

Y4
. Ar 5/2

1012

9374
Ar 5/2
C 56

056 ALLEGED PURCHASE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION BY
A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

GOVERNMENT
Storage

DOCUMENTS

MAY 29 1973

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARING
BEFORE THE
ARMED SERVICES INVESTIGATING
SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

UNDER AUTHORITY OF

H. Res. 185

HEARING HELD MARCH 27, 1973

KSU LIBRARIES

111900 473227



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1973

93-545

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Louisiana, *Chairman*

MELVIN PRICE, Illinois	WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana
O. C. FISHER, Texas	LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois
CHARLES E. BENNETT, Florida	BOB WILSON, California
SAMUELS S. STRATTON, New York	CHARLES S. GUBSER, California
OTIS G. PIKE, New York	CARLETON J. KING, New York
RICHARD H. ICHORD, Missouri	WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Alabama
LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Michigan	JOHN E. HUNT, New Jersey
WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Missouri	G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, Virginia
CHARLES H. WILSON, California	C. W. (BILL) YOUNG, Florida
ROBERT L. LEGGETT, California	FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina
FLOYD V. HICKS, Washington	WALTER E. POWELL, Ohio
RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas	ROBERT PRICE, Texas
BILL NICHOLS, Alabama	DAVID C. TREEN, Louisiana
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia	WALTER L. ARMSTRONG, Colorado
ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia	GEORGE M. O'BRIEN, Illinois
DAN DANIEL, Virginia	ROBIN L. BEARD, Tennessee
G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi	DONALD J. MITCHELL, New York
HAROLD RUNNELS, New Mexico	MARJORIE S. HOLT, Maryland
LES ASPIN, Wisconsin	ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Virginia
RONALD V. DELLUMS, California	
MENDEL J. DAVIS, South Carolina	
JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma	
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado	

ARMED SERVICES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Louisiana, *Chairman*

SAMUELS S. STRATTON, New York	LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois
OTIS G. PIKE, New York	CHARLES S. GUBSER, California
WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Missouri	WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Alabama
ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia	JOHN E. HUNT, New Jersey
DAN DANIEL, Virginia	

JOHN T. M. REDDAN, *Counsel*

JOHN F. LALLY, *Assistant Counsel*

RICHARD A. RANSOM, *Professional Staff Member*

(II)

CONTENTS

Statements or testimony of—	Page
Hébert, Hon. F. Edward, Chairman.....	1
Runnels, Hon. Harold, Member of Congress.....	2
Kantor, Seth, reporter, The Detroit News.....	21
Poorman, Paul, managing editor, The Detroit News.....	43
Lally, John F., assistant counsel, Armed Services Investigating Sub- committee.....	52

ALLEGED PURCHASE OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION BY A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
ARMED SERVICES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:00 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, the Hon. F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Members present: Hon. F. Edward Hébert, Hon. Samuel S. Stratton, Hon. Otis G. Pike, Hon. William J. Randall, Hon. Robert H. Mollohan, Hon. Dan Daniel, Hon. William G. Bray, Hon. Leslie C. Arends, Hon. Charles S. Gubser, Hon. William L. Dickinson and Hon. John E. Hunt.

Staff present: John T. M. Reddan, counsel, John F. Lally, assistant counsel, and Richard A. Ransom, professional staff member.

Mr. HÉBERT. The committee will be in order.

Members of the committee: On Sunday, February 25th, there appeared in the Detroit News a story headlined, "Congressman says he bought secret Pentagon documents."

The story, under the by-line of Mr. Seth Kantor of the News Washington Bureau, alleged, among other things, that Congressman Harold Runnels, in a series of private interviews, told the Detroit News that he had purchased classified documents last summer from three unidentified men; that the trio had indicated to Congressman Runnels that they were able to reach into highly placed areas of the Pentagon to provide him with sensitive information; that their price was \$1,000 in cash for any subject; and that the Congressman had made two purchases from them. The story further alleges that Congressman Runnels told the News that he stopped buying last fall when the trio raised their fee to \$3,000 and \$3,500 per set of secrets.

On Tuesday, February, 27th, I received the following letter from Congressman Runnels:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of an article that was given considerable coverage by the national news media this past weekend, I feel it imperative that I give you and my fellow members of the House Armed Services Committee an opportunity to look at all the facts.

I can assure you that I have not at any time bought any classified material from any source. The material I did purchase was strictly of a research nature and the reporter who wrote the story had no facts on which to base his allegations.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am requesting that the House Armed Services Committee conduct a full investigation of the entire matter.

Yours very truly,

(S) HAROLD RUNNELS,
Member of Congress.

The Investigating Subcommittee staff has now completed its inquiry into this matter and this subcommittee is prepared to take the testimony of witnesses.

I am acutely aware of the fact that there is obviously a direct conflict between Congressman Runnels and the Detroit News regarding statements allegedly made by Congressman Runnels to Mr. Seth Kantor, a reporter for the Detroit News.

However, whether Mr. Runnels or Mr. Kantor have stretched the truth is essentially a private matter between them. What is of paramount and primary concern to this committee is the question involving national security—that is, have classified documents or materials extracted from classified documents been the subject of sale to the Congressman?

I further recognize that an examination of all the pertinent facts relating to the national security aspects of this case will inevitably involve discussion of the private aspects that I have previously noted. Nonetheless, in the interest of time, I trust that the members will attempt to direct, to the maximum extent possible, their questions to the area of our primary concern, which is national security.

Do any members have any questions?

[No response.]

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Runnels, I understand you have a prepared statement, and the members have been given that statement previously.

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Runnels, you are familiar with the committee's operation. Will you continue, without interruption by members, after which each member will be given ten minutes to interrogate, if he so desires.

Mr. RUNNELS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD RUNNELS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, since February 25th, when a certain article appeared in the Detroit News and most other newspapers and media in the United States, I have had the most frustrating period in my political career.

I asked for this investigation, but I must say the whole thing looks ridiculous—and I was there. With each question the investigators asked, I found myself wondering why I did certain things, where certain conversations went haywire and how I could establish any credibility at all. I am faced with the printer's ink on one side—and I notice there are quite a few media people here in the room today—and on the other side, an almost total absence of fact that can be demonstrated to erase all doubts as to just what did happen.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am going to present my side of the story now, and if there are conflicts that arise after testimony of others, I would appreciate an opportunity to comment later, on the major differences that may arise.

I would like to begin by stating here and now that there was never any information of a classified military nature, either spoken or written, which was involved in the circumstances under examination. Like every Congressman, I have a great deal of interest in defense problems. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I govern

myself accordingly. I have automatic access to most items of a classified nature through the committee. There is no need to seek outside sources for items of that nature.

If there is anyone who wants to prove the contrary, ask them to present the proof. As far as I am concerned, I have nothing to hide and have done nothing wrong.

When I read the article under the by-line of Seth Kantor, it was quite a surprise and shock to me. I have known Mr. Kantor ever since I came to Washington and have had many contacts with him. When he told me in June he would be leaving the two papers that he was writing for that had circulation in my district, our association continued, even after he joined the *Detroit News*. We have had conversations frequently in the halls of the Capitol, at social events, and in my own office.

Last year, Mr. Kantor and I had several conversations concerning cost overruns in the Department of Defense; what could be done about it, and how effective I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, could be in helping to resolve the problem. I mentioned to Mr. Kantor that the problems are so complex and widely ranged that no one could possibly be effective without help. To digress for a moment, there just aren't that many hours in the day to keep up with all, or in some cases, the little problems that arise daily in the DOD, and to get a handle on items of personal interest, much research is needed.

Mr. Kantor asked me why I would make a statement like that. I told him that in my case I did not have the staff to research and deal with the military aspects of my job. He asked why I didn't have the staff I wanted, and I assured him I was proud of my staff and they were a dedicated, hard-working, conscientious group of people. I told him I was not complaining, but every Congressman was working with the same set of rules and tools, but in my opinion, congressional districts make quite a difference on how each Congressman believes how they should and could serve their people the best.

I told him my district covers nearly 85,000 square miles, with three distinct cultures—Indian, Spanish, and Anglo. Therefore, I maintained three district offices with six staff members in my district. I told him, in case he did not know, that the Navajos do not really have a written language per se and only about 5 percent could write in Navajo. Therefore, we did a lot of personal work in my district and it left me short in my Washington office to do the indepth research I wanted done. I further explained that the committee has a staff that is very knowledgeable on military affairs, but I, as well as all the other members of the committee, are well aware of the fact that the nine staff members could not possibly satisfy the needs of every member if they all descended on them at hearing time. I know that the staff has all it can handle to keep up with the flow of documents and testimony from the Department of Defense.

I told Mr. Kantor, therefore, that I had gone through a series of young, bright men who were put on my payroll to perform research chores for me. It has not worked out because, in the first place, the preponderance of the data needed for research is inside the Department of Defense and staffs of Congressmen do not have ready access to that data for one reason or the other. I'm not talking about the classified secrets; I'm talking about cost; how the programs are

proceeding and the reasons for overruns. We read about these items in the papers continuously. I feel there must be some way to stop the unnecessary part of the spending before it starts.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I have added some of my concerns in my printed statement. I won't go into these because I don't want anything to distract from the real business here today. Nonetheless, these concerns were part of the reasoning for seeking additional help.

Mr. Chairman, I will now pass over to page five in my testimony, and start with the next-to-the-last paragraph.

I informed Mr. Kantor last May or June that I was having some research performed for me on certain military procurements.

Mr. REDDAN. Excuse me, Mr. Runnels.

When you tell the committee of your conversations, would you, if you can, give us the approximate date or time sequence, where the conversations took place, and who, if anyone, was present?

Mr. RUNNELS. Do you mean starting from this place on?

Mr. REDDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUNNELS. Thank you, Mr. Reddan.

As I say in this paragraph, I informed Mr. Kantor last May or June—Why I say "May or June," Mr. Chairman, is because that was when I was having the research performed. Our conversation, to the best of my ability, I feel sure, was over in the Capitol Building, and I would think that it was either in the dining room or outside of the House Chambers.

But I told him that I was having research performed for me on certain military procurements. The programs involved the Cheyenne helicopter and the MBT 70. Both programs ran into trouble and at the time my interest began, these programs were discussed widely in Congress.

Of further interest was the fact that when everyone thinks a program is dead, it always seems to hang on and pop up in the budget again, under another name or the very same name. Funds are cut in the programs to keep them on the back burner and all of a sudden a preproduction prototype rolls out of the plant and a contract is being negotiated for production.

I told Mr. Kantor that the research I had asked for was being performed by persons outside my office payroll. As limited conversations went on periodically with Mr. Kantor—and this, I would say was from May, June, July, and I can give other dates, Mr. Chairman, as to when I was here and when I was not here.

Mr. HÉBERT. Just in the area.

Mr. RUNNELS. All right, sir.

As limited conversations went on periodically with Mr. Kantor, he said he had an interest in the research and the men who were performing it. He asked questions about the price and what it was I was buying, and I told him.

My arrangement was made with a Mr. Walter Snyder and Mr. Ben Thomas. They visited my office in early spring last year.

Mr. Chairman, to the best of my recollection, they first had called me in April of 1972. They did the work in May and June of 1972.

They visited my office in early spring last year and asked me if I had any need for research, and I told them I did. They seemed to know enough about me to know that I was interested in cost overruns. I indicated my interest in military procurement overruns and certain

programs, such as the C-5A, F-111, the Cheyenne, and the MBT 70, and others. They talked a good game and said they had done work for some other Congressmen—and I took them up on their offer to help. Since I had already reached the limit on my congressional office payroll, I agreed to pay them out of my own pocket. It was agreed that they would have to do the research without occupying any of my office space because I hardly had room for the staff that I already had, and have now, I might add.

I had several meetings with Snyder and Thomas between April and about the end of June. I was provided papers which appeared to be representative of quite a bit of research. The quality, however, was so-so, but was accurate because they were dealing in facts on something that had already happened. I could see that part of it was a good summary of what was going on on the Hill, in DOD, and how the weapons fit in with all of the other similar type weapons, and as a part of the total inventory of weapons. There was nothing, insofar as I could determine, that was of a classified nature. I felt, and I believe now, that it was a product of good, diligent research and that so-called "secrets" inside the Pentagon was not a necessary factor in the presentation of the papers.

I received the material in a series of papers. On delivery I paid them cash that I had on me at the time. The payments were based on the progress I felt was accomplished.

So that you will understand, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to explain to you my office arrangement. By doing so, you can get a better picture of how it is easy for people to come and go out of my office, why I have only one door, and why everyone must enter and exit by the same door. If I kept my door locked, it would mean I would have to get up and let them in every time somebody knocked.

