

The John H. Glenn, Jr.
Oral History Project

Oral History Interview 12

with
John H. Glenn, Jr.

in the Hart Senate Office Building
in Washington, D.C.

June 9, 1997

Brien R. Williams
Interviewer

[Begin Interview 12, Tape 1, Side A]

WILLIAMS: This is the twelfth interview with Senator John Glenn. We're in his office in the Hart Senate Office Building. The date is June 9, 1997.

Let's pick up, then, with the campaign financing issue today. Should we start with where things stand right now?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, why don't we do that.

WILLIAMS: Okay. Go ahead.

SEN. GLENN: Where we stand right now on June the 9th, is we're sort of at a stalemate. During the interim since I last put down my thoughts in late April, there have been quite a number of things that have occurred back and forth on them submitting on the Republican side, with Chairman [Fred] Thompson submitted requests for additional subpoenas, us questioning them. But I can only hold them up for seventy-two hours legally, even if I object to them. They can then vote them out.

So on most of these I did not object formally, which means that when I don't have an objection, they then can put them out. I should add that the same thing does not apply the other direction. When we ask for a subpoena and I submit it to Chairman Thompson, they can ignore it. There is no seventy-two-hour rule with regard to the minority. So they ignore our subpoenas and don't put them out. So far that has resulted in them having put out 142 subpoenas out of the 142 that they wanted, and we have 18 of the 43 that we had requested. All of ours were in the scope of the investigation as outlined by the Senate and previously to that by the Governmental Affairs Committee. So this is just not being conducted fairly. My view at this point is that Chairman Thompson is responding too much to the will of his leadership, leadership that does not want any campaign finance reform at all. All they want is to do a number on Democrats with their investigation leading up to the congressional elections next year, and that's what this thing has evolved into.

I find it very unpleasant that that is the case, because I really thought, going into this whole thing, that we could do a wonderful and needed job for the country in laying out all the problems with campaign finance, but it appears at this point that that is not going to be the case. It's going to be them pushing for information on Democrats, and that's about 90 percent of it.

This is not the way Senator Thompson went into this. That's the reason that I think that his Republican leadership is what is swaying him to the extent that they are now just concentrating on Democrats, rather than on the big issues that are involved with campaign finance reform.

Senator Thompson made a statement on the floor of the Senate on January 28th of this year, '97, in which he said this: "We hope that in all cases the work of the committee can be done by the staff in a cooperative fashion. Consensus should emerge on which issues are the most serious and those matters which will receive the greatest consideration." Then note this last sentence, "But if legitimate disagreement arises as to priorities, the majority will in no way limit the minority's rights to investigate any and all parties within the jurisdiction of the committee," end of quote. That's in the *Congressional Record* on page S-717 for this year. So that was his view then, and I think he was sincere in it.

I really do believe the American public is on the right track in demanding action on the steamy mess that is campaign finance, and they want reform. I think they want across the board, both parties. I think the impression is out there and it's a correct impression, that while there may have been a greater number of irregularities connected with Democrats that have come to light so far, nevertheless, both parties are in this up to their ears, and it needs to be corrected and we need to get to the bottom of it.

Now, I think we see right now, as of this day in June '97, a golden opportunity beginning to slip away from us to do something about this. Why aren't we moving on it after Senator Thompson's views as I just read from the record? Well, my view is that Senate Republican leadership does not want campaign finance reform in any way, shape or form. Majority Leader Trent Lott has made public statements to the effect that he didn't feel we needed serious reform. When asked about it after a speech in Florida he gave several months

ago, he said, "Well, the present system was the American way." "The American way."

He was happy, apparently is happy with the current system. That is the view of [Thad] Cochran, [Don] Nickels, [Mitch] McConnell, [Rick] Santorum, quite a number of people on the other side, two of which, Nickels and Cochran, are now on the Governmental Affairs Committee, having been placed there by Lott at the beginning of this year, which, looking back on it, I think was no accident. I think that was done intentionally because they support his views.

The Republicans, in my view, are obstructing this investigation as far as our efforts go. They're obstructing when they prevent us from issuing subpoenas. They're obstructing when we get from the Republican National Committee, after having been stonewalled for almost two months after they got the subpoena, and with a deadline of the 30th of April for submission of material under the subpoena, the Republican National Committee, as an interim report, sent us a phone book of Republican Headquarters to show us their organization. It was an insult to the committee.

Then finally, after we pushed and pushed and pushed, and some of Thompson's staff called over there and asked them to cooperate with us more, when they finally submit material two weeks ago, they had redacted, which just means delete, they had deleted about 20 percent of the material they had sent to us. Now, there was a page or two of very good information in there that we can use for follow-up interviews and so on, and it makes me wonder if they were willing to send something like that, then how bad was the material that was on the

redacted pages or on the pages where everything was deleted. Also, they have refused to permit the interviews that we requested. There hasn't been an interview set up yet, to this day.

WILLIAMS: What is the role of the interview in this process? Explain what that is.

SEN. GLENN: If we want to request interviews without a subpoena, we can do that and they had agreed to set up appointments for our staff to do interviews with appropriate people.

I take back just a moment ago. There was one interview set up, that was set up for last Friday—this being a Monday morning when we're speaking now. At the last minute it was canceled. So we have yet to have any interviews actually take place.

WILLIAMS: Democrats or Republicans, there just have been no interviews?

SEN. GLENN: The Republicans have gotten dozens of interviews. This is from the Republican National Committee I'm talking about specifically here. The Republican National Committee failed to permit any interviews.

Now, we had two other subpoenas that went out and the information was supposed to be back in by the 30th of April, and here we are in the middle of June, almost. The National Policy Forum, which was Haley Barber's organization that he set up ostensibly as a tax-exempt organization, which the IRS denied and did not give him that classification. So we subpoenaed them and they have failed to produce one single piece of paper by the middle of June. Not a one. Same thing for Americans for Tax Reform, which was this Norquist organization that was almost an umbrella organization for several other groups. The Americans for Tax

Reform also have failed to produce one single piece of paper—no interviews, no nothing. So they're just ignoring us.

My own view is: we should be going out with contempt citations. These are official subpoenas from the Governmental Affairs Committee. If they're not honored, then I think we should be out with contempt citations.

Another one is the group called Triad. Now, we've had several Triad interviews scheduled. I think there are four of them now that have been scheduled. When we have those scheduled, usually a couple of days before the interview we notify the Republican side, Senator Thompson's staff, that the interview is going to take place and where it will be so they can have representation at the meeting. They do the same thing with us.

