

© 2005 CBS Broadcasting Inc.  
All Rights Reserved

***PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS CBS  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "CBS NEWS' FACE THE NATION. "***

**CBS News**

# **FACE THE NATION**

**Sunday, February 20, 2005**

**GUESTS: Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, (R-SC)**

**Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, (D-NY)**

**MODERATOR: BOB SCHIEFFER - CBS News**

*This is a rush transcript provided  
for the information and convenience of  
the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed.  
In case of doubt, please check with*

**FACE THE NATION - CBS NEWS  
202-457-4481**

BOB SCHIEFFER, host:

Today on FACE THE NATION: Senators Clinton and Graham on Iraq and Social Security.

There's been no halt to the violence two weeks after the Iraqi elections, and the major questions remain: How strong is this insurgency, and how long will US troops be there? We'll hear from Democratic Senator Hillary Clinton of New York and Republican Lindsey Graham of South Carolina. They have been in Baghdad.

We'll have a report on the latest bombings from our reporter there, Kimberly Dozier, and I'll have a final word on trying to put reporters in jail because of a leak by a government official.

But first, the latest in Iraq on FACE THE NATION.

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

SCHIEFFER: And we start this morning with Kimberly Dozier, who is in Baghdad, where there were some awful bombings yesterday, but today fairly quiet. What's the latest, Kimberly?

KIMBERLY DOZIER reporting:

Fairly quiet, but people are still holding funerals from yesterday's attacks and Friday's. Almost 100 people were killed and more than 100 wounded in a series of suicide bombings targeting Shiite worshipers marking the annual holiday of Ashura. That is to mark the prophet Muhammad's grandson's death. Now there were worse attacks last year; almost 200 people died. This year there was greater security, but suicide bombers still managed to mingle in with the crowd and, as the religious leaders have been saying here, tried to make the attacks that would turn Shiites against Sunnis. Religious leaders are trying to keep that from happening.

Bob.

SCHIEFFER: So Baghdad is still a very dangerous place. Kimberly, what's the latest on the political situation?

DOZIER: Well, we're still waiting to hear who the prime minister will be. The Shiite Alliance has two candidates, Ibrahim al-Jafari and Ahmad Chalabi. Depending on which one is chosen, we'll have a better idea as to how Iraq is going to react to Iran, whether it will bow to Iran in policy decisions. The US Embassy here has been working quietly behind the scenes to make sure that that doesn't happen.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Thank you very much, Kimberly.

And we welcome to the broadcast from Baghdad what has become Capitol Hill's 'odd couple,' and I say that as a compliment: Democratic Senator Hillary Clinton, conservative Republican Senator Lindsey Graham, who are doing something very unusual these days. They've joined together to try to get something done for our military veterans and also members of the Guard and the Reserve. Welcome to both of you.

Senator Clinton, it seems there's still more violence going on in Iraq. How do you sum up the situation now? Do you think this election has had any--is that any reason that this violence has happened, this election we've just come through there?

Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (Democrat, New York; Senate Committee on Armed Services): Bob, I think that the election was a very positive step for the Iraqi people and also for the United States and our involvement here in Iraq. The violence that preceded the election was about 50 to 60 incidents a day. Leading up to the election, it rose all the way to 300, and now it has subsided again to, unfortunately, about 50 or 60 a day. But what was important about the election is that for the first time, the Iraqi security forces did most of the perimeter support for security around polling places.

And there were some heroic actions by some of the Iraqis, Bob. We had some very significant efforts and even some Iraqi security force members who literally died protecting the polling places and voters. So although the violence has continued, the fact that there will be an Iraqi government, that it will be responsible for dealing with these insurgents and terrorists is, I think, a big step forward.

SCHIEFFER: Senator Graham, how do you assess the situation right now?

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM (Republican, South Carolina; Senate Committee on Armed Services): Well, Bob, I've been here three time, and it's more dangerous than it's ever been, but I agree with Senator Clinton very much, that the elections were an important sea change. I think it proved to the American people that the Iraqi people deserve our support. If you're willing to go vote, and the graffiti on the wall greeting you to the polling place says 'Vote or Die,' that is a huge commitment on the part of the Iraqi people. And I think the international community should respond in a more aggressive fashion. But security-wise, this is a very dangerous place, but the Iraqis are in the fight.

But one thing I don't want us to misunderstand: the elections were huge. They were important. They made me proud, they made us all proud as Americans. It should not mask the long road ahead. We're far from a rule-of-law nation in Iraq. We're far from an economy that can sustain itself. The Iraqi people want to be free, but they're nowhere near having the capacity to be free. So on my third visit, I can tell you this: We need to be patient in America, because our footprint here will be large for a long time. We're years away from leaving with honor.