My office is made up of two large rooms and one small room. My staff is in room 1728 and the annex that would normally be for a Congressman. These two rooms connect and have two doors leading to the hall. My office is next door and is room No. 1727. It has only one door and is not connected to my other two offices. It is approximately 50 feet from the door of my reception area to the door of my office.

The project on the Cheyenne was interesting, but again, so-so, even if it was accurate information. I knew I was hooked on the MBT 70, which was the second project we discussed, and I went along with what had already been agreed to. At the end of June, when it had all been accomplished, it was suggested by Snyder that further research might be more productive but it would cost more, and the price went up to \$3,500. I figured it was not worth it and said, "No." They left their telephone number and we parted company. At Mr. Kantor's persistence I told him all of this and he seemed very interested in seeking out these individuals. Nothing really happened at the time.

I came back to Washington on January 2, 1973. Some time after that, in January, Mr. Kantor contacted me again on the same matter. He said he needed some research done and wanted to be put in contact with the two men who had done the research for me. As I recall, the subject of classified data did come up by him, but to me it was only of passing interest. I am concerned with the handling of so-called

classified information, so carefully guarded, and we are all reminded about the need to be mum about such matters by the Chairman. I have been in hearings one day when classified matters were under discussion, then have gone out and bought the noon paper and the very thing that was classified inside the hearing room was on the front page. In this kind of atmosphere, I believe anyone can be befuddled as to what is and what isn't classified, and a good researcher can find almost anything he wants if he digs hard enough through material that is generally available. This is particularly true on the subject of cost overruns.

Anyway, it's apparent from the article Mr. Kantor wrote that he believed I had bought classified information—the kind you can't get by digging through available materials. At one meeting with Mr. Kantor he told me he had proof that someone was peddling classified data on the Hill, and he was persistent in his delving into my affairs to see if I was a party to such transactions. I was concerned, and figured I had better reread the research I had purchased. Well, I couldn't find it. The only thing I can figure is that it had either been misfiled or thrown out. I kept the research material on the table in my office.

My records show that Congress was in session on 46 days between the end of June and the November elections. I was present and voting on 37 of those days. The rest of the time I was back in my district in New Mexico. I might add that 37 of the 46 is an 80.4 percent voting record during that time.

The research material was typed on plain bond paper. There wasn't even a letterhead on the top page. It probably lay on the table for months until either I, or one of my staff, took it into one of our other offices. What happened at that point is anybody's guess. It was probably thrown out, since it was obsolete.

The next thing I did concerns a telephone number Snyder and Thomas left me. Mr. Kantor was so anxious to contact these individuals that I tried to call them in February some time. I was informed by a recording that the number was no longer a working number. There was no other way to contact them, and I told Mr. Kantor so. As far as I was concerned, the matter was closed. The telephone number was a dud, and I just threw it in the trash.

The next thing that happened was that Mr. Kantor told me he was going to write an article on the transaction I had with the two unidentified individuals. I guess he was not aware of their names, because I had not given them to him. At that point, I wouldn't give them to him in view of his comments about such an article. Anyway, I couldn't find them.

Mr. Kantor's boss, Mr. Poorman, also called me about the story, and I told him that I had bought research information—that it seemed pretty accurate and to the point, and that their observations were fair. The conversation included comments relative to the access of classified material, and I told him I had access to it, but if he thought I was talking about the research matter, that was his mistaken impression. I told him I had no objections to the article, if that was what they wanted to print. It was their story and their newspaper—not mine. I was not told by either one what was in the article. The first time I saw it, it was in print.

I will conclude my statement, Mr. Chairman, with a comment that I asked for this investigation, and have done my best to assist

the investigative staff in every way, and they have done a thorough job as far as I am concerned.

Unfortunately, the only two items that may have cleared the air have been chucked away somewhere, and I am at a great disadvantage. I have had my staff turn my office upside down to find a documented clue to support my position. I am not aware of the full results of this investigation or what has been said on the other side. If there is proof that classified documents are being sold on the Hill, as Mr. Kantor indicated to me, I want to know it, as I'm sure other members of the committee do.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state again that I have not at any time purchased classified information, and I have never indicated to Mr. Kantor or anyone else that I have done so.

For additional information, I would also like to give you these points to consider:

1. If I had been doing anything wrong, common sense says I would not have been discussing it with a newspaper reporter.

2. Had I been approached to purchase unauthorized material, I would have reported it to the Department of Justice. I know right from wrong.

3. Had Mr. Kantor asked me to show him the material, which he never did, I feel sure I would have let him read it.

4. Mr. Kantor or Mr. Poorman never told me or showed me a copy of what was going to be in their story.

5. Why, and for what reason, would I have to buy classified information, when all I would have to do is ask for it, if I had a need for it?

6. After having suffered a severe heart attack in May 1971, and stayed in intensive care at Bethesda for 21 days, I don't think I would participate in a cloak and dagger operation, as described by Mr. Kantor. I do not need the excitement, nor the tension that would go with a situation of this kind.

7. The reason this entire matter came up was due to one of my first conversations with Mr. Kantor after he changed jobs. He said he would be doing indepth stories and wanted to know if I had any leads or ideas. I was trying to help him and made mention of the two men I had doing research for me on defense contracts.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that I have not at any time purchased classified information, and I have never indicated to Mr. Kantor or to anyone else that I have done so.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I have taken up a lot of time, and that I have rambled a great deal, but, to the best of my recollection, this is the true story.

If you have any questions now, or later, I will be glad to answer them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Runnels.

For the sake of expediting this hearing, I think that it is best if counsel, who is familiar with the whole investigative procedure, would please ask his questions, and the members ask theirs afterward.

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Runnels, I just have one or two questions at this time.

Was there anyone present at any time during any of your conversations with Mr. Kantor?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Reddan, to the best of my knowledge, there never was anyone present. There could have been, maybe at one time

one of my staff members, who had walked in and brought some mail for me to sign while Mr. Kantor was in my office.

Mr. REDDAN. Who might that have been, sir, do you know?

Mr. RUNNELS. My administrative aide, Mr. Dick Hapke.

Mr. REDDAN. In your statement on page 7 you state: "As I recall, the subject of classified data did come up by him, but to me it was only of passing interest."

Could you explain that just a little more fully, please, sir?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir. This was after—and I know that there is a bone of contention from reading, Mr. Reddan, the articles that have been printed, not just the first one but others. I will have to go back in time. I have already stated that the work went on in May and June of 1972.

If my memory serves me correctly, I knew of Mr. Kantor's change in jobs back in June. Now when his bosses, or when the Detroit News and he made the deal, I don't know. I just know that in June was when he first told me that he would be leaving the newspaper. That, I say, the subject was mentioned by him, and this was, if you will note, after the January starting of the new Congress, so it had been to me from May and June of 1972, until January before any conversations really got in depth, and I think it was mentioned by him that he knew that certain people were handling classified information on the Hill.

Mr. REDDAN. Did he identify any of these individuals at that time?

Mr. RUNNELS. To the best of my knowledge, I think he either insinuated or thought that the two young men who had done the research for me may have been involved in selling maybe to others. I don't know, but I know they had not sold any to me.

Mr. REDDAN. Did he indicate to you that he knew who the two individuals were?

Mr. RUNNELS. By his conversation, when he was positive that he knew that it was going on, and for the insinuation that the men that I had had the research work done by were in on it, I would have to assume that he knew who they were. But then, when he asked me for their names, it did not fit the story.

Mr. REDDAN. When was the first time he asked you for their names?

Mr. RUNNELS. I would say it was either in January or February. He never asked for their names in 1972, and probably if he had asked me back then, I possibly would have given them to him.

Mr. REDDAN. Had you tried to set up any appointment for Mr. Kantor with these two individuals prior to January?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. REDDAN. Do you know how these two men happened to come to you, sir?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Reddan, I had had a stream of people come through my office prior to this, and during this time. I have been one who believes in doing his homework. I might as well be honest with you and the committee. This is not the first time I have paid personally to have research done for me. It was the only time that I had paid to have research from military projects, but 10 years in the State Senate, I have paid people on a State level, and I have paid people since I have been here in Washington to do research for me.

As this thing has unraveled, I did have a young man on my staff, who was doing research for me, and he—

Mr. REDDAN. Could you identify him, for the record, please, sir?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Dave Hennessee.

Mr. REDDAN. He's no longer with you?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. He worked for me from December 1971 until March 1 or March 15 of 1972.

Mr. REDDAN. And you say he did research for you?

Mr. RUNNELS. He did research. Also, he had other people that he was asking to help him and to help me in doing research.

Mr. REDDAN. You state on page 6, referring to Walter Snyder and Ben Thomas: "They talked a good game and said they had done work for other Congressmen."

Did they tell you for whom they had done work?

Mr. RUNNELS. They did not tell me, sir, nor did I ask them.

Let me declare that I may be a little loose in my operations. But I have to go back, that there have been some people in my life who have given me a chance, and I guess I have a lot of faith and trust in young people, and I believe, if you can check all of the members of my staff, I do it on a personal interview basis, and not go in for all of the references, and so forth.

Mr. REDDAN. Did they give you any indication of their background?

Mr. RUNNELS. They had indicated to me that they had done research and they had done legislative work and knew how to dig into the facts of a research matter.

Mr. REDDAN. Did they tell you anything of their previous employment? In other words, I'm trying to find out what sort of references, if any, they may have given you, sir.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Reddan, as I stated, I did not ask them for any references, and, as I have stated, with the rest of the members of my staff, I have never asked them for references, because I talk to them, ask them questions, and make up my own mind, rather than what somebody else had to say about them.

Mr. REDDAN. Did they give you any office address?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. REDDAN. The only thing they gave you was a telephone number, as I understand, and that was some time in June?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. The first contact was in April.

Mr. REDDAN. I mean when they gave you the telephone number.

Mr. RUNNELS. They gave me the telephone number in June of 1972.

Mr. REDDAN. Did they ask to be paid in cash, sir?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I have established—and since all of this has come out, I am sure I will change my habits—but, never once in the House restaurant have I ever signed a ticket. Those that eat with me every day know that I pay cash. It's probably a situation where from now on I may go to checks. But they didn't ask. That's just the way I paid them.

Mr. REDDAN. As I understand from your statement, sir, you and your staff have made a thorough search of your office for the material that Snyder and Thomas supplied you, but you have not been able to find it. Is that right, sir?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Reddan we have turned my office, the other offices, our file cabinets, upside down.

Now, if I could, for you and the members of the committee. I have a table that sets off to my left in my office, and if it was of such a confidential nature, I don't believe I would have left it on the top of the table from May and June up to the time I started looking for it in late January, or February.

Mr. REDDAN. Have you made any effort to find Snyder and Thomas since this matter arose?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir; I certainly have, with no success. I kept praying to the good Lord that they would show up, even today, but I have not been able to find them, and I think the staff has looked for them.

Mr. REDDAN. Is Mr. Walter Snyder or Mr. Ben Thomas in the room this morning?

Let the record show that no one by those names indicated they were here this morning.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Stratton.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Runnels, how long have you known Mr. Kantor?

Mr. RUNNELS. I would say I definitely have known him since I've been a Member of Congress, which was January 1971. I knew who he was prior to that.

Mr. STRATTON. I take it that, in view of the conversations you had with him, you were on a pretty friendly, personal basis with him. Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Stratton, I think that I am on a personal basis with a lot of people. Naturally, for a man who is writing articles for newspapers that were circulating in my district, I would have reason to be in his presence.

Just so I can expand on that, I was invited, along with other Congressmen from New Mexico, to have dinner at his house one night, when he had the editors, some Scripps-Howard people whom he was working for. We attended a luncheon, or a dinner deal, at his house, and the other Congressman and I went to another reporter's house, who is Mr. Paul Wieck, who had his editors in, and we went to his house that night.

Mr. STRATTON. When did he inform you that he was leaving—I think it's the El Paso paper that he used to write for—and going to the Detroit News?

Mr. RUNNELS. I would say it was some time in June, and I can establish a date that I know others can establish, on June 17.

Mr. STRATTON. As I understand it, you discussed with him this matter of getting research material that you referred to after he left your area, when he was writing for the Detroit News. I think, according to his story, the conversations were in September and October, and then again in January and February of this year. Is that pretty much correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. My recollection is that it went on in May and June, and then resumed in January of 1973.