Now, there's beginning to be a pattern here, because with Triad, in particular, we've scheduled four different interviews in which people said, oh, yes, they'd be glad to talk us, glad to be interviewed, no problem. So we set a date and time, but then when we notify the Republican side when the interview is going to be, then it just happens that a few hours before the interview, the interviewee, whoever it or whatever group it might be, has something come up and they're not able to do the interview. That's happened several times. The latest one was last Friday. We had an interview set up in Louisville and that was canceled just hours before it was to take place.

So I can't claim a full-blown conspiracy here to prevent us from getting our information, but there are certainly a lot of circumstances here that begin to look very suspicious. These people are not just left on their own when they decide

they're going to cooperate with us in interviews.

Now, there are other reasons why I think that the Republican leadership is calling the shots now—that they don't want campaign finance reform. First, they've refused all this year to bring up the McCain-Feingold Bill, which is the first major bill that could be considered as far as campaign finance reform goes. They've refused to bring it up even though we made that a priority earlier in the year on the Democratic side of wanting a certain date to vote on that and bring it up. John McCain is the author of that on the Republican side. He only has one other co-sponsor on that and that's Senator Thompson, who I think really did start out wanting good campaign finance reform, but he's being reined in by his own leadership, in my personal belief.

WILLIAMS: “He” being Thompson?

SEN. GLENN: Thompson, yes. So they refuse to bring the McCain-Feingold Bill to the floor.

When they assigned the campaign finance hearings to the Governmental Affairs Committee, we went ahead and worked very hard and despite a lot of opposition we set a broad scope for the investigation, which would include not only illegalities, where law had been broken, but also improprieties, things that weren't necessarily against the law, per se, but were egregious behavior by any estimate, as far as campaign finance reform goes. That's the so-called soft money, the money that supposedly can be given to the national parties or local parties for generic ads and for general party-building things, but which in this past election were used then in particular races and to the advantage of particular candidates. And that's wrong. There were tens upon tens of millions of dollars used that way

in this last election. So the scope that we came out of the committee with was a broad scope that was going to include all of that, not only illegalities, but also the improprieties.

Now, our budget approval has to go through the Rules Committee for approval. When our budget went through the Rules Committee, and Senator Thompson and I both appeared before that committee, the Rules Committee basically emasculated the scope when they cut out all that impropriety investigation that the Republicans are particularly sensitive to, and went back on illegalities, which they feel gave them an advantage in going at the White House, going at the Democrats.

WILLIAMS: In the last interview, you explained the meeting that Lott had and he had to back down, right?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, we did. I'll go ahead with that in just a second. In the Rules Committee, this was the lineup: you had [John] Warner as the chairman on the Republican side, with [Jesse] Helms, [Ted] Stevens, McConnell, Cochran, Santorum, Nickels, Lott, and [Kay Bailey] Hutchison. Now, there you have Lott sitting on that committee in addition to his majority leadership role. Lott, Nickels, who is strongly opposed to anything, even though he is on our Governmental Affairs Committee and just voted it out—the approval of this broad scope. Then he turned around and went the other way on the Rules Committee. Senator Cochran did the same thing. Senator McConnell is adamantly opposed to any change in campaign finance reform. So that was the lineup for the vote.

But then it went to the floor—I floor-managed that bill on our side. We

made a point of trying to restore the scope back to its original version that we had coming out of committee. That particular day in the Republican caucus, it turned out there were eight or ten people who wanted to vote with me out on the floor. So Lott had lost control of his organization. So he came out and proposed the same thing I proposed and it became his proposal then on the floor, and it passed ninety-nine to nothing.

Now, in spite of that, the subpoenas that we have wanted to issue from the Democratic side to look into some of these things have been thwarted at every step of the way. We've only gotten eighteen out of forty-three. Of those eighteen that we did get, what's been the response? Well, I mentioned a moment ago, the Republican National Committee has delayed and then what they sent us was cynical. It was insulting to the Governmental Affairs Committee. We got four boxes of material, finally, but it was so heavily—either entirely redacted or heavily redacted. In addition, their counsel has been completely uncooperative in setting up interviews.

Now, in contrast over on the Democratic side, the Democratic National Committee has sent fifty-one boxes of material so far, and each box contains probably somewhere around 2,000 pages. That would be about an average. So you have tens upon tens of thousands of pages and dozens of interviews that have been set up as a result of the information that they've obtained from what the DNC has submitted. Chairman Thompson says that the quality of the material they've gotten is extremely poor; they haven't gotten anything that they really wanted. I don't know whether that's true or not, but I know at least the level of production

has enabled them to go ahead with dozens of interviews so far, where we haven't received enough material to even do any of that.

So, the Republican National Committee was stonewalling. The National Policy Forum, as I said—not a single paper or any commitment from them at all as to when we might get them. Same thing with the Americans for Tax Reform. Same thing with the Triad. We got a few documents from Triad, but not ones that were particularly useful. And we need the material to prepare.

Now, I don't know whether this is a conspiracy on their side. I do know that it's making a mockery of this investigation. I do know that we're being obstructed heavily on what we can do and not do on our side, and I think it's very unfair. We cannot wait into the fall to issue subpoenas and expect to have them do any good since this investigation is, by what was passed in the Senate, limited to this year. It ends at the end of December of '97.

Now, I don't know if they're trying on the other side to not start the hearings until late enough in the year that there won't be time enough to bring up matters involving Republican wrongdoing, or whether they deliberately want to get a lot of material, save it until the end of the year, and then try and push it over, get an extension of time, and push it over into '98, which is a congressional election year.

I didn't cover necessarily why the Republicans do not want campaign reform. Well, basically they are able to raise about twice as much money as Democrats from their sources. They give the ability to raise money the credit for them being able to take control of the Senate and the House in '94. They see their

ability, their superior ability to raise money, as being key to maintaining control of the Senate and the House, and they're probably right in that regard. So that's the reason they were so dead-set against any changes in election law.

I think they're being very shortsighted in that area, because they may get a temporary tactical advantage in one or two or three elections, but for the long-term benefit of this country, what they're doing is absolutely wrong. We need to clean up campaign finance reform. I have come out in favor of federal financing of federal campaigns. I think that's the only way we can clear this mess up and start restoring people's faith in the elective process.

What I have proposed in the past and I have proposed again to Chairman Thompson—I think instead of going after things just based on a reference in a newspaper column to where there may or may not have been something wrong, and issuing a subpoena to try and find out, we have a very good idea of the major things that are wrong in political campaigns. I think we should be laying it out subject by subject, and then taking up that subject and getting information where both parties are in error, and approaching it that way.

