

# News Release



**Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network**

400 North Capitol Street N.W., Suite 650  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 737-3220

Contact: --Sunday-- Rayne Pollack (202) 626-4863  
Kristin Wennberg (202) 626-7975

THIS MATERIAL IS EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL 6:00 PM (ET),  
SUNDAY, AUGUST 5, 1990

C-SPAN EXCLUSIVE: GOVERNOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS (D-MASS.) GIVES FIRST  
IN-DEPTH NATIONAL INTERVIEW SINCE '88 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN  
-- Advises President Bush on deficit and S and L; discloses  
thoughts on strategy for '92 --

Washington, D.C., August, 5, 1990 -- Governor Michael Dukakis  
(D-Mass.) reflects on his failed presidential bid, the future of  
the Democratic party and his own political future during an hour-  
long C-SPAN interview taped this week at the National Governors  
Association meeting in Mobile, Alabama.

The C-SPAN interview marks Governor Dukakis's first in-depth  
national media appearance since the 1988 presidential campaign.  
The interview will air in its entirety on Sunday, August 5, 7:00  
PM (ET), and will be re-broadcast that night during C-SPAN's  
"Election '90" coverage at 9:30 PM (ET) and 12:30 AM (ET).

Among the topics the Governor comments on:

- o why his campaign failed
- o negative campaigning: Boston Harbor, Willie Horton, "the tank"
- o "no new taxes"
- o S and L and the deficit
- o the Democrats in '92
- o personal publicity
- o John Sununu
- o presidential debates
- o Jesse Jackson
- o assessing George Bush's leadership
- o sound-bite politics
- o Massachusetts economy
- o his future in politics

C-SPAN, the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network, is available  
in 50.6 million households through 3900 cable system affiliates  
nationwide and around the world via satellite. The network is  
privately funded and is a public service of the cable television  
industry.

# # #

# News Release



**Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network**

400 North Capitol Street N.W., Suite 650  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 737-3220

Contact: --Sunday-- Rayne Pollack (202) 626-4863  
Kristin Wennberg (202) 626-7975

THIS MATERIAL IS EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL 6:00 PM (ET),  
SUNDAY, AUGUST 5, 1990

C-SPAN EXCLUSIVE: GOVERNOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS (D-MASS.) GIVES FIRST  
IN-DEPTH NATIONAL INTERVIEW SINCE '88 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN  
-- Advises President Bush on deficit and S and L; discloses  
thoughts on strategy for '92 --

Washington, D.C., August, 5, 1990 -- Governor Michael Dukakis  
(D-Mass.) reflects on his failed presidential bid, the future of  
the Democratic party and his own political future during an hour-  
long C-SPAN interview taped this week at the National Governors  
Association meeting in Mobile, Alabama.

The C-SPAN interview marks Governor Dukakis's first in-depth  
national media appearance since the 1988 presidential campaign.  
The interview will air in its entirety on Sunday, August 5, 7:00  
PM (ET), and will be re-broadcast that night during C-SPAN's  
"Election '90" coverage at 9:30 PM (ET) and 12:30 AM (ET).

Among the topics the Governor comments on:

- o why his campaign failed
- o negative campaigning: Boston Harbor, Willie Horton, "the tank"
- o "no new taxes"
- o S and L and the deficit
- o the Democrats in '92
- o personal publicity
- o John Sununu
- o presidential debates
- o Jesse Jackson
- o assessing George Bush's leadership
- o sound-bite politics
- o Massachusetts economy
- o his future in politics

C-SPAN, the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network, is available  
in 50.6 million households through 3900 cable system affiliates  
nationwide and around the world via satellite. The network is  
privately funded and is a public service of the cable television  
industry.

# # #

I

7:35 p 7/4

5:400 7/5

5:25A 7/8

3:20A 7/5

1:20 p 7/5

II

8:100 7/4

2:030 7/6

9:30A 7/8

4th circuit

comp.

judicial

3:20A

5:25A

5:40A

1:20 p

7:35 p

2A

8A

9:30A

**C-SPAN**

C-SPAN

-TRANSCRIPT-

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS (D-MA)

Copyright 1990 C-SPAN

Video Dates: Monday, July 30, 1990 in Washington, D.C.

Video Dates: Monday, August 5, 1990 in Washington, D.C.

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL 6:00 PM (ET)  
SUNDAY, AUGUST 5, 1990



The Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network  
400 North Capitol Street, NW  
Suite 650  
Washington, D.C. 20001

**Contacts:**

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| Rayne Pollack    | 202-626-4863 |
| Kristin Wennberg | 202-626-7975 |

Transcript By:

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.  
Professional Transcription Service  
(202) 347-5395

**-TRANSCRIPT-**

**EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS (D-MA)**

Copyright 1990 C-SPAN

Tape Date: Monday, July 30, 1990 in Mobile, Alabama  
Air Date: Sunday, August 5, 1990

**EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL 6:00 PM (ET)  
SUNDAY, AUGUST 5, 1990**

The Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network  
400 North Capitol Street, NW  
Suite 650  
Washington, D.C. 20001

**Contacts:**

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| Rayne Pollack    | 202-626-4863 |
| Kristin Wennberg | 202-626-7975 |

Transcript By:

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.  
Professional Transcription Service  
(202) 347-5395

This interview with Gov. Dukakis was taped Monday, July 30, 1990 in Mobile, Alabama for airing on Sunday, August 5, 1990.

2

TRANSCRIPT:

Q: Governor Dukakis, have you decided whether you'll ever run for any office again?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I don't know that it's a decision you make; I mean, I've been at this now for almost 30 years, I've been in my state legislature for eight, I've been governor longer than anybody else in the history of my state, I came close to the top of the mountain in the Presidential race and failed ...

I don't think you rule it out, I don't think you rule it in. Kitty and I are still relatively young, we've still got our health, we've got a lot of energy, it's an exciting and wondrous world out there these days, as we read about the cataclysmic changes every day internationally and otherwise.