Mr. STRATTON. In other words, your recollection is that you did not discuss this subject after he left the paper that serves your congressional district?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Stratton, I have given the dates of how many days that Congress was in session, but I will pull on my memory. I said that from June 1 until the end of the November elections, that

Congress was only in session, I believe, 42 or 47 days. I had a June primary in New Mexico, and I believe the record will show that I left early and was not even here during most of October, November, and December.

Mr. STRATTON. I'm just trying to establish whether you discussed this matter with him—I gather you did—on a personal basis.

You realize, do you not, that when you talk to a newspaperman that what you say is likely to get into the papers?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is why I say if I had been doing anything wrong, Mr. Stratton, I would not have told a newspaper reporter the activities, if there was anything classified about it.

Mr. STRATTON. Did he write any stories after you started talking to him in May or June with respect to your efforts, or were these conversations on a kind of personal, friendly basis, sort of background information between two friends on some of the problems that you run into on Capitol Hill?

Mr. RUNNELS. It was, up until about 3 or 4 days before he wrote this article. He had never published anything on it whatsoever from May or June, from then until February 25.

Mr. STRATTON. I mean you regarded him, as I take it, in these discussions, as a friend, and you were discussing some of the problems on Capitol Hill?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. You didn't expect that he was going to write a story on the basis of that. Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, and particularly not say that I said it.

Mr. STRATTON. If I understand your statement, you were trying to get research material that would be helpful to you in giving you some of the inner workings of the Pentagon, something that would be helpful to you on the committee, and something that you couldn't just pick up out of a paper, or from the Library of Congress, or something of that kind? Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, Mr. Stratton.

Mr. STRATTON. If that kind of information is going to be available, that would have to be information that had some kind of inside reference to what was going on in the Pentagon, would it not?

Mr. RUNNELS. Naturally, since all of this has come up, I will say that all of these papers right here (indicating papers on witness table) are either in the Congressional Record or the Library of Congress, and every bit of it is on the Cheyenne and the MBT-70, and I don't think there's anything classified in any of it.

Mr. STRATTON. You said that you never mentioned to Mr. Kantor that you were buying classified information, but is it not likely, in these informal discussions that you were having, that he might have gotten the impression that you were buying classified information because, presumably, this was something that was going to be a notch or two above the kind of thing you could get elsewhere?

Mr. RUNNELS. He must have assumed that; yes, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. I'm a little disturbed that you would have paid—what was it, \$3,500?—for something on the MBT-70 because—

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. That's not correct. I paid \$1,000 for the research on the Cheyenne and I paid \$1,000 for the research on the MBT-70. But I made the deals both at the same time.

Mr. STRATTON. As I say, I'm a little disturbed, because both Mr. Reddan and I regard ourselves as experts on that particular system, and I'm sorry you didn't come to me first.

Mr. RUNNELS. I'll be happy to next time. What is your fee?

Mr. STRATTON. We would have done it for nothing.

You said that you paid by cash. This was not because the individuals who were getting you the information requested it, but because that was your normal way of paying?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Stratton, I have told the investigative staff, and I think they have done a thorough job, the fact that they first wanted to be put on my payroll. Now, I would assume when a person tells me that they want on my payroll, first, that they have given me their right name. I assume, secondly, that they would have a social security number to match the name which they had given me.

I—and you can check the record—I bump the peak every month on my payroll in my congressional office, and I did not have the slot or the money. This was mine.

Mr. STRATTON. Why didn't you pay them by check?

Mr. RUNNELS. As I said, I have established a habit over the years. On the first of the month I write a check for what I think I will be spending during the month. But, as I said, after this it will certainly change.

Mr. STRATTON. Was there anything particularly surreptitious about this operation? I think Mr. Kantor's article says that these people slipped some of the information under your door in the Longworth Building at night. Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Stratton, one time, yes; the papers were put under my door, but that was because they had hand delivered the other set of papers.

I have already established, I think, that once I come to my office, I unlock my door, and it's unlocked until I leave, and I had told them that if at any time they wanted to bring the research to my office and I was not there that they could feel free, if the door was unlocked, to put it on my desk; if the door was locked because I hadn't been there, they could slip it under the door. I think even the Investigating Subcommittee has checked to make sure that things can be slipped under my door.

Mr. STRATTON. But there was nothing, other than that suggestion, that indicated these individuals didn't want to be identified, or didn't want to appear in the presence of other individuals?

Mr. RUNNELS. They met every time, except that one, in my office; and certainly it's open to the public, and I don't see anything about hiding in my own congressional office. They had to come and go.

Mr. STRATTON. Did you testify that there was nobody present when they were present?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Arends.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Runnels, what was the largest amount you ever paid them at one time?

Mr. RUNNELS. \$500.

Mr. PIKE. Is it your custom to have that much cash on hand?

Mr. RUNNELS. It was up until February 25th, yes, sir.

Mr. PIKE. It would seem to me that these payments which took place—Were they in June?

Mr. RUNNELS. May and June.

Mr. PIKE. May and June, for research, would be a legitimate income tax deduction.

Did you keep any records, or books, on which you entered this payment of \$500?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir, I knew how I had paid them.

Mr. PIKE. Yes, but did you keep any records or books?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. PIKE. You haven't anything of your own for income tax purposes to show the expenditure of this \$2,000 for research?

Mr. RUNNELS. I have my own memory as to how I paid it. As far as wanting to take it off my income tax, that was not my object, nor will I take it off my income tax. And I have discussed it with the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. PIKE. Did they tell you it could not be taken off your income tax?

Mr. RUNNELS. They said they would check into it, but they felt sure I could not deduct it because I paid for it in cash.

Mr. PIKE. Was the reason that it could not be deducted not that it would not be a legitimate expense if you had paid for it by check? Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct. If I had paid for it by check it would have been a legitimate deduction.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Runnels, when you contacted these people, how often did you ever try to telephone?

Mr. RUNNELS. I only tried once, sir. They would call me.

I know that you are referring to the private number deal that was in the article. I even gave Mr. Kantor my private number because if I'm not in my office nobody's going to answer it, and they called me, rather than my calling them.

Mr. PIKE. And you only tried to call them that one time?

Mr. RUNNELS. That's right, sir.

Mr. PIKE. On that day when the answering service told you that the number had been disconnected, did you throw away the phone number, or did you throw it away subsequently?

Mr. RUNNELS. It was not the answering service. I assume that it was a telephone recording.

Mr. PIKE. The telephone company? You got a recording?

Mr. RUNNELS. That's right, and they said, "The number you have called is no longer a working number. Please check * * *." At that time I chucked it in the trash. If it had been disconnected, I had no further need for it, because I hadn't had any contact with them in 6 months.

Mr. PIKE. What was the approximate date of that phone call?

Mr. RUNNELS. I would say some time in February.

Mr. PIKE. Was it prior to, or after, your discussion with Mr.—I think the name was Poorman—Mr. Kantor's editor? Was it before that discussion, or after?

Mr. RUNNELS. It was prior to that discussion, because Mr. Kantor reiterated that he wanted to get in touch with these young men to do some work for him.

Mr. PIKE. And when he said that to you, you told him you were no longer able to provide him with the right phone number?

Mr. RUNNELS. When he asked me if I would contact them, I told him that I would, and I tried to contact them by the phone number they had left. When I found the phone number was disconnected, I threw it in the trash. The next time I saw him I told him that the number had been disconnected and I could not contact them.

Mr. PIKE. Did he ask you for their number at any time?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. He eventually asked me for their names in either late January or February, but up until then he had not asked their names.

Mr. PIKE. What was the reason that you did not give him their names?

Mr. RUNNELS. Like I said, if he had asked back in May or June, and, of course, we were out in July, if he had asked back then, I possibly would have let him have the names and see the material, but he never asked for the names, nor did he ask to see the material.

Then when I came back in January, his interest had seemed to really get all riled up over these two gentlemen and others, and that was when he wanted to know their names. But, due to his conversation, by the insinuation he knew them, and then wanted me to identify them, I felt in my own mind he did not know the two gentlemen who had done the research for me.

Mr. PIKE. So it was after you knew of Mr. Kantor's great interest in contacting these people, but before you talked to Mr. Poorman, that you threw away the phone number?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. PIKE. That's all I have. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Gubser.

Mr. GUBSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Runnels, you have been quite emphatic in your statement that, in your opinion, none of these research materials were of a classified nature.

Do you recall ever specifically stating to Mr. Kantor that, in your opinion, these items were not of a classified nature?

Mr. RUNNELS. You say did I say that they were not?

Mr. GUBSER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUNNELS. I feel sure that I did, sir.

Mr. GUBSER. I'm trying to develop a rationale for what happened.

Is it possible that since the nature of your dealings with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Snyder, were, or on the surface seemed to be, clandestine, because it was outside your office payroll, and the meetings were in secret, that Mr. Kantor might have assumed that this was classified material, because of the manner in which the transaction took place?

Mr. RUNNELS. He could assume that, yes, Mr. Gubser, but it would have been his assuming it and not my telling him.

Mr. GUBSER. Your recollection then is that at no time did you represent them to Mr. Kantor as classified, and you probably specifically told him that they were not classified?

Mr. RUNNELS. I possibly did, and of the nature. I told him of the research. I told him the amounts. I had nothing to hide about that. I wasn't ashamed that I had paid for it out of my own pocket, because I have done others the same way.

Mr. GUBSER. As the Chairman stated in his opening statement, your personal financial transactions with two individuals and your hiring them for research work is strictly a personal matter, and it really is of no concern to this committee. As the Chairman stated, our concern is, was classified information being sold?

Mr. RUNNELS. That's right.

Mr. GUBSER. Thank you very much. I have nothing further

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Randall.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have very many questions for Mr. Runnels. I would have more for Mr. Kantor. But it seems to me we should attempt to establish the course of your discussions, or conversations, with Mr. Kantor.

How long have you known Mr. Kantor?

Mr. RUNNELS. I would say again, I have known him personally since January 1971. I knew of him prior to that time.

Mr. RANDALL. I have had an opportunity to read over your prepared statement earlier. You regard him as your friend, is that right?

Mr. RUNNELS. Well, I thought he was, yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. And I think you said you've had lunch with him on some occasions?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. You've talked with him frequently? How many times did you have these conversations with him?

Mr. RUNNELS. Are you going back to 1971, January? I would just guess 20 or 30.

Mr. RANDALL. 20 or 30 times.

For the benefit of the record, it's my understanding that he had come from the southwest. Did you know him down there?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. You didn't know him down there?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. I see. But in your conversations, is it possible—I'm not trying to put words in your mouth—but just tell us, were you close enough to him that you joked and kidded about this thing in any way, or was all your conversation serious?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Randall, I joke and kid quite a bit, but I am serious, and I never joked or kidded, I think, about any of the stories that he has written, and he has written numerous stories over the period of 2 years, plus.

Mr. RANDALL. Then are you saying to the committee that you regarded anything that you said to him as available for the ears of anyone, is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, sir. I didn't have anything to hide. As I stated earlier, if I was doing anything wrong, or if this material was wrong, I certainly would not have told him, or anybody else, other than go to the Department of Justice. I would have gone there probably.

Mr. RANDALL. Some of the times at least that you met with Mr. Kantor it was right outside or in the House restaurant, or wherever it was that you met. There were no secret meetings of any kind, as far as that's concerned. The meetings that you had, the conversations that you had with Mr. Kantor, were either in your office or somewhere on the Hill here, open, where anyone could see you together?

Mr. RUNNELS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you very much.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have just a few questions, if I may, Mr. Runnels.

You were asked, but I don't remember if you replied, so I will ask again: How did Mr. Snyder and Mr. Thomas happen to come to you?

Mr. RUNNELS. They called me on the telephone.

Mr. DICKINSON. I know, but were they referred? Did they say someone had referred them?

Mr. RUNNELS. They said they were referred to me by a friend.

Mr. DICKINSON. You didn't ask them to identify the friend, and they didn't identify the friend?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. Did you at any time inquire into what type of business they might be in?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Did they have a business name, or anything of that nature?

Mr. RUNNELS. They said they were doing independent research, indepth studies.

Mr. DICKINSON. They evidently indicated that they had some access to Pentagon information.

Did they have a business name? Did they ever present a business card, or tell you under what name they were doing business, or if, in fact, they were doing business?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. I don't think they were doing business as a company. I think they were just two individuals, and I think there are a lot of individuals who do independent research.

Mr. DICKINSON. Did they indicate to you that they had some access to information from the Pentagon that was not normally accessible to the public or to a Member of Congress?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. You indicated that you paid them in cash, sums which, to me, would be rather large sums, and that you had done this also with others.

Just for the record, could you tell us who else you might have paid cash out of your pocket to do research for you?

Mr. RUNNELS. Here on the Hill, or in New Mexico?