I'm not trying to protect Democrats. If there was wrongdoing down at the White House, or wherever, in the Democratic Party, let's clean it up. Let's get with it. But where they have made such a big issue out of issuing a subpoena to John Huang—that's been all over the newspapers about what influence he may have had. I certainly think we should go after John Huang. But I also think we need to go after the National Policy Forum that, so far, is the only clear track, provable track, of foreign money coming into political campaigns. That came

from Hong Kong, Ambrose Young in Hong Kong, through the National Policy Forum. That was a group formed by Haley Barber and the money wound up in the Republican National Committee coffers and was used in the election. They refused to give us subpoenas to look into that at the same time they wanted to go in to John Huang. We have a subpoena on the National Policy Forum itself, but they have refused anything on Haley Barber, which is where we need to go to get more information. That's the only proven track of foreign money so far. So, things like that we need to have a fair shake on.

Foreign money is one area that's illegal and should be looked into. There were concerns about whether national security matters, whether classified matters, were made available to certain people over in the Commerce Department, John Huang, among others. Certainly we should look into that. Those first two may wind up with more difficulty on the Democratic side than on the Republican side, except for that track of foreign money. That's one that's very important.

There were all sorts of things promised for that foreign money. We had just last week the lawyer for Ambrose Young in Hong Kong, the lawyer in this country, who was willing to come up and, without a subpoena, give us a deposition, a sworn statement, as to what happened. He brought along over one hundred documents that show where this money went, what it was intended for, what the arrangement was.

The National Policy Forum, they're the only known entity, so far, where money really did come into campaigns. So we need to look into that, to foreign money, to the security aspects certainly. But also into another category, which is

soft money, in which I think there'd be far more difficulty on the Republican side than there would on the Democratic side. That needs to be looked into. So far we have not been able to get the subpoenas to do that.

Another area is the illegal transfer of money through third parties to be contributed. Where a person's given the maximum amount, but that person gets another person to give and tells them, "What you give, I'll reimburse you for this." That's illegal, and that needs to be looked at. We haven't been able to get subpoenas out to look at that so far.

So we need to do all of these things to really clean up the system. Instead of that, the Senate Republican leaders don't want campaign finance reform. It's that simple. Their main objective with this is to go out and get Democrats and tar Democrats. They are looking forward to next year's election, and want to keep the election laws pretty much the way they are right now, because they can raise twice as much money, roughly speaking, for these campaigns than we can on the Democratic side. They don't want to let us look at any of these particular issues and flesh them out. I think it's strictly a matter of Senate leadership using this investigation to look forward to the '98 election. I keep asking, "What are you afraid of? Why don't you want us to look at these organizations?"

I've approved most of their 142 [subpoenas] when they submitted them to me. There haven't been many that I have turned down and asked them to go back and reconsider again—whether I did that or not, they put them out anyway, because I can only hold them up for seventy-two hours. As I said a little while ago, they can ignore our request. There's no seventy-two-hour rule with regard to

how you deal with the minority, unfortunately.

WILLIAMS: Are those rules that are unique to your committee, or is that throughout the Senate?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, it's pretty much the same. Ours may be a little bit different. There's no standard set of rules that apply to all committees. Each committee feels that its work is special enough that they need their own committee rules. So our committee rules have been in effect for many years. But never have I ever seen them, in the twenty-two years I've been on that committee, never have I seen them being misused like they are right now.

WILLIAMS: While you were chairman, how would you treat a Republican-sponsored subpoena normally?

SEN. GLENN: I don't know that we ever turned one down, and there have been hundreds issued through the years, particularly on the PSI, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which is one of the major investigative subcommittees in the Congress. Our committee is basically the old Truman Committee, the McClellan Committee that did some of those famous investigations out of the past. So we have the broadest investigative authority of any committee in the Senate, or any committee on Capitol Hill, really. But my view is it is being misused right now. And while I think Fred Thompson went into this with the best of intentions, it's not coming out this way. I'm sorry that he's not going ahead and just running things himself and feels that he has to kowtow or knuckle under to leadership on the other side.

WILLIAMS: How do your relations stand with him at this point?

SEN. GLENN: He and I have always gotten along well. I've tried to work with him. But there's been more and more coming out publicly now about some of our disagreements, and so I guess I'd term them a bit strained at the moment. I'm going to have to have a meeting with him here shortly, probably even today, I don't know. Probably today.

One of the more controversial subpoenas that they are putting out is one on the AFL-CIO. It is so broad-based that I found trouble believing they'd put out a subpoena like that. It involved even subpoenaing information on union organizing efforts and some of the union plans for that. They wanted to subpoena all the records of executive committee meetings. I think the AFL-CIO would have been well advised, as broad as the subpoena was written—it encompassed just everything about the whole labor movement, whether campaign finance reform or not, the way I read it. I told some of our staff here it includes everything except bringing in the Statue of Liberty, and I wasn't quite sure they couldn't have included that, it was written so broadly. I thought it was a little bit like the dog that chases the truck, and then the truck stops and what's the dog do with it? He's got more than he can handle.

I thought the AFL-CIO might have been smart to start sending truckload after truckload after truckload of material over here and they'd have to have fifteen warehouses and they'd be so inundated with material. But, of course, that's expensive to do and the AFL-CIO doesn't want to do that. But their claim is that the only reason all these pseudo organizations were set up, like the National Policy Forum, was because the AFL-CIO had announced a program of being very

actively involved politically in the last election. But the AFL-CIO was making no bones about this. They were going out very directly and supporting candidates of their choice, which is quite legal and above board. They announced it; there wasn't any subterfuge on it at all.

But the Republican side claims that the only reason they had to set up all these things like NPF and like the Americans for Tax Reform, and all the rest of these groups was in response to what the AFL-CIO was doing. So they're subpoenaing the AFL-CIO. Of course, I'm sure the lawyers will have to get together and decide how much material they really want to send over and if they can have an agreement on how far they want to push this. If they get what they ask for, it is so broad that it has very little to do just with campaign finance reform.

So, on our side I keep asking them, "Why are you holding up our investigations?" because they can hold up our investigations indefinitely. What are they afraid of? What do they want to hide? At the same time, I cannot hold up their investigations, except for seventy-two hours on a particular subpoena. Now, what's probably going to happen today is that we are going to—they submitted another request for a subpoena last week after...

[Begin Tape 1, Side 2]

SEN. GLENN: Last week, more in frustration than anything else, we held a press conference, which all Democratic members of the Governmental Affairs Committee attended. We laid out basically the whole situation as I have just described it in the

preceding part of this interview, and said that it was not beyond possibility that we would boycott hearings in the future. This had been suggested by some of our members and it's a possible route of action. It's one that, at least at this point, I don't think we should do. I think we would lose more than we would gain by walking out.

