizarre as you want to be.

And Chairman Burton is providing ample evidence of the importance and the strength of that democratic institution.

SNOW: All right, panel. Now, everybody talks about how—how terrible it is, how uncivil things are in Washington. I want you to take sides. Tell me who's primarily responsible—I know everybody's responsible—who's primarily responsible, Marz, the White House or Republicans?

LIASSON: In this particular instance?

SNOW: Nope. Generally.

LIASSON: Well, I think the Republicans have been less restrained and exercised less self-control. I'm not saying the White House wouldn't want to say those same kinds of things about Republicans, but they usually bite their tongues first.

SNOW: Does James Carville count as a—as a spokesperson?

LIASSON: No, I'm not counting him.

SNOW: You're not counting him?

LIASSON: I'm talking about White House staff.

SNOW: What do you think?

WILLIAMS: Well—I mean, I don't know where you start. You said you can't just blame everybody.

But gosh, for this guy to you know—The New York Times said it was a—an—what is that? A bad word for a condom or something is the way they described it, in polite company. But I don't think you call the president that. That's way outrageous. It's unnecessary. And I don't think anybody appreciates—and I think it damages Dan Burton. It damages his integrity as he goes forward in his probe.

SNOW: Tucker?

CARLSON: Well, I—I—clearly, I mean, it damages the Republicans. My theory is—and I think I'm right—is that he is a Democratic plant. He and Susan Carpenter McMillan...

(LAUGHTER)

... exist to discredit the Republicans, normally a sober group. They show up and make the party look foolish.

LIASSON: But the White House says over and over again—I've had people in the White House say to me, "We are blessed by our enemies." And I think this is now another example.

CARLSON: In this case they certainly are.

LIASSON: I mean, they couldn't have—they couldn't have paid for something like this.

SNOW: Burton's office tells me he's been flooded with fan mail. Doesn't seem to have hurt him.

(CROSSTALK)

LIASSON: The public thinks the Republicans are on a partisan witch hunt, they're out to get the president.

WILLIAMS: Right.

LIASSON: And this kind of thing...

(CROSSTALK)

CARLSON: Well, fan mail and nut mail, I mean, there's a very fine line...

WILLIAMS: Good point.

CARLSON: ... as someone who gets mostly hot mail.

(LAUGHTER)

WILLIAMS: That's right.

SNOW: One of the other key issues of the week is the Secret Service. Ken Starr wants the Secret Service to come in and testify, presumably against the president.

Juan, now we have the White House asserting a new kind of privilege—that is, the Secret Service privilege. Do you think it makes sense?

WILLIAMS: It doesn't make sense to me. I don't understand how executive privilege, you know, which started as the—the right of the president to have intimate conversations about matters of national policy with his top aides has suddenly been expanded not only to the first lady, but now to the Secret Service. I think that's a bit much, although George Bush, the former president, has written a letter saying he thinks that it—that's right and that's the way it should be, although the—former President Bush was careful to say he's a fan of Ken Starr's.

LIASSON: Yes. Well, you know, the—the—most legal experts will tell you that—that it's going to be very hard to find this protection privilege in the Constitution, or at least in the Supreme Court rulings about executive privilege to date.

But on the other hand, you want the Secret Service to be able to do their jobs as they see fit. And that was the point of George Bush's letter.

He's saying: I have tremendous respect for the Secret Service. If they believe that their ability to protect the president would be diminished if presidents wanted them at arm's length because they were afraid of what they'd overhear, that's bad.

SNOW: But the word is that they've got like a dozen agents and some of whom want to testify. It's not the Secret Service necessarily, but it's a lawyer.

CARLSON: I mean, that's right. I mean, this is the most newly minted privilege there is. What's wonderful with this one, I think, is its heavy-handedness. The administration is essentially arguing, if they testify, the president could die. And that—that is essentially what they're saying. And it's not rational, but I think it's going to be effective.

WILLIAMS: Wait, I don't understand what you just said. The president could die?

CARLSON: That's exactly what...

WILLIAMS: George Bush said if he would have kept the agents at arms length, Mr. Bush wrote...

CARLSON: Right.

WILLIAMS: ... if he thought that they could later be called in and gossip about him or report on something that he had done that was, you know, maybe embarrassing.

