Interview With Jack Kingston, Jan Schakowsky

October 1st, 2002

By Sean Hannity, Alan Colmes, Carl Cameron

FOX HANNITY & COLMES

ALAN COLMES, CO-HOST: Welcome to HANNITY & COLMES. I'm Alan Colmes.

We have breaking news from the New Jersey Senate race. Fox News has just confirmed the Democrats have chosen their man to replace Robert to on the ballot.

Fox News correspondent Carl Cameron now joins us on the phone -- Carl, you've got the latest. Fill us in. CARL CAMERON, FOX CHIEF POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT: Hi, Alan.

Well, it's Frank Lautenberg, and he will be the Democrats' substitute candidate.

But all of that sort of falls second on the priorities list to tomorrow's Supreme Court arguments where the two sides will argue whether or not Torricelli can actually come off the ballot or not, having missed the 51-day deadline that passed back on September 16.

If that gets past the state Supreme Court, then the Republicans take it to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Now, as for Lautenberg, it's actually pretty interesting because, of all of the people that Torricelli had hoped to see succeed him in this race and potentially even in the seat itself, Lautenberg was the absolute last on the planet.

They have had a longstanding feud, and he'd made to clear -- Torricelli did -- with Governor McGreevey over the weekend that he would have preferred first Pallone, then Menendez and, as a last possible ditch effort, Lautenberg, and that that might jeopardize his potential resignation from the seat itself because of their animosity between one another.

COLMES: All right, Carl. We thank you very much.

We'll keep you updated as this continues.

Lots ahead tonight. We'll talk about that with Dick Morris. We'll talk about the ramifications of that. Will Lautenberg ever get on the ballot?

And is criticizing the president an act of treason? In our weekly visit from Bill Bennett, he'll give us his perspective on where and when dissent is appropriate.

And Linda Chavez says she's the most hated Hispanic in America, and she'll tell us why.

But, first, our top story tonight. Has war with Iraq been averted?

Chief U.N. Weapons Inspector Hans Blix announced in Vienna today that he has reached an agreement with Iraq for the return of weapon inspectors, but the deal still won't allow the inspectors to poke around in Saddam Hussein's presidential palaces whenever they want.

So is this a breakthrough or just politics as usual in Baghdad?

We're joined by Illinois Democratic Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky and Georgia Republican Congressman, my old friend, Jack Kingston.

Not that old, but still a friend in spite of your political leanings. Jack, how are you? Welcome...

REP. JACK KINGSTON (R), GEORGIA: I'm doing great, Alan.

COLMES: ... back to the show.

Is this just posturing? Is this a resolution that will stick...

KINGSTON: Alan, I don't...

COLMES: ... and do you -- go ahead.

KINGSTON: I don't understand what the U.N. is thinking. This will be number 17. No inspection. No access to the presidential palaces. That's an area of 12 square miles. And there's no military threat.

And so I don't understand what's new about this. I mean, we're massaging the old words, but we're going back to where we've already been, and I --

It makes me really worry about the U.N. I just don't think they're serious about being relevant.

COLMES: All right. What about that, Congresswoman Schakowsky? Do we need more teeth in this to get Saddam Hussein to really tow the line this time?

REP. JAN SCHAKOWSKY (D), ILLINOIS: Well, you know, it's not an either-or question. I think we should move ahead with these unconditional inspections, which includes mosques and military installations. It does not include, as you said, the palaces.

COLMES: Right.

SCHAKOWSKY: But we should continue to move ahead on that track with the U.N. to try and push for a stronger resolution and pull-out.

COLMES: All right, but, look, I'm against -- I've been very vocal about not rushing to war, not wanting this to happen, doing everything we can to forestall it.

But, if we're going to have inspections, don't they have to be able to look everywhere so we can then satisfy ourselves in knowing that Saddam Hussein isn't playing some game of hide-and-seek?

SCHAKOWSKY: I think so, but I think we shouldn't discount this entirely. I think we should move ahead.

Particularly I think it strengthens the president's hand, if it turns out that Iraq is not serious about allowing unannounced, unconditional inspections.

We would have to inspect these sites anyway. So let's get going with that and continue to push for a stronger resolution at the United Nations.