So I want to keep my hand in public life; what form that takes I don't know. I'm very concerned about young people in public service in this country. I don't want to see kids turning away from public service. I've been in it for 30 years and have had my highs and lows, my victories and defeats -- and I think somebody like me who has had the kind of career I've had can have a special relationship with young people who I hope we can begin

to turn on to public service in this country.

So I want to spend some time doing that, but what form that will take and whether that will ever involve running for political office again, I'm not sure is something that at this point I can tell you.

'88 CAMPAIGN

Q: How much time do you think about 1988?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Not too much. I mean, it isn't that it wasn't a disappointing defeat, I mean, we had a great primary campaign and unfortunately, a lousy final one.

But it's not as if one dwells on it; I've had a very busy and not an easy year and a half in Massachusetts - - we're finally beginning to restore some fiscal stability and get on with the future in my state. But like all of the northeastern states, we have been in a period of economic slowdown, and that's not been easy.

As I watch the President and the Congress now struggling once again over this deficit and this S&L fiasco, you can't help but wonder a little bit about how you might have done it differently.

But I don't think it's something that you can dwell on; I

mean you've got to put it behind you, you've got to move on and look ahead -- and that's the kind of person I am.

Q: Is it the kind of thing when you look back, that you say things like, "It was inevitable, the times were what they were" -- or could you have done things differently and gotten elected?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I think we screwed it up. We had a very, very good run in the primary, a terrific grassroots organization, a wonderful fund raising operation. We ended up with literally almost 400,000 individual contributors to the campaign -- I mean that must have set some kind of record ...

But we just did not handle the communications of the campaign well, and I think that had a lot to do with the defeat. I'm not saying that I'm sure I could have won it, but I know this -- we just didn't do a very effective job of communicating in that last two or three months, and I think that hurt badly.

Q: Was it the technique of communicating or your personal communications?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I think it was a combination of the two; I don't think you can separate them out. If you begin to get the sense that your campaign isn't doing a very good job of handling

the whole communications side of things, I think it's going to affect your own performance as well, and I think both happened at the end.

#### NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING

Q: How do you feel about negative campaigning?

GOV. DUKAKIS: It's lousy. I wish I had an answer for it. I mean, I think with the benefit of hindsight, I probably should have been a lot tougher on Bush in response to his stuff; on the other hand, you know, Jim Florio and Jim Courter went at each other hammer and tongues in New Jersey from the beginning, Florio knew that Korder had Ailes and the people that had advised Bush during his campaign, and he knew exactly what kind of a campaign they were going to run at him, and he basically said, "Hey, I'm not going to let them do to me what they did to Dukakis".

So he was out there banging away right from the beginning.

When it was over, Jim had won by a very large margin, but on the other hand, a lot of people in New Jersey were turned off to the campaign and to the way that it developed -- and you know, that's what is so troubling about negative campaigning.

I mean, as it is, we're having record low turnouts in this country. If two candidates for the Presidency, two nominees for

the Presidency from day one are out there beating each other over the head day after day after day, what does that do to the public's sense of what this campaigning and what politics is all about?

And yet on the other hand, it's clear that you can't let somebody do to you what Bush did to me. And we let them; we let it happen.

So how do you try to balance the kind of positive approach that I'd like to think a guy like me has always stood for, and effect a response to the kind of attacks that were coming at us, which by the way, we knew were coming, I mean they made no secret about the flag and Willie Horton and that kind of stuff.

How you do that is a real challenge.

Q: Everybody wants to know if you ever get mad.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, I get mad. But on the other hand, I'm a pretty level guy; you know, I've been in politics and public life for 25 or 30 years, I mean you've got to assume there's going to be at least a crisis a day, and if you're bouncing up and down temperamentally like a ping pong ball, you're not going to be very good to yourself or to the people who work with you and what you're trying to do.

So I tend to be pretty steady. Look, I like this business; I love public service, I always have. I've had an opportunity to do as much in public service as about anybody -- short of being the President of the United States and at least I came as close as you can to that, and I just even now, with some difficult problems that we're facing in my own state, there isn't a day that I don't go to work when I don't feel good about what I'm doing and the opportunity to make a positive impact on the lives of my fellow citizens. And I think that's why most of us who are in public service are in public service.

#### NO NEW TAXES

Q: What's your reaction when you turn on the evening news and you see a clip that ran during the convention, at the Republican convention, and you see George Bush saying, "Read my lips -- no new taxes'?"

GOV. DUKAKIS: What can I tell you? I mean, as I said at the time that he reneged on the commitment, we've all got to make a decision when we run for office. You've got to stand up and tell the truth or at least do the best you can to tell people where you stand or you're going to play games and then live to regret them.

The President made a very foolish commitment, I said during the campaign more than once -- and this was based on painful experiences I had had in similar situations in my own state -- that nobody can look the American people in the eye and say, that at no time during the 4 or 8 years that you might be President of the United States will you not ever raise taxes. That's just a dumb and a foolish commitment to make, and unfortunately he made it and he made it in what we now know in a rather dramatic way with this "read my lips" stuff.

And now, unfortunately the administration is in much more serious trouble than they would have been had he faced the issue forthrightly last year and done what, for better or for worse, governors do all the time -- which is to stand up and make the tough decisions even though they're unpopular, and provide some leadership.

Q:       What about the whole business of promising the people during a campaign one thing, and then once the campaign is over, just shifting gears?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well ....

Q:       In other words, we've got the more gentler voice thing -- has he been that kind of a President?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I think he's been somewhat kinder and gentler than his predecessor. Nobody's been suggesting that ketchup is a vegetable and that homeless people are homeless because they like sleeping on grates or whatever it was that some of his people were saying.

I mean I think in that sense, George Bush doesn't have that sharp ideological edge that Mr. Reagan and the people around him had. But -- on this fundamental issue, which really goes to the heart of whether or not this country is going to get itself back on track in an economic sense and provide the kind of leadership that -- given what's happened internationally, we ought to be in a position to --

I mean we ought to be on the top of our game right now, we ought to be out there leading and leading this world into a whole new era given what's happened in the Soviet Union and the fact that our values and our system of government is now the inspiration for new democracies and people all over the world.