At one time, since we were being treated so unfairly, we thought that might be one of the options we had, because I was under the impression that the majority party could not hold a legal committee hearing unless at least one member of the opposite party, namely Democrats in this case, was in attendance at the meeting. Now, that applies in some very specific situations, but it does not apply here. So we ran that by the Senate Parliamentarian, and I had been incorrect on that, because we thought at one time that if they were still this unfair, we could possibly boycott their meeting, the hearings, and there could not be an official meeting. They could do one of two things: either hold an unofficial meeting, and we could do the same thing on the Democratic side, of course—even though we don't have subpoena authority, we could do the same thing on our side—or they could then take it to the floor of the Senate, and, in effect, have the hearing over on the floor of the Senate, which I didn't think they would do. Well, we cannot block by that means. So the only way we could use a boycott to any advantage would be if we could just make the case of how unfair this is and refuse to participate any further.

Now, last week we brought that up at the press conference as a possible course of action. Some of our members favor that. I personally at this point do

not, because I think we would probably lose more than we would gain. It would be looked at as the ultimate roadblock that we're trying to throw in the Republican investigation of the White House and everything that people have read about that is wrong. I don't think that's the route we ought to be going.

We are not here as apologists, nor defense counsel for the White House, or for anything that happened at the Democratic National Committee. Whatever happened in those areas will have to be answered by the people that were involved. The President has said he wants all this stuff on foreign money and all the campaign irregularities investigated and brought out. I think he's sincere in that regard. He wants to get that behind him so he can get on with the business of being President and doing the things that are important for this country in education and environment and so many different areas.

As of last week, after all of this, and all the refusal, and after my having approved the previous week—I had approved twenty-three subpoenas they had sent that were follow-up subpoenas to banks. I looked through them, thought they were okay, and I approved those. Then they submit another one to us, after they refused once again to give us any of the subpoenas that I had asked for on behalf of the committee. So, on June 9th, the day we're talking here right now, my seventy-two hours that I can hold them up on runs out at about six o'clock this afternoon. So I have a letter prepared here that I have to go over sometime today before then and take it over and submit it to them, objecting to their subpoena. That, in turn, will hold for seventy-two hours and that's it.

I didn't tell one reason why this is important, that I object. If I object

officially by letter on behalf of the minority, Democrats, then he has to call a hearing to discuss this. At that hearing, we not only can bring out why we object to this particular subpoena, but also can talk about the other subpoenas and why we're not getting ours put out. So that's what we'll do and that's the reason I'm objecting to this one. I really have no objection to the subpoena as far as what it is after; it's after some bank records. But I can object to it as a way of turning once again to the court of public opinion to let them know that we are being dealt with very, very unfairly. And I think that's important.

In my letter that I plan to send over, I'll talk some about what has happened in the past and how we had hoped to make this an across-the-board bipartisan inquiry into all aspects of campaign financing, without regard to whether it was Democrats or Republicans. We wanted to go at specific issues where we know there are problems. Sometimes it's going to hit hardest on Democrats, sometimes it's probably going to hit hardest on Republicans, but let's bring it out. That's what they don't want to do.

I'll protest about our number of subpoenas issued by the committee and the fact that we're being stonewalled. Even when we get the few subpoenas we have out, we're being stonewalled by the people being subpoenaed. So, I'll go through some of those figures on what the response has been.

The National Policy Forum situation is one that I think they are very, very nervous about, because once they found out that we had Benson Becker, who is the lawyer for the Hong Kong business interests for Ambrose Young—when they found out he was coming up to, in effect, give us a deposition, which is a sworn

statement, just as much as if it was done under a subpoena, they really didn't know what to do on that one.

They attended the interview we had and the deposition that was taken with Mr. Becker, in which he laid out chapter and verse from beginning to end how this started out with Haley Barber, who was the Republic National Chairman— requests for money, how it was laid out. He even stated how you could turn that kind of money into hard money that could be used by the Republican National Committee. It was used. It was millions of dollars starting out. It was supposed to be repaid and then did not get repaid. They wound up stiffing, or not paying, Mr. Young in Hong Kong about a half a million, which made him very irate. And it hasn't been paid back yet.

WILLIAMS: That's the reason he's cooperating?

SEN. GLENN: And that's the reason he's cooperating, yes.

Now, there is one of the former Republican officials, Richard Richards, who also has a letter that was given to us last week that just lays this out from beginning to end in major detail. I think he may have been the Republican National Chairman at one time, but he was high up in the party, anyway. He was involved with this. He feels that his honor was involved in what happened here, and so he's very unhappy about this also.

One of the letters we have just goes through chapter and verse about how they got the money, where it went, the purpose in transferring it from soft money over to hard money, how they were going to do that, how it got used in the campaigns. It's very explicit. They knew that when we did that deposition last

week with Mr. Becker, who represents all the Young interests in this country. That Richard Richards letter, in particular, was a very damning one for their purpose.

Late last Friday afternoon, a representative of the National Policy Forum came by with a copy—I should precede this with one statement. All of this that's given under deposition, or under subpoena, is, in effect, classified information. I can't release that to the press. It's considered as committee material, it's under investigation, and I can't pick a part of it out and put it out there for the press to speculate over. We may know it internally and the press may know some of it, but we can't legally take that out and we should not. I've abided scrupulously by that rule. But what happened last Friday with them knowing that we had all this information, what happens? The NPF drops a packet of information off that they're releasing to the press themselves that has some of this same material in it. They give a copy to us and a copy to the Republicans, and it has the Richard Richards letter in it that details all this from beginning to end. Now, what they're obviously trying to do, the Washington traditional way of doing things, which happens to work, incidentally, is, if you have something awful that you're going to have to 'fess up to anyway—you're going to really take your lumps in the press—release it on late Friday afternoon. The major writers at the papers are gone for the weekend or have already done their weekend pieces. Information put out then may make a wire story over the weekend, but it does not have anywhere near the impact on public opinion or the rest of the news media as something put out by an aggrieved party that is spotlighted out in the open. By the time the following

week rolls around and people pick up on this, it's old news by that time. So that's a way of damping bad news in Washington; you put it out late Friday afternoon. That's exactly what they did. So we're going to have to follow through on that.