COLMES: All right. Congressman Kingston, isn't that fair? We start. We begin down this road.

KINGSTON: Well...

COLMES: We then try to -- down the road to do more than we're doing now, but at least let's start the process so we can at least, if there are weapons of mass destruction, get them out of there.

KINGSTON: You know, the process started in 1991. It was interrupted in 1998, even prior to then, because of his lack of cooperation. So we're talking about four years that this guy has been skirting around hiding chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

SEAN HANNITY, CO-HOST: Twelve years.

KINGSTON: So -- so I don't understand why -- you know, what is it that people don't get?

I can tell you this. As a House member on a bipartisan basis, we are ready to move along, unlike the Senate. We don't need Kofi Annan's permission. We are Americans in the United States House of Representatives, at least the lower House...

HANNITY: Hey...

KINGSTON: ... and we're not going to sit around and wait for Kofi Annan to say, "OK"...

HANNITY: Congressman...

KINGSTON: ... "It's been cleansed now. Let's go ahead with it."

HANNITY: Congressman Kingston, good to see you.

Congresswoman, good to see.

Congresswoman, what -- explain this to me. What part of unfettered, unconditional don't you understand? Because that's what he signed on to and that's what he is --

Now he's laying down conditions. There's no point in going in and having inspections in some places and not others. Why don't you understand -- why are you so willing to...

SCHAKOWSKY: I totally...

HANNITY: ... let this madman dictate the terms?

SCHAKOWSKY: I totally understand that. What I'm saying is that I think that we should get going now, and then we should continue to move forward.

HANNITY: He's setting conditions.

SCHAKOWSKY: What part don't you understand that we're going to -- we're talking about the potential of 250,000, 300,000 young men and women. I will tell you I had a...

HANNITY: What part don't you understand that this madman may bamboozle you? He's pulled you -- pulled us around by our nose for 12 years. Now he may get weapons of mass destruction because we've not been active. Why don't you get that, Congresswoman?

SCHAKOWSKY: We're going -- we are going -- because we -- can't we take yes for an answer? We should start with these inspections, continue to go back to the U.N., and get the presidential palaces inspected, too.

HANNITY: Wait a minute. He agreed to unfettered, unconditional. Now he has conditions, and it's not unfettered. So why don't we just now force him to abide by that agreement?

SCHAKOWSKY: Then let's go to the U.N. and ask for that. I believe in coercive inspections.

HANNITY: Yes, we've got to bow at the altar of the U.N. "Almighty U.N., may we please have your permission? Please, oh, please, will you, please, stick up to the conditions you set forth?"

SCHAKOWSKY: Why are you so anxious to go to war? We had a hearing today that said that our -- that we are not prepared to guarantee that our military are not...

HANNITY: Maybe you didn't hear it, Congresswoman, but the guy who ran his nuclear program for 20-plus years...

SCHAKOWSKY: I did hear it.

HANNITY: Excuse me.

Congressman Kingston, I'll throw this to you. The man who ran that program for 20 years says he's within three months to six months of having -- to two years of having three nuclear weapons.

So you know what? I'm getting a little anxious because, as he plays this cat-and-mouse game, he has the ability to hide weapons of mass destruction and develop new ones, and I don't know why you don't get that.

Congressman Kingston.

KINGSTON: Well, what I don't understand is the people who are jumping up and down today saying, "Well, what did President Bush know prior to 9/11? Why didn't he do anything?" -- these are the same people who are saying, "Let's trust Saddam Hussein. Let's second-guess President Bush"...

COLMES: No one is saying that.

KINGSTON: ... "and his foreign policies."

COLMES: We've got to take a break.

But no one is saying we don't -- trust Saddam Hussein. That's not the point.

KINGSTON: Well, actually, one of our House members has gone over there and...

HANNITY: Well, we're going to deal with that next.

COLMES: That is not the Democratic position.

We're going to take a quick break.

KINGSTON: Well, these are the same people who are right now second- guessing 9/11, and what we're sitting on is saying, "Look, we don't want that to happen again."

COLMES: That is not -- that is not what the majority of Democrats are saying.

SCHAKOWSKY: That's right.