And instead, we're wallowing around in a deficit that looks as if it's going to hit \$250 billion -- worse than anything in the Reagan years -- and the President has no plan, they're sitting around in that summit kind of doing this minuet -- and in

the meantime the economy is getting softer and softer and public confidence is getting weaker and weaker.

And you know, that's what happens when you make foolish commitments you can't keep -- and you don't take advantage of what a new chief executive can do, which is to move decisively when you're elected, not in the second year or the third year and the fourth year.

BOSTON HARBOR

Q: One of those campaign things you can see is George Bush standing in Boston Harbor.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah.

Q: Did the federal government ever come up with any money for Boston Harbor?

GOV. DUKAKIS: No ... well, they have because the Congress has insisted on it, but the President literally recommended zero for Boston Harbor's budget.

And here again, I mean that was my failure; it was a colossal fraud from the beginning, the President himself had been part of the environmental wrecking crew that had proposed the dismantling of federal assistance for clean water projects during the early 80's, and I just did a lousy job of responding to what

was you know, a colossal piece of fakery when he arrived at the harbor.

But given the use that he made of that issue, the least you could expect is that maybe he'd come through been a plan that was underway long before the campaign started in terms of the cleanup.

Q: Based on that experience, if that were to happen again -- that very same thing -- what could you have done differently?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Oh, I think I would have had to go after him hammer and tongue. I mean, really laid out his record on the environmental front and been much tougher on him when it came to his role in dismantling the federal water cleanup program.

RECENT CRITICISM ON THE MASSACHUSETTS ECONOMY

Q: What's happened to the Massachusetts Miracle?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, it was a miracle, I mean there's no question about it; a state which in the middle 70's had the second highest unemployment rate in the country and was being called the New Appalachia on the front page of Time Magazine and so on -- and has come light years in an economic sense ...

Like the other states of the northeast, we have gone

through now a period of strong, you know, a real slowing of our economy and we have some work to do to get ourselves back on track.

But the same strengths that created the miracle of the 80's are still there; I mean we still have the finest colleges and universities and medical centers in the world, and so even as we're seeing this slowdown in construction and real estate, the biotech industry is beginning to explode with growth, the software industry -- we're probably the software capital of the world -- polymers, materials, applied manufacturing technologies ...

All of those new technologies are things that we have great strengths in, and when I go back from this conference to Boston, I expect that over the course of the next two or three months we will be announcing three or four major biotech R&D Centers, just in Boston alone -- as well as other parts of the state -- because of this great strength.

So it may not happen before Mike Dukakis leaves office, but the seeds of the next chapter of growth in Massachusetts are already being sown.

And in the meantime, we will be going out and be under

construction with about three and a quarter billion dollars of new public construction, which will really provide us with a base not only to get 12,000 construction workers back to work -- but to really set the stage now for what I think will be a very strong 1990's for Massachusetts and New England.

Q: You just had to increase taxes.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yes.

Q: A billion two?

GOV. DUKAKIS: About a billion, two hundred million dollars -- yeah.

Q: How did you raise it?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Principally through an increase in the income tax, but with some expansion of our sales tax to services, and with an increase in the gasoline tax -- 85 percent of which will be dedicated to the construction and reconstruction of our highways.

Q: What happens if the federal government comes on top of this and increases gas taxes and sin taxes and things like that?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, it's going to impose burdens on my state and every other state. We had the fourth lowest gasoline

tax in America before this increase; in fact, this increase will only take us up to the national average.

So it's not as if we're putting ourselves at a serious competitive disadvantage with respect to other states. But my sense is, and I think while taxes are never popular, the part of our tax program which was the least unpopular was the gasoline tax because people know that it is going to be going directly to highway construction and reconstruction and to stimulating our economy with literally \$850 million worth of new construction and reconstruction of highways and bridges and transit systems.

Q: You said earlier you wanted to work for the infusion of young people into our system.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Right, right.

PERSONAL INTEREST IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Q: Go back in your own life and pull out for us two or three things you did that you think made a big difference and got you interested, and helped.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Originally in public service?

Q: Well, not necessarily public service as much as -- starting with your education, this thing begins, we hear all the time at home and in schools and all that.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Right. Well, part of it was my parents, although neither one of them was a political activist in any sense; they both were immigrants, they both came to this country as immigrants as young people, they took their citizenship very, very seriously. I mean, they were very proud Greek Americans.

They always voted. Back in the radio days, the CBS World News Roundup was always on at six o'clock, I mean everything had to stop while my dad turned on Douglas Edwards or whoever it was. And I remember Edward R. Murrow coming in from England over that crackly radio at the time, and that was very much a part of our lives.

So I think just in a general sense, the fact that I was interested in public affairs had a lot to do with the fact that my parents were interested voting citizens.

John Kennedy, unquestionably, for those of us in my generation, had an enormous impact; after all, he was from Massachusetts, he became the President of the United States just as I was coming out of law school -- he was a guy that had a special ability to bring young people into public life I think in a way that no President in my lifetime has.

And he was young himself; I mean we related to him in a very

direct sense. So I think his influence on me and on the people of my generation was enormous.

And part of it, I'm not sure is explainable; I mean why was I running for President of my third grade class in elementary school? I don't know. Why were my brother and I sitting at a card table listening to the national conventions in 1940 and taking down the vote tallies that came in over the radio when I was 7 years of age?

I mean I don't know what happens to some and it doesn't happen to others, I guess ...

Q: I guess what I wanted to ask you is can that be induced into a young person? As you look at what you want to do, can you induce that interest?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I had thousands of young people working for me during my campaign, thousands --and they were terrific kids. And many of them have come up to me since the campaign, disappointed though they were at the loss, have said to me, "I'm going to stay in this because of you, you're the person that encouraged me and inspired me to get into this."

And I think those of us who are in public life have been in public life and can in a very personal way, connect with young

people about the importance of their going into this. Probably the single most important influence on a young person's decision, as John Kennedy in a very real sense was in my generation.