Now, back to this letter—I asked them what are they trying to hide, and why they were putting out these subpoenas at the AFL-CIO. Yet different groups were supposedly acting in response to the AFL-CIO and we're not permitted to get subpoenas on those groups that were formed to counteract the CIO. Some of them were already in existence, but some of them were formed just for that purpose.

The Christian Coalition is being given immunity for being subpoenaed, even though they were into all these political races hot and heavy. Americans for Tax Reform, National Policy Forum, have so far ignored the subpoenas that were served on them. If this is the way we're going to go, I can only conclude that bipartisanship is dead and that basic fairness is not to be found in this investigation. My last sentence, if I send it this way, and this is the final letter yet, but I said, "Partisan politics has triumphed over the public interest."

So that's sort of where we stand right now. It's been a battle back and forth over the subpoenas. I just find it very distasteful, the whole thing. I thought we were really going to have the opportunity to get into this and really do a good job on it.

Let me give just a moment here—let me just run through some of these things. We have submitted some additional—so the figure I gave of forty-three [subpoenas] was not correct. As of June the 5th, we had submitted a total of fifty-one subpoenas and we've received eighteen of them. Eight of them were

negotiated and issued in April. Twenty-two were just rejected by the Republicans. The Young Brothers' subpoenas were negotiated and issued in May, and those came through. We got those, luckily. I think they were approved on a Thursday or a Friday and *Time* magazine came out with this big exposé on the Young, Ambrose Young, money and how it got into the Republican coffers. They came out with that on the following Monday. So I'm sure if that *Time* magazine thing had been out, we would not have been able to get our subpoenas, but, luckily, we did get those subpoenas.

We had three more Young Brothers-related subpoenas that were rejected in May. That was directly for Haley Barber to a man named Volcansic [phonetic], and Volcansic's company, in that he was involved in some of the arrangements of how the money was going to come in. Three bank subpoenas, two nonprofits, two bank subpoenas to a Mr. Kojima [phonetic], who was another source of foreign money coming into the campaign, as far as we know.

We also have a subpoena out to the National Policy Forum to get their donor lists. For a tax-exempt organization, they are not permitted to put out their donor list, nor their contribution list, but they were denied their tax-exempt status by the IRS, so we should be able to get those donor lists. There was a thing in quotes in the *New York Times*, quoting some people, unnamed people, anonymous people, but it was in quotes, that indicated there would probably be other foreign money that we could track if we could get those NPF donor lists.

Now, the majority, in turn, has submitted a total of 143 subpoenas; 142 were issued. The one that was not issued was turned into a joint letter. Both sides

agreed that should be done for that one. So in effect, they've received 142 of the 142 they wanted. Thirty-four were issued in May. Twenty-three were issued June 2nd. Those were the ones I approved just two weeks ago, or a little less than two weeks ago. Several of those were involved with this Buddhist temple situation out on the West Coast.

The summary production of documents—the DNC has submitted fifty-one boxes. That would estimate out to be somewhere around 100 to 125,000 pages of documents. There have been twenty-seven interviews conducted with DNC personnel, and depositions. The White House has turned over some twenty-five boxes, which would be somewhere between 50 and 60,000 pages of documents. Clinton-Gore has submitted six boxes. There have been several hundred other boxes from federal agencies and corporations and individuals and banks.

Senator Thompson has said, yes, but these don't respond to what they had wanted. Well, okay, I've told him repeatedly, then let's get together and see if we can't get the information he needs. At the same time we would like to get the information that we feel we need on our side also. Now, that's the record on production of documents on the Democratic side.

On the Republican side, we received from the Republican National Committee just four boxes of materials so heavily redacted that they're basically not useable. That could be anywhere from 10 to 15,000 pages of documents. About 25 percent of the materials they've given us are duplicative forms and press releases and public information releases and things like that, so it just hasn't been as useful as we had wanted it to be. They refused to cooperate in any interviews

or depositions so far.

Now, the Dole-Kemp Committee, presidential committee, has sent three boxes. We're going through those now. The Americans for Tax Reform has sent not one single item, not one single document. National Policy Forum, until they came over last Friday with this release trying to cut us off on what we knew, I guess, or cut the public impact of it off, they had not submitted anything. Triad has sent one box of documents and one box of videotapes. All the interviews we've had scheduled have been canceled after the minority notified the majority of when the interview was to take place. There were four interviews that fit that category so far, so I begin to be very suspicious.

I have another summary here of some 8,000 pages that the RNC had sent us—how they break down so far in different topics, schedules for galas and fundraisers, and the Dole campaign logistical information, telephone directories and building rosters, Republican Network Satellite Exchange Commission correspondence, things like that that have anywhere from 500 to 3,000. So there are about 8,000 pages that consist primarily of logistical information that we don't have any real use for. We knew all those things to begin with.

So that's where we stand as of today. I'll be working later today on this letter to the chairman, officially objecting to putting out the subpoena that was delivered to our office on Wednesday, June the 4th, at about six o'clock, because the seventy-two hours is in your legislative days. You don't count weekends on those. So Wednesday leads us to Thursday to Friday to Monday evening at six o'clock. So as long as I get that over there, why, then we'll ask in this letter also

for a hearing so we can discuss not only that particular subpoena, but tell them that while I don't care about that particular subpoena, what we do want the committee meeting for is to discuss our subpoenas and also when the hearings may start.

So, that's sort of a catch-up on where we are right now.

WILLIAMS: When do you expect that hearing to take place?

SEN. GLENN: They have talked recently about perhaps having hearings starting sometime in early July now. The original plan was to do our investigating in January. The hearings were to start in February. Then it was put off until late April or May. Then the next it was put off until late June or early July. Then Senator Thompson did not broach this to me, but staff talked to our staff, just remarked one day, there might be a possibility we wouldn't even start until after the August break, which would mean we'd have a very short time to complete everything that has to be done.

I think some of these things we've been able to dig up without subpoenas are very damning on their side. I think they may be sorry they ever started this whole thing. So far, it's going to come out hurting them worse than it does the Democrats right now, in this one instance of foreign money, anyway. Now, what comes out of all the John Huang stuff and all of that so-called China connection, I don't know.

Mitch McConnell, who is chairman of the Republican Senate Campaign Committee, never wanted the hearings. He only wanted them targeted at Democrats—period. I got a kick out of it last week—he now comes out with one

of these fundraising letters that is just scandalous in some of the remarks that it makes. It goes on—it's five pages of material. He wants people to contribute so the Republicans can fully investigate the following allegations: that agents of Communist China and foreign corporations operated freely within the Democratic National Committee, the Commerce Department, and the White House. The third one is that illegal cash from entities connected to Red China, the Russian mafia, Cuba drug dealers and Asian arms peddlers recklessly and illegally funneled money to the Democrat National Committee and to Clinton-Gore '96.