Mr. DICKINSON. On the Hill, in connection with your business.

Mr. RUNNELS. I paid Miss Penny Kirk.

Mr. DICKINSON. She was not on your payroll, or staff?

Mr. RUNNELS. She is now, but she did research over in the Library of Congress for about 2½ months prior to coming into my office, and, in fact, there was another reporter, who I knew back then, and this was a year ago approximately, that I had someone over in the Library of Congress that was not in my office, and they inquired about that.

Mr. DICKINSON. I'm trying to establish for the record that this was your normal way of doing business. This was not unusual, that you did this on a personal basis. I wish you would furnish some names for us.

Mr. RUNNELS. Penny Kirk, Michael Runnels, Peggy Wood, and then I had three young men that I did put on my congressional staff.

Mr. DICKINSON. Miss Kirk, Mike Runnels, and Peggy Wood were all paid out of your pocket, in cash money, to do research for you here on the Hill?

Mr. RUNNELS. I feel sure that all of them were cash, yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. Approximately how much money are we talking about? \$100, \$200, \$500?

Mr. RUNNELS. Oh, no. Per person, I think, I paid Miss Kirk approximately \$1,000 for 2½ months. I paid Miss Wood maybe \$500 or \$600. I would say that I paid Michael Runnels, over a longer period, approximately \$3,000.

Mr. DICKINSON. As a man with substantial business interests, haven't you ever charged off any of these as business expenses?

Mr. RUNNELS. No; I figure once I earn my money and pay my taxes, it's mine to do what I want to do with it.

Mr. DICKINSON. That's true, if you don't want to deduct it. If it were mine, I'd want to deduct it.

Mr. RUNNELS. When you get to a certain point, you don't get much deduction. I pay more than I receive.

Mr. DICKINSON. About how many times would you say that Mr. Snyder and Mr. Thomas visited with you in your office?

Mr. RUNNELS. Five times.

Mr. DICKINSON. Did any of your staff ever meet them?

Mr. RUNNELS. I think some of my staff may have remembered seeing some people come and go, but they never were in there when I had discussions with them, nor were they in there when I had discussions with other people who were discussing things with me.

Mr. DICKINSON. I'm just trying to establish, did any of your staff ever see these people, or know who they were?

Mr. RUNNELS. I don't think they knew who they were, no, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. And the only time you attempted to use the telephone number that you had, you found it not working. About what time did you say that was—October?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. This was about January or February, the latter part of January or the first of February.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PIKE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, we still have time.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Runnels, did any of your staff ever talk to these people on the telephone?

Mr. RUNNELS. I feel quite sure in the beginning they had to, because I don't answer the telephone of my regular number, and they had to.

Mr. PIKE. So in the initial call, there would have been a message to you from your secretary saying that so and so had called, or were you in when they called?

Mr. RUNNELS. If I am in my office when I receive a phone call, we do not keep a telephone log. The only time a log is kept is when I am not in my office and someone wants me to return their call. If they say, "I'll call back," there is no log whatsoever on those when I'm not there.

Mr. PIKE. And I presume you checked your log for the period of that first phone call and found no entry?

Mr. RUNNELS. So I must have been in my office when they called.

Mr. PIKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Mollohan.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Bray.

Mr. BRAY. Did you ever have a contact with Mr. Snyder or Mr. Thomas after you called them when the telephone was disconnected?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. I had no contact with them after June, prior to the July 4th recess.

Mr. BRAY. Have you ever made any attempt to determine, after you found the telephone to be disconnected, to find out who they were, or where they came from, or what their residence was?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir. And I know that the staff has done the same thing, sir.

Mr. BRAY. And you had no success?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. BRAY. Do you know whether Mr. Kantor, or anyone connected with the newspaper, to your knowledge, has made any attempt to locate these persons?

Mr. RUNNELS. If they have, I have not had any conversation with Mr. Kantor since the date of this article.

Mr. BRAY. That's all. Thank you.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Runnels, based on your testimony, it is evident that this is something which you've been doing over a period of time, that is, paying others to do research for you.

I know the subject has already been belabored, but I wonder if you could give the committee some examples of the type and nature of research which you have paid for in the past?

Mr. RUNNELS. Sir, I'll go back to when I was in the State.

As chairman of the legislative finance committee, who investigated our highway department, our welfare department, our land office—and the same is true in the State government in our State, as it is on a national level. There are just certain things that are in your budget that you can do, and certain things you cannot—I have paid for research on many subjects in the State. I have paid for transportation, room, and meals for those who wanted to give sworn testimony before our committee because there was none in the State budget.

On the national level, prior to my even taking the oath of office, I personally went to the Library of Congress two times on a subject matter that was most important to me, Mr. Daniel, and it had to do with Federal lands, because in the West the Federal Government owns most of our State, it and the State government. I started researching State lands which each one of the Western States come into, and I won't belabor the point, but it had to do with every dollar collected by the Federal Government from the beginning of statehood until the present.

I have had research done also on all people who have served in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress from our State.

I had the energy crisis researched in depth.

Those are some of the subject matters, other than this. This was the only time that I had research done on anything pertaining to the defense budget.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Runnels, to clarify the record, let me ask you again, and this has been alluded to, but I don't think it's been asked directly: Did either Mr. Snyder or Mr. Thomas ever suggest to you that they could obtain classified information from Government officials?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. Did you ever tell Mr. Kantor that they did?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I have a question of counsel.

Mr. Reddan, have any questions posed by Congressman Runnels before the committee indicated knowledge of information that he could not have obtained through committee sources?

Mr. REDDAN. No, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Runnels, there are just a couple of questions I would like to ask you to clarify, with respect to the articles by Mr. Kantor.

He said that these documents, or one of the documents, was marked "Confidential." Is that correct?

Mr. RUNNELS. The only time that I mentioned the "Confidential" was when it was slipped under the door, the envelope it was in said, "Confidential," and it was confidential to me.

Mr. STRATTON. It was confidential to you?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. It did have "Confidential" on it?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, but I receive a lot of things that have "Personal," or "Confidential," or "Personal-Confidential" written on it.

Mr. STRATTON. Was this handwritten "Confidential," or stamped "Confidential"?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir. It was handwritten "Confidential."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Kantor says that he had discussions with you in September of 1972 and in October of 1972. I understood previously that you had said that that was not the case. Is it true that you had discussions with him in those 2 months, or is it possible that you might have had?

Mr. RUNNELS. I may have had a casual, very short, 2- or 3-minute discussion, or something like that.

And again, I don't want my people back home to think that I was not here attending to my business, and this is the reason that I keep establishing the amount of days that we were in Congress and the amount of days that I was here. I answered the roll 80.4 percent of the time, from June until the November elections.

But in October there were 31 days and I was only in Washington 6 of 31 days. In November I was only there 4 days.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Kantor reports that you told him that you contacted the Justice Department with respect to this. Did you, or did you not?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. You did not?

Mr. RUNNELS. I did not.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you.

Mr. RUNNELS. I had had a conversation with a personal friend of mine in the Department of Justice since the story broke, but not prior to that.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Runnels, may I attempt to sum up exactly what has been presented here, by the questions and answers and your original statement?

As I indicated in my opening statement, your private business is not ours. The sole matter that we're concerned with is: Did you, or did you not, purchase any classified information from anybody?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman, so help me God, I did not from Mr. Snyder, Mr. Thomas, or from anybody else, and if anybody has any proof to that, I wish they would bring it forward.

Mr. HÉBERT. Did Mr. Snyder or Mr. Thomas ever, at any time, indicate to you that they were employees of the Pentagon, or employed in the Pentagon?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. They never did?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Did they attempt to offer to sell you what would be classified information?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. They did not?

Your statement then resolves itself around the question of veracity and reliability, based on your own reputation.

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You agree and understand that.

So, to sum it up, the corroboration of your statement could be furnished in only two ways, which you said: The production of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Thomas?

Mr. RUNNELS. That's right.

Mr. HÉBERT. You can't produce them?

Mr. RUNNELS. I haven't been able to.

Mr. HÉBERT. You haven't produced them?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. The staff hasn't produced them?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. So that fades out the window as a wisp of wind. You can't produce them.

Mr. RUNNELS. That's right, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Can you produce any of the documents which you admit that you did purchase from Mr. Thomas or Mr. Snyder?

Mr. RUNNELS. I've already stated that I could not, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. I know you have. So you can't document it with documents?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You can't produce any documentation at all?

Mr. RUNNELS. No, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. So we must rely entirely upon what you say here today as the truth and the whole truth, and rely upon our respect for you, our understanding—I don't mean that in a derogatory manner—that we have to rely on your reputation as a truthful, honest man.

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You say that you have told us the truth, and you stand on your own loyalty?

Mr. RUNNELS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Kantor, will you identify yourself for the record, please?

STATEMENT OF MR. SETH KANTOR, REPORTER, THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

I'm Seth Kantor. I'm an investigative reporter for the Detroit News of the Washington Bureau.

Mr. HÉBERT. And are you the Seth Kantor to whom reference has been made with regard to this subject?

Mr. KANTOR. I am, indeed.

Mr. HÉBERT. Do you have a prepared statement, or a résumé?

Mr. KANTOR. No, I have none. I wish to make a statement at this time, but I have no prepared statement.

Mr. HÉBERT. When you wished to make a statement, did you understand that you should have had a statement here 24 hours before you appeared?

Mr. KANTOR. I have no prepared statement.

Mr. HÉBERT. You just wish to make an oral statement?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You may make your statement without interruption, and then the committee will ask questions.

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. KANTOR. On page 6 of Congressman Runnels' statement he said that the first contact with me on this subject was in May, or June, or July.

I never heard of the situation, or any of the people involved with it, before September. I was with Scripps-Howard newspapers in May, June, and July, and I negotiated to go to work with the Detroit News last June 26. It was the same day that there was a party on behalf of Senator Clinton Anderson, who was leaving Congress, and I remember the date specifically. I went down to the Democratic Convention in Miami, and immediately following the convention, which began, I believe, July 10th, I turned in my resignation to Scripps-Howard, and until that point, which was July 15th, no one anywhere knew that I was leaving Scripps-Howard and going to work for the Detroit News.

I gave Scripps-Howard 1 month's notice and went to work on August 14th for the Detroit News, and it was in September, I believe the latter part of September, that I held my first conversation with Mr. Runnels on the subject.

Mr. Runnels brought up the subject himself in a corridor outside the House Chamber on the second floor of the Capitol Building. He said that he had been dealing with three men. He indicated that they had strong connections within the Pentagon and perhaps that they were then at that time employed in the Pentagon.

Mr. REDDAN. Excuse me. Was anyone present during these conversations other than you and Mr. Runnels?

Mr. KANTOR. This conversation, the preliminary conversation, as the others that followed, were conducted between Mr. Runnels and myself.

Mr. REDDAN. No one else was present?

Mr. KANTOR. No one else was present at this time.

As Congressman Runnels indicated in his testimony, at one point in a latter conversation, Dick Hapke from his office walked into his private office while we were discussing it.

Mr. REDDAN. All right. When we get to that you can tell us about that.

Mr. KANTOR. He told me he was given access to military information which would be beneficial to his participation in the Armed Services Committee, and he thought that it would be of interest to me in that I was starting in a new job.

He was very friendly about it, and the conversation was in low terms, as I described in my articles, and he wanted to know whether the Detroit News might be interested in purchasing some of this information. I decided the best thing I should do was say that, "It certainly seems like a conceivable idea." I notified my national editor Al Blanchard, by telephone and told him about the offer.

I went back to Congressman Runnels—this was again in the very latter part of September, or the first few days of October—and expressed my interest again, and he said he would like to set up a luncheon between these people and myself, and perhaps it could be done in the second week of October.

At that point I wrote a memorandum to Mr. Blanchard outlining what I had told him on the telephone, and I supplied a copy of that memorandum to Mr. Reddan.

Mr. HÉBERT. Could you read that memorandum, for the record?

Mr. REDDAN. Do you have a copy of that memorandum with you?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, I do.

Mr. REDDAN. Would you read it into the record, please?

Mr. KANTOR. The memorandum to Mr. Blanchard, which was dated October 4, 1972, was marked at the top "Confidential Memo," and it begins:

AL: Met today with a Congressman who is buying secrets from sources in the Pentagon. His name is Harold L. Runnels. He is a freshman from Lovington, New Mexico, and a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

He deals with three principals. They are Defense Department civilians, as I understand it at this time. They in turn are able to reach various sources in and out of the military, but especially in the military, within the innermost confines of the Pentagon.

Runnels is attempting to set up a luncheon meeting for next week, so that I can meet these three people and perhaps arrange to buy information—but at least establish a relationship.