SCHIEFFER: Well, what do you mean 'long time'? Do you mean years?

Sen. GRAHAM: Well, just think about it, Bob. It's not the number of people that carry guns and wear an Iraqi uniform that's exclusively important. You've got to leave a court system behind. You've got to leave the capacity to maintain freedom and to have a market economy. These people lived under a brutal dictator. There is no legal system in place. There is no market economy. I don't want the elections to mask the long road ahead. It's important we win. Our security is tied to how well things turn out in Iraq, but it's time for American politicians and I think the world to understand that this is a long, hard road that lies ahead to give these people capacity to maintain their freedom.

Sen. CLINTON: If I could just add to what Senator Graham said, because I think it's really important we underscore this. Senator McCain made the point earlier today, which I agree with, and that is, it's not so much a question of time when it comes to American military presence for the average American; I include myself in this. But it is a question of casualties. We don't want to see our young men and women dying and suffering these grievous injuries that so many of them have. We've been in South Korea for 50-plus years. We've been in

Europe for 50-plus. We're still in Okinawa with respect to protection there coming out of World War II.

You know, we have been in places for very long periods of time. And in recent history, we've made a commitment to Bosnia and Kosovo, and I think what is different is the feeling that we're on a track that is getting better and that we can see how the Iraqi government will begin to assume greater and greater responsibility. The elections were key to that. The training, equipment, equipping and motivating of the Iraqi security forces is key to that. But so is our understanding that if we were to artificially set a deadline of some sort, that would be like a green light to the terrorists, and we can't afford to do that.

And the second point that I would make is that, you know, this is not only just about Iraq. This is about a breeding ground for terrorism. No matter what anyone's opinion is about how we got here, whether we should get here, we can have that debate back at home, but when you meet, as we have today, with Iraqi officials, and I just came from a brief meeting with a lot of the Iraqi women leaders, they thanked me and they asked me to thank our government and particularly to thank the American people. And they know that they have a lot riding on this, and I think we do, too.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Clinton, that was the question I was going to ask you. Would it be a mistake to set a deadline as some in your party have done? And you say, obviously, you do think that. Do you think we're coming to a situation where we will have permanent bases in Iraq?

Sen. CLINTON: No, but I think that we should take this sort of one step at a time. I really do understand the, you know, deeply felt feelings on the part of many Americans as to how we got into this situation, whether we should have, and a very strong concern that we don't want any more American casualties and we should be trying to get out as soon as possible. Well, I think everyone agrees that we should get out as soon as we can, but we can't get out any sooner than it is feasible in terms of what we have to accomplish and in terms of what the Iraqi government needs to accomplish. So I don't know that setting a deadline, a public deadline, is the best way to achieve that goal.

Secondly, though, if you look at what we are trying to achieve, I don't know that we can talk about anything we might do. We are going to be negotiating with the new Iraqi government. The Iraqi government could turn around any time and say, 'We want you to leave.' I don't see any indication of that, but it could happen. The Iraqi government could say, 'We want you to be here with a certain kind of footprint.' But until the Iraqi government is stood up and operating, I think it's a little premature for us to be talking about what they and we may decide to do together.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you, Senator Graham. I know you all got a briefing, I believe, from General Petraeus, who's in charge of training these new Iraqi troops. Did he give you any indication when he'll have a sizable force, up and trained and ready to take on some of the combat responsibilities that the US troops are handling at this point?

Sen. GRAHAM: He said he thought with the end of the year that the combat capability of the Iraqi police and army would dramatically improve. Training is going a lot better. This is my third visit, and that's the good news, that the Iraqi troops are better trained. They performed well during the elections and right after the elections there was a flood of people that came in that wanted to join the army. These people literally risked their lives to vote so that was a strong statement that should make us all feel good.

General Petraeus outlined progress in that are, but one thing we need not forget here is that this operation is very important to our own security. If we get it right here, we've turned the tide on terrorism. If we lose, it's a giant setback.

But the stress on our troops is what I would like to talk about for a second. Senator Clinton and I represent different spectrums of the political ideology on many occasions, but we have Guard and Reservists from New York and South Carolina who are making up about 40 percent of this operation, and I really do believe we're going to be here for a while because the Iraqis are nowhere near having the capacity to maintain a democracy. And our Guard and Reservists need better benefits. They do not receive health care while they're a Guard or Reservist. Only when they're activated do they receive military health care. Twenty percent of them coming into the active duty are unable to go to the fight because they're not medically ready. So we're proposing that we provide full-time health care to our Guard and Reserves through military health care called TRICARE. We need to adjust and we need to make sure that our troops are well taken care of as we train the Iraqi forces.