So I think the more of us who can reach out to young people and say, "Look, this is important, it's not easy, you know, you're going to be out there, you're going to be exposed, the media is going to want to take a look at you, and every once in awhile it isn't going to be pleasant, but this can be the most fulfilling and satisfying life you could lead because you can make a difference in the lives of your fellow citizens."

I think that's a message that guys like me have to try to go to young people with. And I find when I go to college campuses these days and I talk to young people, I get a very, very positive response.

#### PERSONAL PUBLICITY

Q:       Going back over the last few years that we've seen -- why would anybody like you want to put yourself through the personal publicity? The publicity about your wife or your brother, your family? Doesn't all that just tear you down?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I think there is much more of that when

you make the decision to run for the Presidency; it isn't that those of us who serve in state or local office or even as governors or members of Congress don't have a fair amount of that -- but there is nothing quite like the dissection of your private life and your personality and all that stuff that you get when you run for the Presidency.

Now look, this is the most important political office in the world, and I mean if you decide that you're going to take a shot at it, then you've got to understand that your entire life, your personality, what you eat, you know, when you go to bed and all that kind of stuff -- is going to be subject to public scrutiny and you've got to be ready for it and you've got to be able to handle that kind of thing. Otherwise, you better not run for it.

But I can't describe adequately the difference between the kind of exposure that you're subject to -- even as a governor -- and what happens to you when you run for the Presidency. I mean, it's light years difference.

Q: When in your opinion, does the press or the media step over the line?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Let me tell you what I think happens in the course of a Presidential campaign, and I'm not sure I have an

answer to this.

As soon as one of us begins to surface as a semi serious candidate, the national press corps begins to follow you. And that's fine. And I think during the primary particularly, it isn't much different from the kind of coverage and scrutiny that you're subjected to as, say, a governor or a United States Senator or someone at that level.

Once you get the nomination, it changes dramatically -- and the problem is that because we've been covered by the national press corps day after day and week after week for months before you get the nomination, there isn't too much out on the campaign trail that you can say that's going to be original, at least so far as the national press corps is concerned.

And I think what begins to happen is that they start getting bored, and it becomes a game of "Gotcha!," you know? Can you catch Bush making a mistake about Pearl Harbor Day? I remember I went through that week when people were questioning my health, do you remember? Now say what you will about Mike Dukakis, but I don't think anybody has ever questioned my physical or mental health. I mean I'm a healthy guy and always have been.

We had been asked for our medical records I think by the New York Times a year earlier, and my doctor had submitted the usual letter and all that kind of stuff, and nobody paid any attention to it.

And for a week, another -- remember the President called me an invalid or something at a press conference, and then said it was a mistake and we went through that whole business ...

But that's the kind of thing that begins to get a little screwy, you know? And I think it's at that point that you begin to say to yourself, you know, "Are these folks for real? I mean, I'm trying to get a message out on the economy and health care and so on --"

And an inordinate amount of time is spent on that kind of stuff. I don't think you can lay down any rules about it, I mean I think the press has got to be as responsible as they possibly can. On the other hand, as a candidate and as my party's nominee for the Presidency, I've got to understand that there's going to be a fair amount of that and if I'm not comfortable with it, then I shouldn't have run in the first place.

Q: Let me give you one personal observation connected with this network.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Sure.

Q: During the primary and caucus season, you allowed us to put a mike on you --

GOV. DUKAKIS: Right.

Q: -- and walk anywhere in the crowds and pick up all of the incidental sounds, and the only candidate that didn't allow us to was President Bush.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Right.

Q: You were open to at least our cameras -- and the minute you were the candidate, it was gone.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Bang, yeah.

Q: Now if you had had your druthers, would you have stayed open for the rest of the campaign -- or could you have?

GOV. DUKAKIS: If I'd had my druthers, I would have, if I'd had my druthers, I'd have had a press availability every day as I normally -- not that I normally do that as governor, but I mean, I remember during the primary I'd talk to the press three or four times a week, right?

The problem is that once you become the nominee, and we're talking about -- what was it? Nine point eight seconds a night on national network news per candidate? Which is what, about a

tenth of what was happening 20 years ago?

Somebody just did an interesting study about that, going back to 1968 when the candidates got a great deal of air time on television directly, without -- and I guess on average, Mr. Bush and I got what, less than 10 seconds a night of ourselves talking to the American people?

That ten second sound bite is everything. You know? And if you miss it or you're not saying what you want to say at the time you want to say it, the other guy's beaten you for that day, you know; it's kind of crazy. But nevertheless, that's -- in a sense what television has done, at least television news has done to this process.

And so you become very, very careful. I think I lost some of the spontaneity that was a part of my, that is what I am and a part of what people saw in the primary; and here again, I'm not sure I have an answer to how to deal with it, but I didn't like what it did to me and to my campaign, and frankly, I don't think the American people got a very good look at Mike Dukakis, or the real Mike Dukakis, in that last three months of the campaign.

Q: What about the physical grind -- too much?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I'm a pretty strong and a pretty

healthy guy. I work out, and did during the campaign, I mean I was always doing my best to get regular exercise ....

But I don't think that's the problem.

I think that it begins to get kind of monotonous; I mean you're saying the same thing over and over again, you're spending three-quarters of your life on an airplane, which isn't the most natural thing in the world. The thing about public life and politics that I've always loved is the opportunity to kind of interact with people, to be informal --

If you talk to people back home, I mean I'm one of these guys, I don't have security, I'm not surrounded by security officers, I never have. And all those Secret Service people who were with me were terrific and very professional; but I never, ever got used to the idea of constantly being surrounded by security. That I found to be very inhibiting and the kind of thing that tends to make you less natural and spontaneous than I normally am.

And here again, I'm not sure I have any answer -- if you're going to run for the Presidency and be the President, you've got to assume that that kind of security is a part of the job -- and you've got to deal with it.

DEBATES

Q: How about the debates? Would you do that again?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, I mean I -- I have a reputation for being a pretty good debater. I did a lousy job on the second debate.

By that time I think maybe a certain amount of fatigue had set in, and I just wasn't as good as I'm capable of being. I think the first debate went pretty well, actually.