Runnels says that he is sure that at least two other House members and a senator are being fed information from these same sources.

I would doubt that they would want to do business with the press, especially on the basis of a single meeting. I would expect a feeling-out session. Runnels has told them about me, and he feels they have already checked me out.

Runnels swears that everything they have given him so far has checked out and stood up.

He has been using the information to ask stinging questions to high brass in closed door Committee sessions. I don't know what other use he has put the information to. All I know is that there is a great deal of ground to be covered on this excursion [sic] and I would have to prove myself as a standup guy before we have a story, or stories.

This has to be treated with utmost secrecy or the venture is dead.

And then, my signature.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you get any reply to that memo?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Blanchard expressed great interest that I pursue.

Mr. REDDAN. How did he express that? Did he write you a letter or a memorandum?

Mr. KANTOR. No; he told me by telephone. We stay in day-to-day contact by telephone, and when he received the memorandum he notified me that he was very interested.

Mr. REDDAN. If you were in day-to-day contact with him, why didn't you give him this on the telephone, rather than a memo?

Mr. KANTOR. My first conversation with him was on the telephone, but I think it's preferable in dealing with any kind of a story matter to get it down on paper at some point so someone can look it over and see what you have in hand.

Mr. REDDAN. Is this your normal business practice regarding any story?

Mr. KANTOR. Absolutely.

Mr. REDDAN. Thank you, Go ahead, sir.

Mr. KANTOR. I think it's normal throughout the newspaper business.

Mr. Runnels, being a freshman and coming to the conclusion of his first term of office, was anxious, of course, to get back home and to campaign for reelection, and he left fairly early in October. Congress adjourned, I believe, on October 18, and he was gone before that, and he told me he would try to set up the meeting with the individuals and myself in his absence.

He took my home phone number. He took my business number. I took his residence number in New Mexico, and I took his business number down there, plus at least one of his District office numbers, and we promised to remain in contact on the subject. He said he would contact me as soon as he could contact these individuals to get together with me. I never heard from him, and I didn't feel that it was necessary to bother him while he was gone.

When he returned, however, on January 3, I was anxiously awaiting his arrival. Rather, the start of Congress was January 3. I don't know if he arrived the day before. But I talked to him again on the subject, and in our conversations in early January the thrust of Mr. Runnels' comments about the operators he was dealing with began to change.

Incidentally, I notice in his statement that he said I wanted some sort of work done for me, or for my newspaper. I didn't institute that idea. That was his thought in the preliminary meeting.

Mr. Runnels, in January, indicated to me that these individuals—
Let me digress one more moment here, sir.

He also never was talking about two people during the early stages. It was always three people. Today he comes into this hearing room with the names of two individuals and discusses two people at all times. However, he told me very clearly and emphatically on a number of occasions that there were three people involved. Eventually he told me that there were perhaps as many as five meetings or more that he had with two of the people, and at the second meeting the third man showed up, and that was the only time that he was present. Mr. Runnels had indicated that he thought that the third man was connected with the Pentagon and that if the other two had been,

they were gone and they were operating a small business of their own with a private telephone number of their own.

At any rate, he told me in January that he felt that these people were selling their services to at least two other members of the House Armed Services Committee, and he identified them as Michael Harrington and Les Aspin.

He suggested that, among other things, I check their payrolls and bring him the names on their payrolls, and he would tell me whether the names of these people were present on the payroll, and then I could go check for myself and go see who was sitting at various desks, and who was on the payrolls, and who wasn't there.

I collected the names from the House Clerk's report of members' payrolls, and provided them for Mr. Runnels in my notebook, and he looked them over and said that the names were not there.

I further looked into the campaign expenditures and income of Mr. Aspin and Mr. Harrington, and I couldn't find any ready explanation for their not being there.

Mr. HÉBERT. At this stage, Mr. Kantor, Mr. Aspin and Mr. Harrington are not present, and we're dealing solely with Mr. Runnels, so unless there is a connection in your story with those two members, I suggest that you just put that back. If there are any charges to be brought against them later, we'll take it at a proper time.

Mr. KANTOR. In the course of my investigation, I talked to several members of the Armed Services Committee, including Mr. Aspin and Mr. Harrington, and some of the panel members here today, and asked each and every one whether they had ever purchased any classified material, or heard of any member of the committee who purchased classified material, and in every case, including the aforementioned two members, they said, "Absolutely not."

Mr. HÉBERT. Could you identify the members of this committee, if they are present?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir. I talked to Mr. Stratton. I talked to Mr. Pike. I talked to Mr. Arends. I talked to Mr. Dickinson. I talked to Mr. Hunt. I see Mr. Nedzi sitting down at the end, and I talked to him. I talked to other members of the Full Committee also, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You didn't talk to the Chairman of this Investigating Subcommittee?

Mr. KANTOR. I only talked to the Full Committee, sir, in the final stages of preparing a story.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want you to be accurate in your reporting.

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Go ahead and continue, sir.

Mr. KANTOR. I established, at least in a cursory way, that everybody I talked to was surprised that this could happen to any member, and I never identified the member I might be talking about at any time, and I felt that perhaps Mr. Runnels might be the only one involved, and so I approached him on that basis. I asked him if maybe he was being had. Finally, in the course of our conversations, he thought that that might be conceivable.

On February 8, which was the day before Congress took its Lincoln Day period break, he told me that he had tried to contact these two individuals on the telephone, either on the previous day or the day before that, February 6 or 7, and had learned that their phone had been disconnected.

He was preparing to leave for New Mexico and asked me what I wanted to put in my story. I told him that in conversations with my editors back in Detroit, they were very interested in seeing if, indeed, Mr. Runnels was buying classified information, that the story get out.

He said that he thought that it was time to talk to his attorney in New Mexico, and wanted to know essentially what I would put in the story, and I told him that it would involve the purchase of classified material from people who were unknown to me at that time for his use in the committee activities. He said, "Is that all"? and I said, "Yes, that was what I intended to put in the story."

He expressed, at that time, worry that if these people had done something illegal by selling the information, then was he also culpable. He said he wanted to check with his attorney about that.

He also was worried about entrapping these people, after the fact; that is, several months after he had purchased the material.

He also expressed concern that the three people involved might sue him, recalling that there had been an earlier suit in which he printed a retraction in the Congressional Record as part of the settlement. He didn't want that to happen again.

I told him that certainly I wasn't a lawyer, but it seemed to me that three people would, rather than sue if their names were disclosed, go the other way and try and get lost.

Mr. Runnels left February 8 or February 9 for his district, and again I anticipated his return, which was supposed to be on February 19. February 19 was Washington's Birthday and the Government buildings were closed down. I was in my office that day and tried several times to reach him at his farm in northern Virginia, and I talked to his wife perhaps half a dozen times, and she said he was out with agricultural problems. Shortly after 7 o'clock in the evening, I gave up.

On Tuesday, February 20, I met with him in his office and asked him what the result was of his meeting with his attorney. I asked him if I could have his attorney's name, and he was reluctant to give me the attorney's name also. He said, pulling a paper napkin out of his wallet and looking at the notes he had on it, that the attorney had told him to avoid publicity and investigation at that time. He said that the attorney had told him to go for advice from the Justice Department. In other words, not get involved with an investigation with the Justice Department, but to get advice. He said the attorney was interested in having Justice find out if these people were ever Pentagon employees.

Also, Mr. Runnels was advised, he said, by his attorney to have the Justice Department find out who put up the deposit for the business telephone.

I asked Mr. Runnels if I could talk to Mr. Runnels' lawyer by telephone from his office, and he grew very suspicious and wanted to know why, and I said, "I want to tell your attorney what the story is, and that we would like to treat you kindly," because I felt certain that if he was going to the Justice Department that it had reached the point where we ought to do a story.

He said, "Maybe when the time comes, you can talk to him." He described his attorney as involved in legislative matters at the State level in New Mexico and the son of a judge, and he would go no further.

I asked him if he could possibly talk to my managing editor in Detroit. At this point I was anxious that there be a corroborating witness of some kind. He agreed to talk to my Managing Editor, Mr. Paul Poorman, the following morning at either 9 or 9:30 in the morning. He said he would be available in his office.

They conducted a conversation, and I saw Mr. Runnels later in the day—that was now Wednesday, February 21st—I saw him just after he had lunch, in the hallway. And I asked him if he was getting together with the Justice Department. He said he hoped to do it the following day, Thursday. I asked him would the meeting be in his office, and he said, "Yes."

The following day, Thursday, I waited until the afternoon and went to Mr. Runnels' office when I couldn't get his private number to answer, and camped there until well after 6 o'clock in the evening, when I realized he probably wasn't coming back. The staff members hadn't heard from him at all. There also was a reception at the White House later that day, and I thought he possibly might be going home from there.

I tried to reach him late into the evening at home, and he still hadn't returned home. Mrs. Runnels advised that I try the following morning, to contact him at 6:30 because he was catching an early flight to Clovis, New Mexico. I called at 6:30, and she said he had left the house at 6:15.

I tried several times Friday to contact him down in Clovis. He returned my calls twice, but I was out. I finally reached him Saturday morning at 10 minutes to 6, his time, in Clovis, and asked him had he gone to the Justice Department. Obviously, he sounded a little drowsy at that hour, and I asked him twice, and both times he said he had had his meeting with Justice.

I asked him what was discussed and he said he had been advised to say nothing to reporters any more.

On the basis of that information, that he had actually met with a representative of the Justice Department, we decided, in consultation with Mr. Poorman, to go ahead with the story the following day, Sunday, February 25.

I noticed that immediately following the story, Mr. Runnels met with Mr. Greg Harrington of the Associated Press, in which he denied that he had purchased classified information, as he had been insisting to me for a 5-month period that he had, indeed, done.

He said that he had purchased information on procurements of tanks and Cheyenne helicopters, and, incidentally, that's the first time that he had brought up the fact that he had purchased information on the Cheyenne helicopters. He could have told me that at any time, but he neglected to do so.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Kantor, I hate to interrupt you, but we have to leave now because we're having a new member being sworn in. We'll have to recess the committee, and I apologize for interrupting. We'll reconvene at 2 o'clock.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed at 11:45 a.m., to reconvene at 2 p.m., on the same day, Tuesday, March 27, 1973.]

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. HÉBERT. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Kantor, let me explain why we had to interrupt you. We have now installed a new member from Louisiana, and we are at full strength, so we can continue now. So just pick up where you left off, and finish your statement before we question you.

Mr. KANTOR. All right, Mr. Chairman, I am nearly finished with my statement.

I was about to mention, following my story of September 25, which made the initial disclosures——

Mr. REDDAN. Story of September 25?

Mr. KANTOR. Excuse me, my story of February 25.

Mr. Runnels talked with Greg Harrington and the Associated Press, and in a story which followed, Mr. Runnels said that he had purchased information on procurement of tanks and helicopters, and that was the first indication I had that any of the material dealt with Cheyenne helicopters.

He had told me during the course of our discussions that he had purchased information relative to tanks, but that it was an old program. I checked in the Armed Services Committee and discovered that there is a very thick file of classified information on the Cheyenne helicopter which is available to Armed Services Committee members, and also a smaller, unclassified file which is available to all members also.

During the Associated Press story interview, Mr. Runnels was quoted as saying he declined to name the men he dealt with, even though several months had gone by, when I had asked him to supply me the names of those men, saying he didn't want to cause them embarrassment, according to the Associated Press story.

I can't see, when he was buying information on tanks and Cheyenne helicopter programs which were no longer being purchased, what would be embarrassing to these gentlemen.

I would like to say in closing that from the outset, and persistently, Mr. Runnels stressed that the men he was dealing with did not want to be identified, that they told him they didn't want to be seen in public with him at any time, that his meetings with him were in his private office on the seventh floor of the Longworth Building, and that on the first occasion, when he was telephoned by them, quoting him, he said, "They said they believed I was for good, honest government, and would I be interested in meeting with them?" And he described it as a private meeting in his own office.

He said that they were familiar with the operations of the cleaning people, and were able to deliver the material under his office door after the cleaning people had finished in the office. He indicated at all times to me that it was a clandestine operation, and said, quoting him again, "They insisted on cash payments, no checks and no records."

It was Mr. Runnels who said that it was cloak-and-dagger stuff in the way they dealt with him. I would be glad to accept any questions from the subcommittee, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Reddan.

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Kantor, when did you first ask for the names of the individuals who allegedly were performing this research?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Runnels made it clear to me last fall that they didn't want to be identified until either they checked me out or until they were ready to meet with me, so I did not ask for their names, as I recall it, last fall.