That's just scandalous, and I don't think he can prove any of those. Then he goes into this, "I am disgusted by the brazen way the Democrats in the time period repeatedly violated the law in '96, of foreign agents being invited to sit at the highest levels. But perhaps the most obnoxious of all many—he says, as quoted in the memo—many Clinton defenders in the media claim the American people really don't care if Red Chinese or Indonesian agents had free access to our most sensitive secrets or that drug dealers and other scum were intimate White House guests."

It just goes on and on like that, page after page after page. Then he wants people to sign up to contribute money and call it a citizen's directive that's going to be rushed back so that they can oppose these things. It's just a scandalous way of raising money, I think.

WILLIAMS: He's raising that for this directive, which will then operate politically, is that it?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, he wants them to send back money. He lays it all on the media, a lot of it.

He talks about, "Meanwhile, we have evidence of foreign agents in the White

House and dozens of related scandals and the press, doesn't want to see another President brought down by scandal," end of quote. He goes ahead, "What this quote really means is that the media doesn't want to see this President brought down by scandal. Make no mistake; Bill Clinton is the media's President. If he had been a Republican, they would have destroyed him years ago, but Bill Clinton is a hard left-wing Democrat, just like 85 percent of the press. So, of course they don't want to bring him down. Well, I don't necessarily wish to bring him down either, but I do want to find the truth." He goes into a whole bunch of things here.

Then he says, "My friend, I'll be honest with you, I get sick to my stomach every time I hear the President or some liberal journalist claim the answer is, 'campaign reform.' Campaign reform is a liberal codeword for taxpayer-funded elections. It's also smoke and mirrors to hide what could be massive lawbreaking and foreign influence pedaling." He goes on and on. "But we can't do it alone." So all these people are supposed to send in money. What he lists then as, "A generous donation of \$20, 25, 50, 100, or more, will help me and the National Republican Senate Campaign Committee. The purpose is (1), print and distribute up to five million citizens' directives; (2), enlist 200,000 Americans who will work with us to build public support for our investigations; (3), recruit and train good conservative candidates who will give us a filibuster approved majority in the Senate in 1998; (4), create a Clinton truth squad that will shadow Clinton and the Democratic liberals every move, smear and distortion. It's a big job and we have a long ways to go." Well, what they really mean is, number three is what they want: a filibuster majority in the Senate in '98. That's the purpose of this

whole thing. Like most of these long fundraising things, a P.S. comes on at the end, which for some reason or another makes it more effective, the polling has shown that. It's just a typical one, but it is really a—it's just scurrilous in what it says. So we're up against some of that stuff right now, too.

So anyway, it's not a very pleasant time around here with regard to campaign refinance reform. That's sort of brings us up to date on that, I guess, unless we wanted to get into...

WILLIAMS: Let me ask you some questions here.

SEN. GLENN: All right.

WILLIAMS: Going back to the letter you're sending Thompson today, when do you expect to have a hearing on that particular subpoena?

SEN. GLENN: I don't know. It's up to him to set it. But you have to have it within the seventy-two hours, so we'd have it this week.

WILLIAMS: You coordinate, then, your approach to that hearing with your fellow Democrats?

SEN. GLENN: Yes.

WILLIAMS: How does that work?

SEN. GLENN: We meet. We've had a number of meetings here in this office. Sometimes we've had meetings over in Senator [Thomas A.] Daschle's office, off the floor over there, because it's more convenient after a vote or something like that. I've wanted Tom Daschle to know what we're doing, so I've invited him to all of our meetings. What we do is talk over different options we may have, what we want to do. As I said, some of the people want to boycott this. I'm not quite as hot for boycott as some of them are.

WILLIAMS: So you work sort of as a unit?

SEN. GLENN: We work sort of as a unit, yes. I have the final say on things, but we work as a unit. I've wanted them to be involved with it as much as we possibly can, too. We get to hearings; I want everybody to be involved in the hearings. I'd prefer not to be sitting there through long, lengthy hearings day after day after day after day like poor Paul Sarbanes was on the Banking Committee, with [Alfonse M.] D'Amato running that entire two-and-a-half-year thing on Whitewater that turned up absolutely nothing. It wasted almost 2 million dollars, 1.8 million.

Paul Sarbanes, as the ranking minority member, sat there day after day after day after day through all of that, with not much support from his own committee. They just had other things to do. It wasn't that they were boycotting, it's just they didn't figure their time was productively spent there.

WILLIAMS: You could see the same thing.

SEN. GLENN: I could see the same thing happening here. But if it happens, it happens.

WILLIAMS: I suppose you are susceptible to the charge that you're sort of a one-tune Harry on this, because you keep having to repeat the same set of arguments, which everyone is now familiar with.

SEN. GLENN: Yes. Of course, Thompson, quite frankly, is, in a way, sort of the darling of the press in some ways right now, in that he's been in thirty-some movies and he's a big sort of handsome—depending on your view, I guess—guy that does a sort of, tries to be, aw-shucks Tennessee-type demeanor. So the press likes him because he's been named as someone who may be a rising star for President in the year 2000. He's in the right age category to think about that, early fifties. He was

involved with Watergate back as Howard Baker's counsel or one of Howard Baker's right-hand people during Watergate years ago. That's where he got his Washington experience.

I guess since we're doing this for my own memoirs, I can say that I have told him privately that he should watch out for this crowd that's trying to tell him what to do. I told him this privately. Because I said, if any one of the—you know, you've got Trent Lott over here, who wants to run for President himself, who I think is hearing *Hail To The Chief* being played in the background as he goes to sleep.

[Begin Tape 2, Side 1]

SEN. GLENN: What you have are people over there, as I told Fred, if they thought they really could envision him riding down Pennsylvania Avenue on Inauguration Day heading back to the White House, they'd cut him off at the knees so fast it'd make his head swim. He shouldn't trust those people. I told him, I can just hear, I can imagine Trent Lott goes to sleep every night with *Hail To The Chief* wafting through his memory. Don Nickels has already been up to New Hampshire at least once, maybe twice, I'm not sure. They all say, oh, this was just for party-building and so on, but they're making all the right moves for what might be considered leading up to the year 2000 election.