Q: On that second debate, you've seen it written that that first question was --

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, yeah.

Q: And I think Germond and Witcover wrote that you had rehearsed an answer 13 times.

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, that's absolutely incorrect. That's absolutely incorrect. I mean I -- I'd had that question thrown at me 100 times in the course of my political career, and it's kind of a trick question, I'm not criticizing Bernie Shaw for asking it, it was a perfectly legitimate question; but for better or worse, I kind of -- and maybe it was because I'd been asked the question so many times, just in the course of my political career that I didn't convey with it the kind of emotion and love

I have for my wife, which I think everybody knows is very real and very profound.

And I think the mistake was in treating it fundamentally as a kind of trick question instead of responding a lot more personally to it.

Q: If you had those debates to do over again, would you negotiate a different format at all?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I wanted a one on one format; I much prefer to debate another candidate where you have simply one moderator and the two candidates really go back and forth.

The Bush people just wouldn't hear of it, they just didn't want that, they wanted a much more structured format and when it really became a question of either that structured format or no debate at all, we finally said, "well, okay, if that's the only way that he'll do it, we'll have to do it that way."

But I think the public gets a much better sense of who you are and what you're made of if they can have an opportunity to see the two candidates basically debating one on one with a timer keeper and a referee and not this business where you've got three reporters and a moderator and they take up a lot of the time asking questions and stuff.

Q: What about the convention? We've read that 17 point spread at the end of the convention and that was all turned around?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well you know, if one thing, those numbers are not real; I mean we're so poll happy in this country that you know, we take a poll every other day. The convention was clearly the high point of the campaign. Had we had a better plan for coming out of the convention and continuing to communicate effectively and well, then I think at least a part of that so called lead would have held up.

But we didn't. And that was our fault, nobody else's. It's one of the reasons why I think in the last analysis -- I got beat.

Q: Should those campaigns be changed at all? I mean, sorry, the conventions be changed at all, the format?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I think the conventions are okay; it'd be nice to have a somewhat shorter campaign, but I'm not sure in our political system that that's possible. I think we're inevitably going to have campaigns that tend to be long.

JESSE JACKSON

Q: Before that convention we saw a lot of copy written

and television stories about the Jesse Jackson connection leading up the negotiations.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah.

Q: If you had that to do over again, would you do it differently?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, I think that worked out actually pretty well; I think we came out of that convention as a party more united, more together and more enthusiastic than we ever had been. I think Paul Kirk did a terrific job of party building during the period, the months and years before the convention, despite a certain amount of back and forth with Jesse. I think we came out of that in pretty good shape.

And in fact, that first week or two of campaigning coming out of the convention was very strong, very positive, the crowds were enormous, people were up and feeling good about it.

But you've got to be able to sustain that and we just didn't do it.

Q: Did Jesse Jackson uphold his part of the bargain after the convention was over?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, pretty much. I mean Jesse is Jesse, he's a guy who has his own style and his own approach and we all

are familiar with it. But I don't think that was the problem. I think the failure -- my failure and the failure of my campaign had much more to do with my and our inability to sustain a good strong, effective message to the American people and to deal with the negatives, which we just didn't deal with very well at all.

### 1992 ELECTIONS

Q: Can the Democratic party get the Presidency back with an individual -- or is it going to take time and the economy changing? What's your view of that?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I think we're going to have a very good shot in 1992; I think it's primarily because the problems in the Reagan years are coming home to roost -- and I'm not saying that everything President Reagan did was bad, although obviously I wasn't a great fan of the administration's. I mean he had some strengths obviously, one of which was that he had some beliefs and he stuck to them come hell or high water.

And there's a lot to be said for somebody who does that, whether you agree with them or not. But I think the chickens are coming home to roost.

You cannot continue to sustain these massive deficits year after year, you can't deregulate financial institutions in this

country; I mean if there's anything we should learn from history -- and especially from the Great Depression -- is that banking institutions have to be regulated strongly and strictly, and any of us at the state level who have to regulate banks as governors do, looking at this S&L thing, frankly I'm just aghast, I mean I can't imagine permitting these financial institutions to do what they were doing.

And yet it happened because of this ideological preoccupation during the Reagan years with deregulating everything -- and now we're paying the piper. And I think the President, despite this surface popularity, is going to have a very difficult time getting us back on track. We'll see, we'll see.

#### THE DEFICIT

Q: If the S & L thing is going to cost us over \$500 billion and if this deficit is as big as it is and the tremendous interest payments we have, why would anybody want to run for the Presidency -- or why would a party want to run the country?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Because as Americans, we're very proud of this country, we have the best opportunity we've had in our

lifetimes to provide extraordinary international leadership, as the Communist system collapses in a heap ...

And because we care a lot about our kids and about our future, and these days about our grandkids (I'll show you my granddaughter's picture in a minute) -- and I just think this is a challenge that good people of both parties can't turn away from.

We're on the threshold of an era in world history which could be the best -- the best, and this country has to lead the way. And we can't do it in the middle of an S&L fiasco with billions and billions of dollars of red ink around our ears. And I think that's why it's going to be very important to the Democratic party and for all good people to try to deal with this issue directly and decisively and not continue to sweep it under the rug.

I think that's why the governors here are so outraged about this latest proposal to eliminate the deductability of state and local taxes. We've had to absorb billions and billions of dollars in cuts over the last ten years. My state wouldn't have a deficit today if we hadn't had these federal cuts.

Okay, we've done it, we've done the best we could to make up

for the cuts that were raining down on top of us. Now in the middle of this mess, we're being asked to do it again. I mean, I don't know of a governor, Republican or Democrat, who isn't walking around here with smoke coming out of his ears on this particular proposal.

And I just hope that one of these days, the President in the White House along with the Congress, will face this issue squarely and deal with it the way governors have to, even though it's unpopular and painful and our poll numbers aren't very good.

But that's why we're elected sometimes; to make decisions which are tough and sometimes aren't fun for us or for the people that we represent.

UNDER THE GUN FROM HOMETOWN MEDIA

Q: Some of those talk shows in your home town up there in Boston have been working you over pretty good.