Certainly by early this year, I was asking, and at one point I asked him if he could even slip me the names anonymously by sending them to me in the mail, and he said he couldn't.

Mr. REDDAN. Did he explain why he couldn't give you the names?

Mr. KANTOR. He said that they very firmly didn't want their names to be made public.

Mr. REDDAN. When were your first conversations with Congressman Runnels relative to the possibility of a luncheon or meeting with these researchers?

Mr. KANTOR. He may have brought it up in the very first contact on this subject in late September, but certainly in the first week of October he was talking about setting up a luncheon.

Mr. REDDAN. Was it your understanding you were going to meet with anonymous people or were their names going to be disclosed at the luncheon?

Mr. KANTOR. Oh, I anticipated finding out who they were, which is why I was anxious to get together with him. Yes, I believed I would find out their identities.

Mr. REDDAN. In the memorandum dated October 4, which you read into the record this morning, you say "Met today with the Congressman who is buying secrets from sources in the Pentagon." Do you recall what Congressman Runnels' words were with respect to his description of the kind of material? Did he identify it as secret, or confidential, or classified?

Mr. KANTOR. It was quite a while ago, sir, and I was not taking notes, and that is the way I defined it at the time. It was my understanding.

Mr. REDDAN. Your understanding was what, sir?

Mr. KANTOR. That it was not public information that he was buying.

Mr. REDDAN. But was it classified—security classified?

Mr. KANTOR. It is my understanding it was, yes, sir.

Mr. REDDAN. But that is your understanding from what he said?

Mr. KANTOR. That is correct.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you ever see any of the documents?

Mr. KANTOR. I never even asked to see the documents because I don't believe I am privileged or entitled to see classified information.

Mr. REDDAN. Well, wasn't that the reason you wanted to meet with these people?

Mr. KANTOR. I wanted to find out what it was they were selling, who they were selling to, where they were getting it from.

Mr. REDDAN. But you would have to look at it, wouldn't you, to find out whether it was secret?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, the first thing to do would be to find out who they were and talk to them.

Mr. REDDAN. Yes, but after you did that—

Mr. KANTOR. I would find out everything I could.

Mr. REDDAN. Regardless of whether it was classified?

Mr. KANTOR. Everything I could find out, I would be anxious to do so, yes.

Mr. REDDAN. I have no further questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Stratton.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KANTOR, you say that it was your impression that these documents were classified—this was classified information. Isn't this the key to what we are investigating here today, whether it was or wasn't classified information?

Mr. KANTOR. It is the very key, and it is what the Detroit News has been anxious to find out all along.

Mr. STRATTON. All right. Did Mr. Runnels say to you that this was classified information in all of the discussions that you had with him?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Stratton, he emphasized that it was classified information, and when I began taking notes openly in front of him through the passage of time, I asked him at least two or three other times so I could have it down in my notebook, was it classified, and if so, what type of classification? He told me at least one of the papers was marked "Confidential" at the top. He wasn't talking about an envelope slipped under—

Mr. STRATTON. You have been around here long enough to know anything that is only "confidential" is really hardly worth looking at, as far as classified information is concerned. Was that all he had to say, that he just mentioned there was one document that said "Confidential"?

Mr. KANTOR. I don't remember him characterizing it as just one document, but he said it was marked "Confidential" at the top, yes.

Mr. STRATTON. Did he say marked with a stamp?

Mr. KANTOR. No.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, I am trying—

Mr. KANTOR. The reason I am doing this is because that is the motion he used.

Mr. STRATTON. I am trying to find out whether somebody was kidding somebody else. Can you testify to your absolute knowledge and certainty that he said these were "classified" documents?

Mr. KANTOR. I promise you that is exactly what he said.

Mr. STRATTON. Why didn't you mention that in your memorandum? You said "secrets."

Mr. KANTOR. Right. The memorandum is dated October 4. It wasn't until the January and February discussions that I began making any notes at all in front of him, and that is when I began trying to clarify exactly what was involved.

Mr. STRATTON. So that as of October 4, he hadn't even mentioned that he had "secret" documents; is that correct?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, this was a note, an interoffice memo, so to speak, and I hadn't even gone to look up the classification aspects and realize that there were three different areas—top secret, secret, and confidential. I was using the term loosely in the note—"secret."

Mr. STRATTON. I think that is the key to what we have involved here.

Now, if he had said, "I have got a lot of inside dope from the Pentagon," if he had said that, you might assume that this was classified. Is it possible that he was talking in rather flowery terms, about all of the inside dope that he was getting, and you just assumed

that this was something that must be not only top secret, but top secret sensitive, just like the Pentagon papers; but as an actual fact, he never really claimed to have that kind of information?

Mr. KANTOR. First of all, Mr. Stratton, we didn't rush into print with the story. Second of all, this is just a m  mo we are talking about now. It is nothing I used in the newspaper.

Mr. STRATTON. I am not talking about the memo.

Mr. KANTOR. I didn't use anything erroneously in the newspaper.

Mr. STRATTON. I am talking about your testimony as to exactly what he said to you in these secret, hush-hush sessions off the House floor and whether he actually told you that he had classified information, or whether he was perhaps building up a little picture of all of the inside information and you just automatically assumed he was talking about something that was classified?

Mr. KANTOR. Normally, when a Congressman I trust over a period of time comes to me and speaks in low tones about information he is getting for use in the Armed Services Committee, and that it is coming to him from confidential sources—

Mr. STRATTON. So it is more just an assumption, rather than an actual assertion, I gather.

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I think that Congressman Runnels made it clear to me that he was getting information that was not ordinary information from Pentagon sources.

Mr. STRATTON. That is a little different thing. For example, in this memo, you notice that you start out in the first line, "the Congressman is buying secrets," but in the last line of your memo, you remind your editor that this matter that you and he are talking about is also a secret, and it must be treated with "utmost secrecy."

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I didn't want the thing bandied about all over the place. There would be no point in that.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, what were you concerned about in connection with this case? Were you concerned about stopping an illegal disclosure of classified information, or were you interested in getting a story?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I was interested in several things, Mr. Stratton. I was interested in who these people were, and where they were getting their information specifically, and to whom they were selling the information. If they were selling it to Mr. Runnels, why couldn't they be selling it to other people elsewhere, beyond Congress? That is what I was interested in.

Mr. STRATTON. Did Mr. Runnels ever tell you at some point that he had decided not to buy any more of this stuff, that he had stopped getting it?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, he told me at a point after the start of this year, when he came back for the 93d Congress, he told me that they had elevated the price.

Mr. STRATTON. But not until 1973 did he mention anything to that effect?

Mr. KANTOR. I didn't see him in November or December, or I didn't have any conversation with him.

Mr. STRATTON. I take it you made no move during any of this period to report this information to the FBI, or the Justice Department?

Mr. KANTOR. I didn't have enough to go on.

Mr. STRATTON. What was your relationship with Mr. Runnels?

Mr. KANTOR. It was as a reporter to a Member of Congress, a reporter with two newspapers, on two opposite edges of his district.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, it must have been a somewhat more personal relationship than that, wasn't it?

Mr. KANTOR. No, I would say it was a professional relationship. He said he came to our house once for dinner. We went out to their farm on two occasions with other members of the New Mexico State Society here in town, and outside of that, I guess I met him two or three times for lunch in the House dining room and called him off the Floor innumerable times and wrote several dozen stories about him, probably, over the course of a couple of years.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, ordinarily in a normal relationship with the press, when you speak to the press, you expect to have the story appear in print, or at least you hope it will appear in print.

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. Why didn't you print these statements when he first gave them to you? Did he tell you he was telling you this in confidence, and ask you not to treat it as publishable material, but off the record, background, et cetera?

Mr. KANTOR. It was somewhere in between there, sir. Mr. Runnels indicated very clearly that he was supplying this information to me as a courtesy and perhaps my paper would be interested in buying information, also.

Mr. STRATTON. This was more of a personal relationship, then. He was just trying to give you a little background information about what was going on up here on the Hill?

Mr. KANTOR. You will have to ask him that, I don't know.

Mr. STRATTON. I am asking about your interpretation of what it was. It seems strange to me he would talk to a member of the press in this way, knowing that the purpose of the press is to put stuff into print. I am just wondering whether you gave him any indication, as far as you were concerned, that this was entirely off the record, you wouldn't say anything about it?

Mr. KANTOR. I don't remember giving him that impression, no.

Mr. STRATTON. What did he tell you he was getting the information about? What particular projects?

Mr. KANTOR. He didn't characterize it. He did not characterize it at that time, Mr. Stratton, and as our discussions proceeded in January and February, he told me only that one parcel of information concerned a tank program.

Mr. STRATTON. Did he ever use the word "research" in his conversations?

Mr. KANTOR. At no time with me, no.

Mr. STRATTON. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am interested in one statement there that you made, and I wonder if you would clear it up for me. I didn't write the entire statement down, but you alluded to the fact that at one point you suggested to Mr. Runnels that he was being had.

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. By whom, you or someone else?

Mr. KANTOR. No, I meant the people he was dealing with. I said that at the point that it seemed clear to me that no other members of the committee were either purchasing such information, or knew of such information being handled on the Hill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Just so I can get the chronological sequence here, your first conversation with Mr. Runnels relative to the purchase of information by him from some third party was in late September?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. And then, early October, he left, going back to campaign for reelection?

Mr. KANTOR. That is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. Nothing of any significance with regard to this matter occurred between the latter part of September and his leaving for campaigning purposes in the early part of October; is that correct?

Mr. KANTOR. That is right.

Mr. DICKINSON. At that time, in the late part of September, you say you notified your editor by telephone—Mr. Blanchard—that you had had this conversation with Mr. Runnels, and he was in touch with someone who was to supply him information of a military nature which was of a classified or secret nature, is that correct? You did this by telephone?

Mr. KANTOR. That is right. The first contact with Mr. Blanchard was about right after my meeting with Mr. Runnels in the hallway.

Mr. DICKINSON. Then you followed this up to Mr. Blanchard by writing a memorandum or a note. What was the date of that?

Mr. KANTOR. The memorandum is dated October 4. It was approximately a week later.

Mr. DICKINSON. A week later than the telephone conversation?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. And then the only conversation or contact you again had with Mr. Runnels relative to this matter was about January 3, when Congress convened?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. You had done nothing about it in the meantime?

Mr. KANTOR. Very early in January, that is right.

Mr. DICKINSON. All right. And then it was some time later that your editor, Mr. Poorman, contacted and discussed this with Mr. Runnels. This was about when?

Mr. KANTOR. February 21.

Mr. DICKINSON. That was right before the story broke?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir, that week.

Mr. DICKINSON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kantor, when did this conversation that Mr. Dickinson alluded to between you and Mr. Runnels to the effect that you told him it was possible he was being had, take place?

Mr. KANTOR. I can't pinpoint the day, but I could make a pretty educated guess that it occurred in the first week of February.

Mr. PIKE. Did it ever occur to you that you were being had?

Mr. KANTOR. No.

Mr. PIKE. And you are still firmly convinced that all of the facts which you wrote about in your story did indeed take place; is that correct?

Mr. KANTOR. No; I have no idea that they took place. The only thing I have an idea of is what the Congressman told me over a period of 5 months.

Mr. PIKE. Well, now, wait a minute. You know what he told you?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. PIKE. But you don't have any idea whether they really took place, is that your story?

Mr. KANTOR. Not firsthand.

Mr. PIKE. Do you believe that they really took place?

Mr. KANTOR. At this point I have absolutely no idea.

Mr. PIKE. In your memorandum dated October 4, you stated flatly that Mr. Runnels "has been using the information to ask stinging questions to high brass in closed door committee sessions."

Have you read any of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee on the procurement bill, the military construction bill?

Mr. KANTOR. I spent quite a bit of time, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. Can you give some of the "stinging questions" that Mr. Runnels asked?

Mr. KANTOR. The only—

Mr. DICKINSON. Would you yield while he is looking that up?

Mr. PIKE. Sure, I will yield, unless you are going to distract him.

Mr. KANTOR. I have my answer ready, but go ahead.

Mr. DICKINSON. Did you ever go into the subject matter of the papers and information he was acquiring other than just in a general manner having to do with the Cheyenne and the MBT70?

Mr. KANTOR. I never realized it was the Cheyenne. I asked if he could tell me in a very general way.

Mr. DICKINSON. You would have to have some knowledge to relate that to the question he was asking. That is the reason I raised that question.

Thank you, Mr. Pike.