CARLSON: It's still not clear to me that the president's life is going to be at stake if Secret Service agents testify about a matter pertaining to an ongoing criminal investigation.

WILLIAMS: No, no. But I'm saying—and I think George Bush is saying—you've got to have those agents right next you, at many times, in intimate, private situations that most people wouldn't want anyone near them.

CARLSON: Right.

WILLIAMS: And if the president decides, hey, wait a second, these guys are going to later start gabbing to the likes of Ken Starr, I don't want them near me.

CARLSON: So he's not going to bring them on motorcades? I mean, come on, think about it rationally. I mean, it's not...

LIASSON: Well, there are many more situations than motorcades. And it's interesting because the White House is very reluctant to talk about what the Secret Service does, because they don't want to—they don't want to broadcast that kind of detail.

And you know, I think the Secret Service has traditionally been given a lot of leeway to do their job as they see fit. And this potentially...

CARLSON: They bully motorists, that's for sure.

LIASSON: Pardon?

CARLSON: They bully motorists in Washington.

WILLIAMS: I can tell you, you're not having a good feeling about the Secret Service this morning.

CARLSON: Not that warm and fizzy, I have to say.

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: Let me throw up a poll question that sort of plays into this—a question about the president's life and what is the proper role model for it. If we can, that's right.

How would you describe President Clinton's life? A Jerry Springer episode, 58 percent. PBS documentary, 15 percent. Neither or not sure, 27 percent.

Is that not the root of the problem? Tucker.

CARLSON: Well, Jerry Springer's entertaining to watch. I think this is—I mean, this has been sad more than anything else. Really. I mean, last night, at the correspondents dinner, President Clinton tried to, sort of make a joke out of it, as he always does.

And this year, you know, I'm sympathetic to making a joke out of things, but this year, I think it wasn't as funny.

SNOW: Good point. Has the humor finally gone out of this?

WILLIAMS: I think the humor has, like a balloon that's lost speed, you know. And "Primary Colors" I think has hit the country like a dud, because I think people are depressed at the end of that movie. You see this kind of behavior. It's not inspiring.

SNOW: Mara.

LIASSON: No. I think it's—look, in the beginning it was so bizarre, it was a spectacle. It was maybe a little bit entertaining, but no, I think it's pretty sad all around. And I don't think there's anything that's enlightening about this.

SNOW: OK. Tucker Carlson, Mara Liasson, Juan Williams, thank you.

Speaking of the Secret Service, the efforts made by Secret Service agents to protect our nation's leaders has been a subject for Fox Moviestone News. Let's look back at a past news reel.

LIPSNOW: When we return, movers and shakers of the year, as seen right here on FOX NEWS SUNDAY.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN KASICH (R-OH): The only thing I'm running for, Tony, is the congressional seat in the 12th district.

KASICH: But I didn't say yes. I said we'll let the future take care of itself.

HUME: I know you didn't—I know you didn't.

KASICH: I said what I said and I'm sticking to it.

SNOW: What he did not say was no.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: He's just called you a jerk, John Boehner.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES RANGEL (R-NY): I'm sorry. I didn't know. I apologize. I apologize.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BOEHNER (R-OH): All right, Charlie. Now that we're both here together, I can take it out on you.

SNOW: John Boehner.

RANGEL: I had no idea it was you. I really didn't.

BOEHNER: I know you didn't. I could tell.

SNOW: Today marks our second anniversary on the air. As we part, I'd like to share a few highlights of the past 12 months—surprising and spirited exchanges on every imaginable topic.

SNOW: Let's begin with a heavy perennial—scandal.

(UNKNOWN): If this president has engaged in the acts which are alleged and the allegations are true, he should just resign.

ANN LEWIS, WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR: We're taking a flying leap from obnoxious behavior to legally actionable. I cannot join you in that league.

JOHN WHITEHEAD, DIRECTOR, RUTHERFORD FOUNDATION: If that would have happened to Ann Lewis, she would say they were extreme and outrageous.

WILLIAMS: Are you willing now to have Monica take a fall to protect this president?

WILLIAM GINSBURG, ATTORNEY FOR MONICA LEWINSKY: I'm not willing to have Monica do anything of the kind.

HUME: You say you had no idea why he called her to that hotel room.

(UNKNOWN): I had...

HUME: What did you think he was going to do, discuss force levels of NATO?

SNOW: Are you accusing them of lying under oath?