GOV. DUKAKIS: That's been going on for a long time.

Q: I know, and I just wanted to ask you, after the Presidency and now back home, and you've had the deficit problem -- do you ever just say, "I don't need this".

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, I really don't.

Q: No? Never? You never -- you never say, "what do

they want from me?"

GOV. DUKAKIS: With all due respect to talk show hosts, you know, a lot of these folks, they get out of bed in the morning, they read the newspaper and they start talking. The people that call in oftentimes tend to be very, very discontented people.

I mean, I'm not saying that I discount all criticism, and especially if somebody in the media who I respect writes something that's critical of me -- I read that or listen to it very carefully, because that means that I'm doing something that I better take a good hard look at.

But you know, if you're going to let the talk shows run your life, if you're going to do what my sense is the White House does these days -- which is to take a poll every night before they do anything, I don't see how you can live with yourself, I mean ...

And I think one of the problems the current administration has is that they don't have very strong beliefs about anything. I mean what are they really for, you know; what do they believe?

I mentioned, I said a few minutes ago that one of Mr. Reagan's strengths it seemed to me, was that -- whether I agreed with him or not and I didn't on much -- there was a sense that

this guy had an anchor, you know? At least he believed in things. And even when things were at the nadir -- remember during '82 with the recession and stuff, he was up there saying, "we're going to stay the course and we're going to stick to our course of action".

I don't have the sense these days that that's what's going on in the White House, and speaking just for myself, I mean I think you've got to have some set of beliefs at the core of who you are which kind of guide you through the tough times as well as the good times. If you don't, then this can be a very unpleasant profession.

JOHN SUNUNU

Q: Does it irritate you that your old adversary, John Sununu, is the chief of staff?

GOV. DUKAKIS: It doesn't irritate me; you know, I have some concerns about the advice that he's giving the President, but the President picked him and the President's got to be responsible for what happens.

I mean, New Hampshire is having the same problems that every other northeastern state is having, and that's not necessarily John's fault any more than it is the fault of anyone else. The

economy has slowed, and his successor is struggling and having to raise taxes and cut budgets and that kind of thing.

But I think in the last analysis, it's the guy in the White House or the guy in the governor's office that has to take responsibility for his staff, and I'm not going to try to advise the President on who he ought to pick -- I mean he's got to live with them and he's got to do the job.

## ADVICE TO GEORGE BUSH

Q: Has President Bush ever solicited your advice since the campaign was over?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, we did have a meeting about a month after the election, and sat down and exchanged some ideas and so on. He hasn't since, but on the other hand, I've been pretty busy trying to get my own state back on track.

I do have one piece of advice for him in connection with this fiscal situation, if I can be so bold -- and I hate to kind of make this sound like a rerun of the campaign, but a couple of months ago there was a front page story in the Wall Street Journal about the \$100 billion in federal taxes owed that aren't being paid today in this country.

And a quote from the new Commissioner of the Internal

Revenue Service, Fred Goldberg, who is the President's appointee, that if he was given the resources, he could collect at least \$40 billion of that. Now I don't know of anyone who's talking about a \$40 billion tax increase, and here is the President's own new appointee as Commissioner of the IRS who says that if you give him the resources, he can get you \$40 billion.

As a matter of fact, I think the direct quote was, "You want \$40 billion? You got it". For the life of me, I don't understand why the administration doesn't begin there. Why should average taxpayers be called upon to pay more when we know that there is at least \$100 billion in taxes owed out there that aren't being paid, and here is the new IRS Commissioner who says, "Look, give me the tools, give me the resources, give me the people and the computerization, and I'll collect you \$40 billion."

I don't get it; it seems to me that ought to be the starting point -- don't you agree? I mean I'm just puzzled. So that's one piece of free advice to the President which, by the way, I did suggest in that meeting that we had in December at the then Vice President's house, and I think it's as good today as it was then, and he's apparently got somebody at the IRS who's ready

to go to work and do it.

ETHICS AND STANDARDS

Q: Let me ask you about ethics, and I don't want to go through the litany -- you know the names.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Right.

Q: Jim Wright, Dave Durenberger, Barney Frank. Friend of yours?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yes, colleague.

Q: Did he get a bad deal?

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, I don't think he got a bad deal. I think he himself agreed that it wasn't a bad deal, that the reprimand was appropriate.

Q: Is there something wrong? We've had three federal judges impeached and convicted in the last couple of years -- and that hadn't happened in years before that; we had a Speaker of the House leave, we had a Vice President back in the seventies leave, a President having to leave -- I can go on down the litany.

What's wrong?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, a little sense of history is in order here. I mean, we have had scandals, national scandals in this

country that make the current, our current problems look like child's play. Credit Mobilier, the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's, I mean these were situations where public officials were just taking plain old graft, you know? It wasn't a question of whether or not you wrote the book or should or shouldn't have gotten royalties and that kind of stuff.

But I think standards are much higher today than they were even 10 or 20 years ago, I think they should be high, I think we should be held to a very high standard of conduct, and I think people have a right to demand it of us, and every once in awhile somebody -- or some people, unfortunately, are going to be found to have violated those standards.

But I think it's a question of much higher standards these days -- and frankly, in my own state, I don't know whether my constituents would agree with this, but compared to even when I first entered politics in the early sixties, we're holding people to much tougher and much higher standards -- and I think we should, I think we should, and those of us who decide we want to go in to public and political life have to understand that that's part of what it means to be a public servant.

Q: Is that being demanded by the citizens or is it

being demanded by the press?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Both, both. I don't distinguish between the two; I think our citizens have a right to expect us to adhere to very high and very tough standards, and I think the press has a responsibility to hold us accountable.

Q: What's created this particular period of interest in cleaning things up?

GOV. DUKAKIS: A much more aggressive, investigative press; much more so than we had 15 or 20 years ago -- as well as greater public concern with standards.

And by the way, I think that's a concern that extends beyond just politics; I think people are expecting more of business leaders these days than we used to, I think we're expecting more of educators than we used to, and I think that's okay, I think we have a right to expect high standards of the people we look up to.