Mr. KANTOR. I see. The closest thing I can find to a "stinging question," I am quoting Mr. Runnels—

Mr. PIKE. What is the date of the testimony you are reading from now?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Runnels is talking to Peter R. Murray during the course of subcommittee No. 1 hearings in February and March of 1972.

Mr. PIKE. February and March 1972—that is good enough, go ahead.

Mr. KANTOR. All right, sir.

Mr. PIKE. What is the stinging question?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I say the closest thing I can find to a stinging question is Mr. Runnels speaking here. "I hate to be tying up the committee, but you mentioned three different types [deleted] and am I asking an unfair question of what kind of [deleted] and what kind of [deleted] are you [deleted] this with?"

Mr. HÉBERT. That is a real stinger.

Mr. PIKE. What was the answer?

Mr. KANTOR. The answer, Mr. Pike, was just as thorough. Mr. Murray said "From a [deleted] standpoint, such prosaic things as [deleted], these types of things, believe it or not you can get almost anything to [deleted] it."

Mr. PIKE. Would you classify Mr. Peter Murray, of whom I probably should have heard, but I must confess that I have not, as high-ranking brass?

Mr. KANTOR. He was acting director of the AFSC Laboratories.

Mr. PIKE. Acting director of the AFSC Laboratories. Well, now, is that "brass" at all?

Mr. KANTOR. No; I have never heard of him before.

Mr. PIKE. And that is as stinging a question as you can get, and as high ranking a brass as you can get?

Mr. KANTOR. Oh, well, I know that Mr. Runnels—

Mr. PIKE. Quite frankly, I think that Mr. Runnels is a very genial, easygoing guy in the way he asks questions. I am just amazed to read in your memorandum that he had been asking stinging questions, that I had apparently missed out on.

Mr. KANTOR. I wrote the memorandum before I went through all of the procurement hearings, right.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Kantor, in your career in Washington how many different grades of classification of documents have you become aware of?

Mr. KANTOR. I understand there are three grades of classification.

Mr. PIKE. You never heard of anything beyond those three grades?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, no; I am aware of Top Secret, Secret and Confidential.

Mr. PIKE. You never heard of Top Secret-Sensitive, or anything marked "eyes only"?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, I have heard of "eyes only."

Mr. PIKE. All right. Have you ever, in your career as a reporter, seen documents which were actually classified?

Mr. KANTOR. No, I never have.

Mr. PIKE. You never have. Did you ask Mr. Runnels specifically whether the documents were stamped "confidential?"

Mr. KANTOR. No, I don't recall asking the question.

Mr. PIKE. Well, now, Mr. Runnels testified this morning that a package of papers was handed, or slipped under his door, or got to him somehow, and the outside of the envelope had written on it the word "Confidential."

Isn't it possible that we got a great big to-do about nothing here, and that there was just a package of papers that was marked "Confidential," and got to his office? And from this we have gotten into this great big hearing and this great big fuss?

Mr. KANTOR. If Mr. Runnels had indicated to me at any time he was purchasing: (a) Research material, (b) nonclassified material, or material that came in an envelope marked "Confidential" to his attention, we wouldn't have had a story, and I guarantee you I wouldn't have pursued it any further. But during a period of 5 months he never once said that to me, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. But you never asked him whether the pieces of paper were stamped "Confidential." And you never alleged that they were stamped anything higher than "Confidential." And you don't believe they were stamped?

Mr. KANTOR. I asked him if it was classified material. As I say, I asked him several times, and he said yes, each time. I asked him the type of classification.

Mr. PIKE. You asked him the type of classification?

Mr. KANTOR. He told me it was "Confidential." And when I came to you and asked you what you thought about people buying "Confidential" information, you said you wouldn't pay 10 cents for "Confidential" information.

Mr. PIKE. You are quoting me absolutely correctly, and I wish you would go a little further and say that when you first came to me with the story I said I don't believe it. Is that not correct?

Mr. KANTOR. That is right.

Mr. PIKE. Well, I can only wish that you felt the same way about it that I did. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Randall.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kantor, could you carry on a little bit beyond the question of Mr. Stratton a moment ago? What was your objective here? I think in answer to the question Mr. Stratton asked you, you said if this was happening in the case of Mr. Runnels, maybe it was happening somewhere else, somewhere beyond that. Someone else was getting some information, was that your objective?

Mr. KANTOR. I was extremely interested in that, and that was the point of all my interrogation. I spent a lot of hours camping on Mr. Runnels' doorstep trying to get him to talk to me and furnish me information, and my main purpose was to find out who these people were, where they were getting the information from, and to whom they were selling it.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, how long have you been in Washington, how long have you been around here?

Mr. KANTOR. I have been around here covering Capitol Hill 11 years.

Mr. RANDALL. Have you ever made any kind of an excursion of this kind before about classified information?

Mr. KANTOR. No.

Mr. RANDALL. Have you ever been assigned to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. KANTOR. No; I have handled an occasional story on the Armed Services Committee or one of its subcommittees but not on a regular basis.

Mr. RANDALL. You didn't know a moment ago that Peter Murray, or whatever his name was, was not brass. You thought he was an officer.

Mr. KANTOR. Oh, my memo was based on what I had learned from Mr. Runnels in the conversation.

Mr. RANDALL. Now, I think you said to Mr. Pike a moment ago, according to my notes here, that Mr. Runnels did tell you it was confidential, isn't that right?

Mr. KANTOR. Absolutely.

Mr. RANDALL. And he had never said the time you wrote your memo back here on October 4, you said buying secrets. You thought it was secrets up to a certain point when he told you it was "Confidential," is that right?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. You do know the difference between all these classifications?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, I understand there is a difference, right.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, there is quite a difference as my colleague from New York said, there is also "eyes only," "Confidential," and all manner of classifications. "Confidential" is worthless, it means nothing. In fact, you marked a memo you prepared "Confidential," isn't that right?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, and it was maintained.

Mr. RANDALL. But you also in your memo of October 4 said this has to be treated with the utmost secrecy, if you will tell us that again.

Mr. KANTOR. I am a reporter dealing with an editor, I don't want a story out all over.

Mr. RANDALL. Could it be such a thing you wanted to get a scoop here, is that why you said that?

Mr. KANTOR. That is a good word.

Mr. RANDALL. You wanted a scoop on it. I am interested in your memorandum. I think that is a very interesting document.

Mr. KANTOR. I think it is important to know how you and Mr. Runnels dealt with each other. Did he seem anxious to talk to you? Did he ever say to you, "This is off the record, don't talk about this?" Did he ever tell you that?

Mr. KANTOR. I think at the outset he was trying to furnish me information on a man-to-man basis.

Mr. RANDALL. By man-to-man, you mean close in, not at arms' length—what do you mean by that?

Mr. KANTOR. I mean I don't think he expected his conversation to be broadcasted across the land.

Mr. RANDALL. Sort of off the record, in other words?

Mr. KANTOR. That was in September, sir, but now we get into January and February and I began to tell him we were very interested in a story, because we felt a story had become essential, because people were running about selling what appeared to be classified information, and I was anxious to find out where all they were selling it, and where they were getting it from, and who these people were.

Mr. RANDALL. Did your editors in Detroit ever give you any kind of an expense account, any sort of a fund of money to go out and try to find these fellows yourself?

Mr. KANTOR. I had no names to go on.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, apparently the committee didn't either. I thought maybe your people were so interested they wanted to try to find them. Your editors in Detroit never offered to do that?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Randall, we didn't have any names at all. If we had names I would have pursued it.

Mr. RANDALL. Did you have some descriptions?

Mr. KANTOR. No; no descriptions. It is possible that Mr. Runnels at one point said they were in their late twenties or early thirties.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes; I thought he did. He said one was 28 years old and—

Mr. KANTOR. He didn't tell that to me.

Mr. RANDALL. No?

You say you camped out in front of Mr. Runnels' office for a while. Did you stand out in the hall? Did you ever go in and talk to Caroline Hapke, or anyone in charge there?

Mr. KANTOR. Hapke, yes—several times.

Mr. RANDALL. Hapke?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. You waited out there a long time waiting to see Mr. Runnels, you said. Did you ever go back in the middle of the night when these documents—did you ever carry on that surveillance that far? Did you ever do that?

Mr. KANTOR. No; I didn't see any percentage in that.

Mr. RANDALL. In your memo you say you doubt if anyone would want to do business with the press. Did you contemplate ever doing business with these people if you could find them? You wanted the luncheon, you wanted to do business then, you had that in your mind?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Runnels suggested that perhaps the Detroit News would be interested in purchasing material, and on that basis would like to set up the luncheon.

Mr. RANDALL. From these alleged persons?

Mr. KANTOR. That is right, Mr. Randall; yes.

Mr. RANDALL. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KANTOR, this question has been asked twice before, but I want to ask it in a different way. What motivated you to write this story?

Mr. KANTOR. At the close of the week of February 19, after Congressman Runnels had given Paul Poorman, my managing editor, assurances he was planning to go to the Justice Department, and after I reached Mr. Runnels in Clovis, N. Mex., on the morning of February 24, at 10 minutes to 6 his time, and he told me he had met with a representative of the Justice Department, we decided in concert that it was the time to go ahead with the story because for one thing, once this set of information reached the Justice Department, it could be leaked out in many ways.

Mr. DANIEL. Now, Mr. Kantor, in your February 28 article you state that you discussed this a few times in September and October, and a dozen times since the first of the year. This would allow a minimum of 15 conversations with Mr. Runnels. And in all these conversations you obtained and he offered no proof. I ask you, weren't you taking an unreasonable chance in reporting an unsubstantiated story of this nature? I ask the question in light of the Jack Anderson difficulties, for example, over the Tom Eagleton traffic ticket. How do you feel about reporting uncorroborated stories of this sort?

Mr. KANTOR. Are we supposed to get into the Jack Anderson thing at this point?

Mr. DANIEL. I wouldn't think so.

Mr. KANTOR. Jack Anderson was reporting through a third person as I understand it, and in this case I was dealing directly with one of the participants.

Mr. DANIEL. My question to you is how do you feel about reporting uncorroborated stories?

Mr. KANTOR. My answer to you, Mr. Daniel, is that I felt I could trust this Congressman. I had been dealing with him over a long time.

Mr. DANIEL. What about if you had been dealing with someone you didn't know?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, no; I would have to pursue it further.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Kantor, did you ever at any time see any document or talk with any person who could substantiate the very serious charges you made in your article?

Mr. KANTOR. I talked to no one beside Congressman Runnels.

Mr. DANIEL. Did you see any document marked "Secret" or "Confidential"?

Mr. KANTOR. No; he never showed me any documents.

Mr. DANIEL. Did you ever suggest to Mr. Runnels that what he is alleged to have done was illegal?

Mr. KANTOR. Just before he returned to New Mexico in early February he said that he was going to take up with his attorney the fact that—

Mr. DANIEL. I mean did you ever discuss it with him?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes; I said it potentially was an illegal move on the part of the sellers to sell the information, and so he said he was going to check to see whether he was doing anything illegal, also.

Mr. DANIEL. Did you ever discuss it with your newspaper's counsel?

Mr. KANTOR. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Do you know of anyone who did?

Mr. KANTOR. Not firsthand, no, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Kantor, in 1963, in testimony on the TFX controversy you appeared to contradict yourself on that testimony. On page 1254 of the record you indicated complete confidence in two sources which provided similar or identical information. Yet on page 1262 of the same document you stated you were unable to judge your sources. Is this a common posture for you as a reporter?

Mr. KANTOR. I don't know. You may be taking that out of context, Mr. Daniel. What do you mean I wasn't able to judge sources?

Mr. DANIEL. I am quoting what you said in that document.

Mr. KANTOR. What was the question?

Mr. DANIEL. I don't know, during the testimony on the TFX controversy, I didn't bring the document with me. The question I am asking you is very simple, though. Is this the common posture for you to do that?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, once every 10 years I go before a committee of Congress, and on the last occasion it was the Senate side, it was the Investigative Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, headed by Mr. McClellan.

Mr. DANIEL. This is the testimony that I have reference to.

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir. And in 1962 I had broken a story that General Dynamics was going to get the TFX airplane contract at a time when it appeared that Boeing had come in with the low bid and was offering a better set of terms. A month later General Dynamics got the contract, and the Senate Government Operations Committee launched an investigation, which went on for several months. During the course of that, the first and only open hearing was conducted when I was asked to appear before Mr. McClellan's subcommittee and reveal the names of my sources. My information was absolutely correct, and it was borne out by the facts after my story.

I did not reveal the names of my sources. So far as I know, I never contradicted myself.

Mr. DANIEL. According to your statement, though, you said you were unable to judge your sources. Do you recall that testimony?