(UNKNOWN): You're damn tootin' I am.

RUSH LIMBAUGH: That's the only place I've heard in the mainstream press the truth of this story told.

(APPLAUSE)

WHITEHEAD: Who's abusing the judicial system here? The White House or Ms. Jones?

GINSBURG: This is it, folks. This is my last round of Sunday shows. This thing has gotten out of hand.

SNOW: But our guests didn't want to talk only about sex. Some also wanted to engage in bare-knuckled partisanship.

(UNKNOWN): We asked Janet Reno for some details. And she won't tell us anything. It's stonewall, stonewall, stonewall.

(UNKNOWN): Pin the tail on the Democratic donkey, and say if there's any campaign wrongdoing, it's one sided. America knows better.

(UNKNOWN): I think the president's fingerprints are all over this.

(UNKNOWN): If I know of anything that affected the—the—the 1996 presidential election, my answer is no.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE DAN BURTON (R-IN): This isn't just some kind of a witch hunt.

(UNKNOWN): When you have somebody who has—that's been dead and you get a check from them, you know, the conclusion is a violation of law. You've got to condemn that.

SNOW: We saw a lot of house leaders in the Rounda celebrating. It was almost like a pep rally. But we didn't see you. Where were you?

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD ARMEY (R-TX): Tony, I was home putting up shutters.

(UNKNOWN): I have not seen a resolution that oust the speaker.

HUME: That wouldn't call on the speaker to step down?

(UNKNOWN): Well, I'm—you know, look.

HUME: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Whoa. Before you go some place else...

(UNKNOWN): Yes.

HUME: You're aware of such a resolution. Are you not?

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE NEWT GINGRICH (R-GA): But there was never a coup. There was—it was all exaggerated.

(UNKNOWN): I don't see any reason why the American government should not talk with Iraq.

(UNKNOWN): Iraq is in a state of denial.

(UNKNOWN): Every time he gets out of the box, smack him.

U.S. SENATOR TRENT LOTT (R-MS): You must be prepared to take military action.

SNOW: Meaning bombing?

LOTT: If that's what it takes.

SNOW: When will you decide whether you're going to run in the year 2000?

(UNKNOWN): I really don't have any desire to be president.

SNOW: Most people think you're running for president. Are you?

(UNKNOWN): I will run for president some day.

SNOW: Do you think Republicans love you more for your brains or your money?

STEVE FORBES: Certainly not for the looks.

REVEREND JERRY FALWELL: Pornography is bad.

JOHN THOMPSON: Any human being that would strangle his boss has a problem.

ROB REINER: People who've—who have—who spank have been spanked.

(UNKNOWN): Black people not paying taxes—how about that for 100 years.

LIASSON: Let's forget about immunity. Let's just talk about, you know, stopping teen smoking. Do you think a bill can still pass?

(UNKNOWN): We have to hold this industry accountable.

(UNKNOWN): Who the heck is Bob Dole?

CHARLTON HESTON: There are probably more conservatives in the Hollywood closet than there are homosexuals. But...

LIASSON: Because what the House Democrats said to the White House was "triangulate you."

U.S. SENATOR PAT MOYNIHAN (D-NY): I'm passed confidence of government. I just want to get through the—the day.

HATCH: I don't think anybody's ever called me soft before, although—although I have to say, there's a real soft side to me.

(UNKNOWN): Most political leaders in the world have never been saints.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SNOW: Why are you interested in reproduction without sex?

(UNKNOWN): I'm not.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: That's it for today. Have a great week and be sure to join us...

WILLIAMS: Tony, Tony, Tony, Tony...

SNOW: ... next Sunday...

WILLIAMS: ... Hold it. Hold it. Hold it. We've got something we want you to see.

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: Oh, God.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SNOW: Good morning from Washington, D.C.

As you can see, it is a beautiful spring day in the nation's capital. And welcome to FOX NEWS SUNDAY. My name is Tony Snow.

(MUSIC)

SNOW: So much bad hair, so little time.

(LAUGHTER)

WILLIAMS: Well, that was—that was—that was two years of Tony Snow compressed.

And you know, to quote Colin Powell, "You look marvelous."

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: Thank you, Juan. Thanks, one and all.

Once again, have a great week. And be sure to join us next Sunday right here for another edition of FOX NEWS SUNDAY.