SCHIEFFER: I know that both of you are working very hard on that. Let me just ask you this, Senator Clinton. Are we putting too much reliance on these Guard and Reserve forces. Do we take--should we take another look at what the Guard and Reserve ought to be responsible for and what they ought to be doing?

Sen. CLINTON: Well, we certainly have put a tremendous responsibility on our Guard and Reserve forces. As Lindsey said, 40 percent of our force here in Iraq are Guard and Reserve. And just today, we've seen Guard and Reserve forces from all over our country. I was happy to shake hands with a group from Rochester and elsewhere through New York. And we know that they are doing a tremendous job. But the fact is that they were never really intended to be quite so significant a part of a mission like this, and that's why I've teamed up with Senator Graham to try to give them the benefits that they need.

We're going to have to look at the role that the Guard and Reserve plays as we look at the future of the military. There are a number of us who think we need a bigger standing Army, that we're going to have to increase the Marines, we're going to have to figure out what missions should be inside active duty and what should be in Guard and Reserve. So we have a lot of work ahead of us, but I don't want to lose really the human beings who are the ones, you know, leaving their jobs, leaving their families. I met somebody who is on his third tour here in Iraq.

Sen. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sen. CLINTON: And, you know, 20 percent of our Guard and Reserve members don't have health care. And we found that when they were activated, a number of them were not medically ready to serve. We want to provide more security, health care, and retirement security for Guard and Reserves and their families because in this new world of global terrorism and the challenges we face, we need these young men and women. We need them to join. We need them to be recruited and retained, and we've got to do right by them.

Sen. GRAHAM: There's one thing that we need desperately here. We need a bigger international presence in Iraq. After the elections, we have momentum. People really do sense that they can be free. They're working together in a productive fashion. They're working under conditions that we can't even imagine at home, trying to find a consensus as a nation to be free and maintain their freedom. The UN is being requested to have a larger presence by the

Iraqi people. The UN needs to be here in a larger presence. NATO could provide security for the UN. We're being stretched. So I hope the international community, international organizations, like NATO and the UN, will come help the Iraqi people because this really is about the world being free, not just the United States and Iraq.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just ask you this. Do you believe the administration shares your view on that? Will there be an outreach to NATO? And what do you need NATO to do because as I look around, I don't see any NATO nations volunteering to send troops over there?

Sen. GRAHAM: Well, the truth is that NATO nations are sending armaments; they're doing some training. But the UN presence needs to grow. And the Iraqi people through their government are going to ask for a larger UN presence. It seems to me that a good mission for NATO would be to provide security for a larger UN footprint. This is not about legitimizing an American mistake any longer, this is about the future of Iraq, their desire to be free and changing the region. So I hope NATO will be open-minded to come to Iraq to help the United Nations. And that would be a turning point in this whole fight to maintain freedom.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Let's take a break right here. We'll come back in just a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: We're back now with Senators Hillary Clinton and Lindsey Graham.

Let's shift just quickly to domestic subjects. Senator Graham, the Republicans in the House say they're not interested in increasing the limit on the amount of income that can be taxed for payrolls, security tax, and that, of course, is your plan to make Social Security solvent. What do you think is going to happen on Social Security here?

Sen. GRAHAM: I hope what will happen this time is what Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did. Ronald Reagan agreed to increase tax rates to save Social Security. Tip O'Neill agreed to increase the age from 65 to 67. The president has been very brave. He's been a good leader. He's putting options on the table, including raising the cap for people over \$90,000 to contribute more to save Social Security. We need to do this in a bipartisan way, park our ideology, find common ground, like Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill. I'm hopeful we can do that with presidential leadership and the Congress stepping up to the plate.

SCHIEFFER: Is the president going to have to buck his own party to get Social Security reform passed, Senator Graham?

Sen. GRAHAM: We're going to have to come together as Americans and do what Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did. The Republican Party cannot fix this by themselves. Ideology will not fix this. This is going to take--give and take and sacrifice by both parties will be essential. If we ever save Social Security now or tomorrow or 20 years from now, you can't do it being stuck with rigid ideology. Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill taught us that. I think this president understands the lessons of 1983.

SCHIEFFER: Senator Clinton, would you be willing to increase the amount of income that can be taxed under Social Security as part of a package for Social Security reform?