#### FUTURE PLANS

Q: What are you going to do when you leave the governor's seat?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Not sure. Kitty and I are just beginning to

spend some time thinking about it; it'll be public service connected, I mean this is my life, I want to stay involved in important public issues. We're just beginning now at the National Governors Association meeting here in Mobile to get into the whole issue of universal health care, and when at last this country is going to be joining every other industrial nation in the world with the exception of South Africa, in providing basic health care for its citizens --

And that's an issue that, in my own state as you know, we've made great progress on, and I want to continue with that -- and I do want as I said a few minutes ago, to really see if I can help to encourage lots and lots of young people in this country to get into public service one way or the other.

So I'm not quite sure what form it will take, but those are the kinds of things I want to do and I think I've got a real opportunity to do it.

Q: Are you going to write a book about the campaign at any point?

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, my wife is doing that -- so we'll leave that up to her. I like to write, but I'm not much of a book writer, I mean I like doing short pieces, I like writing about

things that are focused and I care a lot about; I'm not sure I want to go back and relive the campaign at this point.

I mean I tend to be somebody who looks ahead, and that's what I want to do.

Q: Did you ever do any oral histories right after the campaign?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Some -- and there are some people who are coming around these days who are doing some taping and stuff, and getting reactions, asking me a lot of the questions that you've asked me -- and I'll do that, but I don't think that I've got a book in me about the campaign. If I've got a book, it'll be about something that I hope will provide some positive impetus to the things that I care about.

Q: What is it that says, you say to yourself, "I don't want to spend any time on the past"?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I know what our -- I know where the campaign was weak and where we failed, I think I've got a pretty good sense of that, I'm not sure there is any great value in writing about it. I would like to take a look at issues like negative campaigning, I mean how does one deal with that? Are there ways that we can encourage people to do less of it? I'm not sure

there are.

I think this is going to be a fact of life for a long time, I think that's unfortunate, but you know, how does a candidate who wants to be positive and deliver a positive message cope with that kind of thing? I mean those are the kinds of things that maybe guys like me can at least think about.

#### CAMPAIGN STRATEGIES

Q: We're in the year 1990, we've talked about Presidential politics, 1992. There doesn't seem to be a whole bunch of candidates running to Iowa and New Hampshire.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Maybe that's a good thing.

Q: That's what I wanted to ask you -- is there such a thing as starting too early?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, I think so. You know, in 1986 at this time, in the summer of '86, if you had said to me, "Dukakis, you're going to run for the Presidency" I'd have laughed you out of the room, I mean I had not the slightest notion that I would, I was in the middle of a campaign for reelection, I was very, very deeply involved in my governorship and in running for reelection -- and it was only after that election and the breaking of the Iran Contra scandal and some of these other

things that I really seriously began thinking about it.

Other people like Al Gore and Paul Simon didn't actually get into the race until what, mid-'87? There's plenty of time, I mean I don't think there's any reason why we ought to be expecting almost two and half years in advance of the next Presidential election that you'd have 8 or 10 candidates out there pawing the ground ready to go.

But I think the Democrats are going to have a very, very good shot at the Presidency in 1992, I think we'll have good candidates, I don't know who they're going to be, it may be somebody who hasn't even been mentioned at this point -- but I think it's going to be a very promising year.

And right now, I think what's important is that we all work hard to try to get this fiscal thing squared away because as Americans, if we don't do that, we are not going to be able to provide the kind of leadership that we ought to be providing.

Q: Excuse me for asking about strategy, but if you look at your experience, would you have wasted time with Iowa, would you focus on New Hampshire -- and will California having its primary in March make any difference?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Sure it'll make a difference, but I'll tell

you -- my experience in Iowa was one of the most important experiences of that campaign. Look, I was a guy from the northeast that had never really spent time in a farm state, I spent 85 or 86 campaign days in Iowa, I was in dozens and dozens of small towns, in living rooms, in little cafes out there at the grassroots; it was in the middle of a very serious agricultural crisis which had hit the farm belt -- something which you just don't feel until you get out there on the ground with people who are losing their farms, losing their houses, losing their lives ...

I wouldn't swap that experience in Iowa for anything; and apart from the fact that I did well in Iowa and people responded positively, I think it was a very important part of the experience.

Now if California happens to be early in the hit parade, then obviously the candidates are going to have to spend a lot of time in California, and that will make a difference -- but I would hate to see the candidates avoiding the opportunity to campaign at the grassroots the way we have to do in a state like Iowa. I think it's a very important experience.

#### PRESS POLITICS

Q: What role does the great mentioner play in all this?

We have columnists now, many of them, political columnists -- who begin to drop names into the hopper. Looking back, does the great mentioner have any control?

GOV. DUKAKIS: It doesn't make a prodigal of difference, I mean you take these columns out a year later and you kind of read them for laughs -- with all due respect to some very good people who write these columns, you know, I described myself when I announced my candidacy in the spring of 1987 as being a "very, very, very long shot" and I was, and yet I was able to win the nomination.

Unfortunately, I didn't do well in the final. I don't think there's any way of predicting now who the candidates are going to be or how likely they are to win the nomination and go on to win the Presidency -- just every election is different, every campaign is different, and there's no telling right now what kind of a campaign it might be.

Q: Is the politics of this country in the hands of the people or in the hands of the press?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, the press plays a very dominant role -- and the electronic media obviously are playing a greater and

greater role, and let me say to you and the folks at C-SPAN that I think you are providing a very, very great service in giving viewers a chance to see candidates in this kind of format, not in ten seconds or nine seconds or 17 seconds, and I don't mean just these kinds of interviews --

I think the fact that you're giving us a look at the Congress, that we're having a chance to see people at length discuss the issues, I think is a great public service, and frankly, I commend you for it and I hope you continue to do it because we need this kind of thing.

Q: Thanks for the comment, but let me play the Devil's Advocate --

GOV. DUKAKIS: Sure.