So I think he could have done a great service to the country by keeping this on an absolute bipartisan basis, cooperating with us and really trying to dig out what's wrong with campaign finance. Instead, they're channeling him in more and

more to just concentrating on the White House and Democratic problems, of which there are a lot and I want to look into them. But he wants to keep it on that. Every time I've had a private meeting we always want to bring some staff along for the meeting, but he always wants to have Cochran and Nickels, two people who just came on the committee, were put on the committee, I think, by Trent Lott to make sure that things went the right way on the committee. So they come to every meeting, private meeting, I have with Thompson. I bring Carl Levin and Joe [Joseph I.] Lieberman, who are the number two and three people on our side. In those discussions, we just go back and forth over the same material over and over again, and we haven't been able to get through.

In fact, Cochran said one day at the meeting, he got a little exasperated and he said, "Well, I'll tell you something, if I was chairman, you wouldn't have gotten what you have so far. You wouldn't have had any." So that's where they're coming from over on their side, and I think Fred feels that he's alienated his leadership about as far as he can alienate them and feels he has to go along with them. That's my view.

WILLIAMS: What about the White House in all of this?

SEN. GLENN: The White House, I've had no contact with them directly. I decided early on that if this was going to be a proper hearing, that I should not be consulting directly with the White House or giving them any advice whatsoever. We do that through counsel. That's the traditional way. That's the way you should do things like this.

So our counsel and the majority counsel have met with the White House to work out the ground rules on how they would produce documents and get them

over to the committee, and without a subpoena. They did agree not to subpoena the White House. That gets into some political sensitivity and some questions about legalities. Can you subpoena the White House? I think you can, but they decided, for appearances' sake, at least, they'd work out this agreement of how things were to be produced. So I've dealt with the White House strictly through counsel. I haven't talked to a soul at the White House, President or anybody else, about how we're going about this.

WILLIAMS: Do you get the sense that the White House has any particular way they want to see things handled? Has that word come back through counsel to you much?

SEN. GLENN: No, not really. The only thing that's come back through counsel has been that at some of their early meetings they had a little difficulty, I guess, narrowing down exactly what it was the majority was after, then the White House knowing where they could go to get that information. Thompson complains continually about the White House not producing what they're asking for, and I don't know what the status is on that. I'm all for the White House giving them whatever information they want. Let's get this thing through and behind us, as far as I'm concerned.

WILLIAMS: Let me ask you the relationship between gathering information and having hearings. How does that work?

SEN. GLENN: Let's say you subpoena information. You want a certain type information from a certain organization. If you find something here that should be brought out then, and they give you material that you find is something that should be the subject of a hearing, well, then you would try to broaden that out a little bit and get as many other witnesses to deal with that same subject, to make your case that here's

something wrong, it should not have happened, let's correct it. And if it was illegal, then some penalty should—well, then at that point, I suppose, we would turn our material—we're not a judge and jury here. We can bring material to light. That's one of the functions of this committee. Then if it gets to a certain point where we have enough material and we think there's an illegality, you send it over to the Justice Department, with all the information you have, give it to them to run their own investigation of it. If it was an illegality, then take it before a grand jury.

On the other side, what I had wanted to bring out also were some of the things that aren't illegal, but are certainly wrong. Like the enormous amounts of soft money that came in and is skewing our whole political system, and use the hearings for laying this out publicly to lay an information base, so that we maybe can have meaningful campaign finance reform in the future.

In that last regard, I'm under no illusions here. I do not think, with the current leadership, that we're going to have any campaign finance reform brought to the floor this year at all, no matter what the people say.

WILLIAMS: What about what the people are saying to you? How has your mail been running and so forth in all of this?

SEN. GLENN: Basically backing me up. There have been some charges from Thompson a couple of times that I was obstructing things, which is absolutely 100 percent not true. So there were some editorials about my not obstructing things. A couple over this past weekend—one in particular that I think really is just so far off base it's hard to even respond to, is Bill Safire in the *New York Times*, the one that was

on the editorial page, the Op Ed page of the *New York Times* over the weekend. He talks about how I'm holding Thompson up, in effect. Things like that. One reason I was so disturbed about it, he had a column in on the 4th of June, in which he talked about me and about how I had delayed these things. "The foot-dragging conspiracy," he says on this, "is also at work in DNC's refusal to turn things over," delaying tactics and all this, and paints me into this as part of this effort to prevent getting information from the foreign—the Huang, and Charlie Trie, and this Pauline Kanchanalak of Thailand—that I have somehow refused to go along with looking in to those folks. And that's not true.

The State Department was supposed to set up interviews with those people, with a group that was going to go out from the committee. The State Department either couldn't find the people or couldn't get anything set up. So I wrote a letter a week or so ago suggesting that maybe this trip was unnecessary. It was going to cost fifty or sixty thousand dollars to send the staff out there to Hong Kong and Taiwan and China to try and locate some of these people. No subpoena power out there, of course, and with these people not wanting to testify, I thought that it was just sort of a waste of investigation money.

Well, I wrote that letter, and that was leaked out. So then I'm being held up as trying to prevent this trip. We sent a person along on the trip to be there when they do some of these interviews. We only sent one person. They're sending the larger staff out there. I don't know how many people finally went. But they left last Friday and they're going to be out there two to three weeks. They thought it was important to get out there to try and get some of this stuff

before the Hong Kong turnover. There may be some truth to that, I don't know.

WILLIAMS: How are things run in relationship to the House investigation?

SEN. GLENN: The House investigation is just off the scope. [Dan] Burton has been, in my view, so irresponsible over there. He just fired subpoenas out—everybody in sight, anybody brought to his attention practically, the way it looked. He is not letting this own staff have anything to do with the investigation much and has completely frozen out Henry Waxman and the minority over there. They make request after request, and they're just ignored. So Burton, I think, has carried it to the point where he has lost credibility for whatever might come out.

Where Burton made his biggest mistake, I think, is he just stated that his job as the Republican chairman of that committee, as the majority leader of that committee, his job was to get Democrats and to go after the White House. He said it just like that. So there hasn't been even any lip service given to bipartisanship over there. So I think he's lost credibility. I don't think anything that comes out over there is going to make much difference. I think if anything substantive is going to come out of these investigations, it has to be on our Governmental Affairs Committee.

WILLIAMS: You think the public and the press will perceive that, as well?

SEN. GLENN: Well, I hope so. So far we've tried our level best to cooperate here, and they just won't give us what we need to do our side of this investigation. They want to keep it over on a one-sided Democratic "gotcha" basis.

WILLIAMS: You said earlier, you gave the reasons why Republicans would want to oppose campaign reform. You didn't say that the Democrats have a different feeling

about that. How do you characterize Democratic feelings toward campaign finance reform?