Sen. CLINTON: Well, Bob, I'm waiting to see what the president proposes. We don't have a plan yet. I want to wait and see what the specifics are, and my goal is to, you know, do

whatever we can do together to try to make sure that Social Security is there and not do any harm to it in the process.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I mean, do you--would you think that would be a tax increase, as some Republicans are saying?

Sen. CLINTON: You know, I'm not going to get into the specifics until we see a plan. I think that Senator Graham has come forward with a very specific proposal that would not, you know, lead to increasing the debt, which is one of my givens. I'm not interested in making us an even more indebted nation, especially when we have obligations like I see right here around me in Baghdad. But I'm going to wait and see what the president proposes.

SCHIEFFER: Senator Graham, would that be a tax increase, in your view?

Sen. GRAHAM: In my opinion, it would be a higher contribution for people who can afford to make it, because you literally get some of your money back. You're paying into the system at a higher amount. You could actually lower the rate from 12-4 to a little bit less for those who make under \$90,000. The key--the point I'm trying to make is I'm willing to sacrifice. I make over \$90,000. I'm willing to ask people like myself to give more for the common good. Social Security's going to fail down the road, and people who need it the most are going to be hurt the most. If we come together now and make some sacrifice, we can solve this problem. And the president's put options on the table. Congress needs to also meet him halfway.

SCHIEFFER: I want to thank both of you for being with us this morning.

Sen. CLINTON: Bob, thank you. We're being...

SCHIEFFER: I know you're in a rush.

Sen. CLINTON: ...told we've got to leave now.

SCHIEFFER: Thank you very much.

Sen. CLINTON: But we'll see you back in Washington.

SCHIEFFER: OK.

Sen. CLINTON: Thank you.

Sen. GRAHAM: When you travel with Senator Clinton and McCain, you're 'the other senator.'

SCHIEFFER: For security and scheduling reasons, we recorded that interview yesterday.

And speaking of others, two 'others,' Senator Clinton's significant other and the other President Bush, are on the other side of the world today touring the areas so hard hit by the tsunami. For sure, they are unlikely travel companions, these two old adversaries who never liked each other much, but they have found a new appreciation for each other as they set out to raise money for victims of the tsunami. Today both of them said that only when you are there can you understand just how awful it was.

Former President BILL CLINTON: I was struck by how the devastation was total, and then more limited, and then you'd come to a street and everything would be normal again.

Former President GEORGE H.W. BUSH: As I was looking out that helicopter, I was saying how lucky we are, counting my blessings, our blessings as Americans for not having to sustain this kind of grief and this kind of ravage.

Mr. CLINTON: It's humbling, because you realize just a matter of a few feet determined whether mothers and fathers and children lived or died.

Mr. BUSH: And we're very lucky. We're very lucky people not to have to go through something like this.

SCHIEFFER: They are members of one of America's smallest and most exclusive groups, the ex-presidents club. But we're told they forged a new bond as they've immersed themselves in a project that is far larger than either of them individually. Together, they are making the world more aware of this awful thing, something that neither of them could have done alone. It's the sort of thing we don't often see in today's bitterly partisan political world, but it is nice to see nonetheless.

Back in a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, a federal court cleared the way last week to jail two reporters, Matthew Cooper of Time magazine and Judy Miller of The New York Times, unless they tell what they know about who revealed the identity of a CIA secret agent, an agent who happened to be the wife of an administration critic, former Ambassador Joe Wilson. Outing a secret agent is a crime, but these reporters did not do it. Judy Miller didn't even write a story about it. The leak came from someone inside the government who told columnist Bob Novak who then published it.

Why was it leaked? Not, apparently, to harm the government but to undermine Wilson, the critic who challenged administration claims that Iraq had tried to buy material for a nuclear weapon in Africa, a claim we now know that the CIA also challenged. Unable to find out which of the government officials did this, the prosecutors are threatening to jail reporters unless they tell what they know, and that includes Judy Miller, who, I repeat, never wrote a story about it. What's next? Arresting people who decide not to steal a car?

Our government has its share of corruption, but one reason we have far less than many countries is that whistle-blowers can right wrongs by confiding in reporters, knowing that the reporters will keep their identity confidential. Forcing reporters to break those confidences will not improve government security or efficiency; nor will it reduce corruption. What it will produce is the kind of ridiculous spectacle we're now seeing, where the leaker is never found, the government comes off looking like Inspector Clouseau, reporters are threatened with jail and the rest of us get stuck with a multimillion-dollar bill. All of us, not just reporters, owe Judy Miller and Matt Cooper for refusing to give in.

That's it. We'll see you next week right here on FACE THE NATION.