Q: It's fairly well known that the audiences for this network are public affairs audiences, as any network experiences, is fairly low, I mean they're not the big numbers. The big, big audiences come with the big commercial television networks. You can't force people to watch, so in the end --

#### SOUND BITE POLITICS

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, but maybe we can persuade the national networks -- and as you know, since the '88 campaign they have

been doing a lot of thinking and rethinking, to somehow give candidates more time to make themselves known in a genuine way to the American people than this 9.8 second bite that they were giving us on average on the network news in September and October.

I mean one of the questions I would hope they'd ask themselves is -- how is it that 20 years ago in the Humphrey-Nixon fight in 1968 they were giving the candidates so much more time to speak directly to the American people, with much less of the kind of editorializing, which I think we have too often now on the national network news as part of the news broadcasts --

And what's happened to make it different?

The person who did this study comparing the '68 and '88 television coverage told me that when she showed clips from the 1968 campaign, that the same people who were still part of the network news business were astonished at how much more time they then were giving candidates and how much less of the kind of editorial commentary was going on with it -- I mean this was just straight reporting.

Maybe it's time to get back to that; I really think it is.

FUND RAISING

Q: Let me ask you about money. There are a number of theories, and that is that one of the reasons you were so successful in raising money is that you were a sitting governor.

GOV. DUKAKIS: No, I don't think that had much to do with it. We had a spectacular fund raising effort, very much a grassroots effort; I took no PAC money -- and would take none during the entire campaign. We had, as I said, around 370,000 individual contributors.

It was a terrific grassroots effort, and we had all the funds we needed to run a very strong primary campaign before the public funding kicked in after I got the nomination.

I hope that's an example to people that it's possible to legitimately raise funds -- broadly based, without being beholden to special interests or PAC's or any of this kind of thing, and 80 to 85 percent of my funds came from outside of Massachusetts, so it really didn't have an awful lot to do with -- I got some very generous support from people in my state, but most of my -- I think in excess of 80 percent came from outside of the commonwealth.

So I don't think that was it; we just had a great

opportunity and a great fund raising operation, and at least in the primary, a good message and whatever it was that encouraged lots and lots of people to contribute on a very broadly based basis.

Q: Did you like to raise money?

GOV. DUKAKIS: I don't mind it; I mean as long as you are very clear about the rules that you're setting. I said very clearly that we were not going to take PAC money under any circumstances. And in my own state I had some very strict rules; I won't accept money from lobbyists under any circumstances, I will accept no more than \$100 from state employees under any circumstances ...

As long as you set those kinds of rules, I don't have a problem going out and asking people to participate if they can financially, and if not, by ringing door bells and putting bumper stickers on their cars.

I am strongly for the thousand dollar limit, I'm against raising it -- I think that forces candidates to go out and to appeal to people on a much broader base and it limits the impact of the special interests on your campaign.

But I think you have to set those tough rules at the

beginning, and if you do then I think you can be pretty comfortable about going out and asking people to contribute to your campaign.

Q: Often, it's written today that we have the best Congress money can buy.

GOV. DUKAKIS: I don't buy that, I really don't -- I think we have a very, and this may sound crazy to some people, but I know an awful lot of people in the Congress on both sides of the aisle and I think they are very, very good people, they're bright, they're well staffed, they're well informed.

When I work with members of Congress, I'm constantly impressed at their commitment to try to do the right thing, and some of them agree with me and some of them don't.

We just had a series of discussions, our Governors Health Care Committee, with members of Congress, both Republican and Democrats about the issue of universal health care; I have been tremendously impressed with the knowledge and dedication of these members of Congress -- and I think if we can set some good tough rules about ethics and about fund raising, which the members of Congress have to live with and people have confidence and trust in, there is no reason why we can't restore the kind of

confidence that we ought to have in our public officials.

But I'm a fan of the Congress, I think we've got some very, very good people in the Congress of the United States.

WILLIE HORTON AND THE TANK

Q: I don't have a whole lot of time left; there's a lot I wanted to ask you about. Would you ride that tank again?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Would I ride the tank again? No.

Q: How did that happen?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Well, it was one of those things; you know, people in the campaign thought it would be an interesting idea. It was interesting -- but I wouldn't do it for the television cameras.

Q: Did you know it was wrong right after you did it?

GOV. DUKAKIS: No. No, I didn't -- but here again you know, it's one of those things where when you're in a campaign as long and as hard as a candidate is if you've won the nomination, Ted Sorenson was saying to me once on the campaign plane that at one point during the 1960 campaign, he had apparently given Jack Kennedy a draft of a speech and he asked him to look it over and get back to him with suggestions, and Kennedy said at the time:

"Hey Sorenson, my job is to show up -- you tell me what you

think I ought to say."

It isn't quite that, but you know, you have to take a certain amount of guidance from the folks that are planning your days and doing your scheduling, and that was just something that was kind of a mistake.

Q: Willie Horton -- cheap shot?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Yeah, it was a cheap shot -- but that didn't excuse our inability to respond to it, or the fact that it took us months to find out that Ronald Reagan himself as governor of California had had at least two people on furlough that had murdered others and hadn't even changed the system, which I had, that the Reagan/Bush administration had a furlough program in the federal prisons which was at least as liberal as ours and in some cases, worse. In fact, all those drug kingpins that Mr. Bush at the time was talking about, those folks were getting furloughs, and in fact under much looser conditions than what was a much tighter furlough program that I had -

But here again, you know, as a candidate, I've got a responsibility to make that argument effectively and to take it to the other guy, and we just did not do a good job of doing that.

WILL YOU RUN AGAIN?

Q: Can you ever see yourself running for President again?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Maybe. Maybe. One never knows. I don't think you ever say never in this business, but running for the Presidency is the toughest and the most demanding thing any person in public life will ever be called upon to do in this country -- and it's something you don't do lightly.

Q: What would it take?

GOV. DUKAKIS: Who knows? You know, I'm not sure I'm prepared at this point to answer that question, but right now I want to finish up my final year as governor as strong as I possibly can, leave a good solid state for my successor, and then Kitty and I will kind of take a look at the world and decide where we go from here.

Q: Governor Dukakis, thanks for your time.

GOV. DUKAKIS: Thanks for having me.

# # # # #