SEN. GLENN: We have a few people who aren't very hot for campaign finance reform, but, by and large, the bulk of Democrats are for it. Tom Daschle, reflecting the views of our caucus, tried his level best to get a date certain devoted on the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform legislation, which is the major bill that's before us now, and they wouldn't do it. I had that as one of my goals earlier. I talked about it almost every time I talked about campaign finance reform, but they won't even consider bringing that up. Our people generally want campaign finance reform; rein some of this stuff in.

WILLIAMS: How do you anesthetize yourself from—that's probably the wrong word, but protect yourself from the charge the only reason you want it is because you want government funding of elections?

SEN. GLENN: Well, no. The only reason I want government funding of elections is because I've watched this whole process for some twenty-two years now and it's gotten worse and worse and worse election by election. Nobody would have believed before the last election that the abuses of campaign finance fundraising, campaign finance, would have risen to the heights that they did, on the Democratic side, which has been well publicized, but also on the Republican side, where the soft money far outdid anything that the Democrats were bringing in. The original charges of illegalities, where the law was broken, were mainly down at the White House. Then we came across all this Haley Barber stuff and there are illegalities on the other side, as well. So, I'm all for bringing out all facets of this. I thought

this was the opportunity this year to lay out cold everything that there was to lay out about campaign finance reform.

WILLIAMS: Talk just a moment about soft money. It strikes me that that's always been a bit of a crock.

SEN. GLENN: Yes, it has, but in the past you could give soft money. The FEC made the ruling on this some years ago. Money could be given to the political parties and that could be used for party-building purposes, as they said, which means generic ads supporting Democratic values or Republican values or so and so, and you just put this out as an ad to build support for the party.

Now, what's happened, though, the soft money that was supposed to be used for generic things or for party-building just happened to get twisted around mightily in this last election and became seen as a way of getting a lot of money into local campaigns legally. Now, whether it was all legal or not is something else. That's the reason we need to get back to all the records of what happened.

You just happen to have—and I think both parties did this—but over on the Republican side, at least, you had generic ads, say, on tax cuts or abortion or something like that, that the Republican National Committee did. Then these just happened to be put on in congressional races where the issue was that particular issue, whatever it was, and they even would add the opponents. The person that you're supporting, you couldn't put that name in the ad itself, but you could say, "Look at your two candidates." Then you'd have a very tough abortion ad, say, that happened to go in favor of the Republican candidate and against the Democrat. Now, is that generic party-building? No. And that went on time after

time and it was the same ad. In many cases they've already pulled out, I think, thirty-some or forty-some congressional races where the ad was exactly the same ad put on by the RNC, but not put on all over the country at the same time. It was put on in specific congressional districts. Well, is that the proper use of soft money? No, it's not.

Then you have things like it's for party-building. Well, okay, but then the Republican National Committee will assign people to work in a certain campaign. Now, they're supposed to be out there working with the state for party-building purposes. What they're actually doing is working in a particular congressional district, working out of a state headquarters or something, but working for a particular candidate right there.

So there are all sorts of things like this where soft money has just become an abomination. Before, in previous campaigns it was onerous, but it was something that hadn't reached the point where it really was where people weren't really brought up to righteous wrath by what happened.

WILLIAMS: You stated that the Christian Coalition had been given immunity.

SEN. GLENN: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Explain what that means.

SEN. GLENN: If somebody in the Christian Coalition wanted to come forward and give us information about what happened there that would hurt their cause, they don't have immunity from that. But what I referred to before with immunity was just that our committee is refusing to give a subpoena, which, in effect, gives them immunity unless we get some other information somehow.

WILLIAMS: The last question I wanted to ask you. When you were talking earlier, you were using some handwritten notes. I was curious, were those notes that you used in the press conference?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, they are, and they're somewhat similar to what I used in our Democratic caucus the other day, too. I decided for the press conference I needed some notes to talk from, so I did. That's what the notes were, the same ones that I used when I was at the press conference the other day.

WILLIAMS: Then some of the other materials today have been the chronology from the committee and so forth, is that correct?

SEN. GLENN: That's just from the minority side, on Democratic side.

WILLIAMS: I've seen the verbs used—you've been "fuming," you've "thundered," you've called the Republicans "involved in a conspiracy," and so forth. How does it feel to be a heavyweight fighter these days?

SEN. GLENN: Well, I don't enjoy it. I don't like to make accusations on my fellow senators around here. I really don't, but I think we're being dealt with unfairly. When I feel that we're being dealt with that way and that our interests and the interests of the Democratic side are not being given proper consideration, then I get irritated and get a little more active. I'm sure that's going to continue. Maybe it will simmer down some once we get the hearings, I don't know. Maybe it will only get worse.

In hearings, we can, under our committee rules—if there's to be a hearing that only lasts for one day—we can demand that we have a witness, at least one witness, to bring out something we want to bring out. So we'll have that opportunity. Or if the hearing is to be a multiple-day hearing on a certain subject,

then we can ask for a day of hearings that we conduct. So we'll just have to play it by ear as to what we do in that regard.

Right now I've been mainly concerned with just getting the background information that we need, because if we wait until—let's say we're stiffed on this until after the August break, and then they say, "Okay, put out your subpoenas." Well, there we are in early September or mid-September putting out subpoenas. You have to give thirty days' response time, so you're talking about at least to mid-October. Then being able to take that material and try and work it into something that's presentable at a hearing that means anything and get it all done before the end of the year. So unless we get our subpoenas pretty quick, why, we won't be able to do much.

WILLIAMS: That's why I raised the question earlier, you were talking about 142 subpoenas and boxes and boxes of material and whatnot. It would seem to me you'd want to review that material before you hold a hearing.

SEN. GLENN: You have to. That's what you base your hearing on.

WILLIAMS: Exactly.

SEN. GLENN: Whatever point you're trying to make. We know what Haley Barber did now, because we've got all this. We've got a deposition from the lawyer that was involved with all of it, Richard Richards, who writes to them saying, "I want to summarize what happened in all this." He goes back and recounts the whole thing, right from the start, all the way through, bang, bang, bang, bang. And it's potent stuff. I'll tell you, his letter is—I don't think I have a copy of it right here. So we know what happened on that.

Do we want a day of hearings on that? You bet. In fact, I'll say this: what I've thought about at this point is since they're trying to delay things, if we could get our Haley Barber stuff and all that National Policy Forum, if we could get a good case together on that, I'd volunteer to put on the first set of hearings since they're not ready to go. That would create a little ruckus, I'm sure.

WILLIAMS: Shall we stop here?

SEN. GLENN: Might as well, yes—sort of run out of that subject.

WILLIAMS: Okay.

[End of interview]