Mr. KANTOR. That one particular line, I was up there for an hour and 45 minutes before them.

Mr. DANIEL. All right, let's go to the February 25 story. In column five, you referred to classified information. Several paragraphs later the phrase "confidential information" is used. Did Mr. Runnels use both these terms describing the same material?

Mr. KANTOR. Let me get out the story.

Mr. DANIEL. February 25 story, column 5. You used "classified" and "confidential" interchangeably.

Mr. KANTOR. During the course of my conversations with Mr. Runnels, he used them interchangeably.

Mr. DANIEL. "Confidential" and "classified"?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. He used them interchangeably.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more question. Now, Mr. Kantor, your February 26 article states, quote, "Harold L. Runnels, the Congressman who bought Pentagon secrets, continues to hide from the public the names of the men he bought them from." Do you consider that a statement of fact? And if so, can you establish the factuality of that statement?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, Harold Runnels was the Congressman who said he bought—

Mr. DANIEL. You didn't say he said he bought it, you said he bought it.

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I will just let the statement stand, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have one.

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Looking at Mr. Runnels' statement—and I will quote here from his prepared statement for this hearing—Mr. Runnels says, "At one meeting with Mr. Kantor he told me he had proof someone was peddling classified data on the Hill and he was persistent in his delving into my affairs to see if I was a party to such a transaction."

Now I really believe that if we have any justifiable reason for being here today it is to determine, as the chairman said, was it in fact classified information that was being sold on the Hill?

I will ask you first, did you make the statement? Do you have knowledge or proof that classified information is being peddled or sold here on the Hill?

Mr. KANTOR. No; that wasn't my statement, and it was an untrue statement by Congressman Runnels, and as I started to say this morning, during January it was he who brought up the fact that other members of the Armed Services Committee possibly were getting information from the same sources. It was Congressman Runnels' idea, not mine.

Mr. DICKINSON. You have no knowledge or information on which to base a belief that classified information is being sold to Members of Congress here on the Hill?

Mr. KANTOR. No; and one of the reasons I made the rounds and talked to several members of the Armed Services Committee was to establish whether that might be done.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is all I have. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Now, Mr. Kantor, I find myself in a rather peculiar position. As you well know, politics is not my profession at all. I am just a reporter on sabbatical leave. The only reason I sit here is because I was an investigative reporter. As you well know, I think I broke one of the biggest scandals in American history, the Louisiana scandals and that is how I came here.

This is not an attempt to impugn you or anything else. I want to ask these questions because these memorandums are very intriguing and interesting to me.

During my whole tenure as an editor, my paper was never sued for libel. I think that record speaks for itself. In the memorandum of October 4 to Mr. Blanchard, you make this statement, "Met today with the Congressman who is buying secrets from sources in the Pentagon." Now, your only source or substantiation was Mr. Runnels, what you say Mr. Runnels told you?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You didn't know it at that time to be a fact or not, except he said it?

Mr. KANTOR. That is right.

Mr. HÉBERT. During your testimony here, and I am admiring the choice of words, because as you well know any reporter can take the same set of facts and twist anybody's nose with them by giving the same set of facts. Today when one member was questioning you about the cloak and dagger aspects of this, you said—I am drawing now from what you said, "he was talking in a low voice," did he take you in a corner and whisper to you? What did you mean by low voice?

Mr. KANTOR. It was lower than his normal voice. It was not a whisper. In other words, not a whisper of any kind, but it was a low modulated voice.

Mr. HÉBERT. You drew from this that it was a clandestine operation, and that he didn't want anybody to hear but you?

Mr. KANTOR. He didn't want other people to hear what he was saying.

Mr. HÉBERT. You assume that by his tone of voice, but you don't know that to be a fact, do you?

Mr. KANTOR. He called me off to the side, I think that is the—

Mr. HÉBERT. You don't know that to be a fact. You assumed that. These are your own words, not mine. Maybe he had a cold that day, or laryngitis, I don't know. You talked to him many, many times. Did he always talk to you in this low voice?

Mr. KANTOR. No.

Mr. HÉBERT. This was one occasion where you assumed everything else was a surreptitious operation all the way through?

Mr. KANTOR. I think you are trying to read more into what I said than what I said.

Mr. HÉBERT. You told your editor you had one hell of a story, that is what I am reading into it.

Mr. KANTOR. At that time, yes.

Mr. HÉBERT. You were going to try to sell that reporter that you had something hot going. Isn't that a fact?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I certainly don't want to downplay anything I am offering.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. You didn't downplay it, it is a very intriguing memorandum, because if I were an editor I would have gone out and found out if all these adjectives were correct.

And then we have, these stinging questions which Mr. Pike pursued to a great extent. The only stinging question you came up with was deletion, deletion, deletion. Maybe the sting was in the deletion. I am giving you the advantage of the doubt because you weren't at

that meeting. You don't know what was said, do you? If you had had access to the testimony of that hearing without deletion, would you have printed it?

Mr. KANTOR. No; I have no idea, really.

Mr. HÉBERT. Would you have printed it if you had gotten an unexpurgated copy of that testimony?

Mr. KANTOR. I don't know what the words were.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not asking you that. There was deletion, I don't know what the deletion myself was at this late date. I am agreeing with you, that somebody must have thought it was secret enough to delete, and the executive testimony in executive sessions is privileged testimony. I commend you since a lot of your colleagues don't have as high ethics as you do. You didn't look at "Secret." But would you have printed it?

Mr. KANTOR. I couldn't begin to answer it, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what——

Mr. HÉBERT. Let's get to the current events. There have been burglars around on the highway using police lanterns to hold up women on the highway. Suppose I came to you and said "Seth, old boy, my conscience is hurting me, I am that bandit." You would have printed that? Here I am the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, and I just told you that I was that bandit. That would make a great story.

Mr. KANTOR. I don't think——

Mr. HÉBERT. Would you have printed it on just what I told you?

Mr. KANTOR. I think I would contact Mr. Blanchard in Detroit and say "Mr. Hébert thinks that he is the bandit." [Laughter.]

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. You have certainly answered my question, but nowhere in here did you say Mr. Runnels thinks he bought this. You say he bought it. So you would have given me the benefit of the doubt, where you didn't give Mr. Runnels the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. KANTOR. I certainly, in my memorandum, did believe Congressman Runnels, yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. You just took it on his own words?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is no use belaboring the situation any more than that. I will tell you exactly what I told Mr. Runnels this morning. Our only interest is, was classified material sold, and do you have any evidence of it being sold?

Mr. KANTOR. I have no substantial evidence.

Mr. HÉBERT. You have no witness to substantiate anything that you have said here today? You testified there was nobody present when Mr. Runnels talked in a low voice so only you could hear him.

Mr. KANTOR. My conversations went at great length with Congressman Runnels, and they were with Congressman Runnels alone.

Mr. HÉBERT. You have nothing but Congressman Runnels' word against your word, and we have nothing but your word against his word, isn't that a fact?

Mr. KANTOR. Not quite.

Mr. HÉBERT. What is the fact?

Mr. KANTOR. There is another witness here today, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am talking about you. You will produce a witness?

Mr. KANTOR. There is one scheduled, yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Everybody will have his day in court, there are no closed doors. We operate in sunshine in this committee. This is no closed-door session. The witness that you will produce, we know who it is, of course?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not jockeying with you or playing for position. But nobody was ever present when Mr. Runnels told you that he was getting classified documents and paying for them?

Mr. KANTOR. There never was.

Mr. HÉBERT. There never was. So again we come to the situation of your word against Mr. Runnels', Mr. Runnels' against yours. He denies that he said it. He has no witnesses, he cannot document his statement. He doesn't have a scintilla of evidence.

Let's pursue the conversation when you first came to my office. You didn't suspect the Chairman because you came to me last. This committee operates as one. I had known you had been around. Do you recall what I told you at that time?

Mr. KANTOR. I believe so, yes.

Mr. HÉBERT. What did I tell you? And didn't you identify Mr. Runnels as the man?

Mr. KANTOR. No, I did not.

Mr. HÉBERT. You didn't identify him at that time—are you sure?

Mr. KANTOR. I am sure.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Runnels is the last man in the world I would suspect of doing that, although I am not denying that he might be capable of it.

Mr. KANTOR. I talked to quite a number of people on the committee and I never identified Mr. Runnels, by name, no, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. What did I tell you?

Mr. KANTOR. You told me you would reserve judgment until I put my cards on the table and you would see what I had to say, then you would make a judgment.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is correct. But didn't you use other words, didn't you say you could document your testimony when I told you you could put the cards on the table? And you said you were prepared to document it?

Mr. KANTOR. Perhaps I did, I don't recall.

Mr. HÉBERT. Perhaps you did.

Mr. KANTOR. I don't recall.

Mr. HÉBERT. Where are the documents? Where is the documentation? You have your chance.

Mr. KANTOR. I have already made it clear, I never saw them.

Mr. HÉBERT. All right, but you told me you were prepared to document it, but the documentation has not been brought forth.

Mr. KANTOR. That is true. I guess my fault is believing the Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. But you said you would document it. What did you have in mind as a documentation of what you are testifying to?

Mr. KANTOR. I am here without any documents.

Mr. HÉBERT. So you are not documenting it? Doesn't that follow, silence is the answer?

Mr. KANTOR. Well, I can't go any further than what I have said.

Mr. HÉBERT. The documents are not here?

Mr. KANTOR. I have another witness with me here today.

Mr. HÉBERT. We will get to that witness when we get to him. But I just want to bring what we are after into sharp focus. If Mr. Runnels wants to go around dishing out thousands of dollars, I wish I had met him as a reporter and possibly I wouldn't have had to come to Congress to earn my keep, I don't know.

I am not being in any way facetious about it, because I feel very keenly about a reporter's responsibility. I would, naturally, that is the only business I know—reporting. And I respect you for covering up your sources. I never ask a reporter to reveal his sources; that is his business and I believe in it, and I never do it. Certainly you didn't cover up your source in this instance. You identified Mr. Runnels in headlines in your newspaper and other newspapers that you service. Why did you reveal your source, then?

Mr. KANTOR. We felt the time had come to reveal the story.

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, you had a double standard, then?

Mr. KANTOR. I don't believe so. I felt all along it was important to get this story out, that there were people selling classified information, and we should find out who they are.

Mr. HÉBERT. I didn't want to interrupt you—

Mr. KANTOR. That is all right, sir; I wanted to say who they are and where all they are selling to.

Mr. HÉBERT. You haven't found out yet?

Mr. KANTOR. I absolutely haven't. Today is the first time I find two names.

Mr. HÉBERT. For your information and the information of the committee, the staff will go into the names and the cities, I mean the task they set about trying to find these people. We are not protecting Mr. Runnels, and we are not condemning you. All we want to find out is what I said in the beginning, are classified documents being sold? They may be being sold, I don't know, they probably are, I don't know. Probably not either, I don't know that, until we get the evidence. We are seeking the evidence as assiduously and eagerly as you are. We stand with two completely opposite views here, your word against Mr. Runnels', Mr. Runnels' against yours. Thank you very much.

Mr. KANTOR. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Who is your next witness you want to present?

Mr. KANTOR. Mr. Paul Poorman, the managing editor of the Detroit News.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Poorman, will you identify yourself, please?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say, Mr. Poorman, before you identify yourself, see what we editors have to put up with sometimes.

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir; I do indeed.

Mr. HÉBERT. We do it every day, don't we?

STATEMENT OF MR. PAUL POORMAN, MANAGING EDITOR, THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. POORMAN. My name is Paul Poorman, managing editor of the Detroit News.

Mr. HÉBERT. You may proceed without interruption.

Mr. POORMAN. Thank you. I first became aware of a situation involving Congressman Harold L. Runnels, Democrat of New Mexico,

in the fall of 1972. Allan Blanchard, national editor of the Detroit News, told me that Seth Kantor of our Washington Bureau had learned from the Congressman that there might be a story involving the possible sale of secret Pentagon documents by civilians. Kantor, in his role of investigative reporter, works directly for Blanchard, and kept him informed of his conversations with the Congressman through the winter.

In January of 1973, I was given more detail on the progress of Kantor's interviews. And the second week in February, I was fully briefed on the story as it stood at that time.

The reason for this was twofold: the Lincoln's Birthday break in the congressional session was approaching, and the Congressman was going to consult his lawyers in New Mexico while home; and Blanchard, the editor in charge of the story, was about to leave Detroit for 2 weeks. Due to the importance placed on the story, I would be actively involved in it during Blanchard's absence.

The holiday weekend passed, and on Tuesday, February 20, Kantor phoned me that the Congressman had said he would probably seek the advice of the Justice Department that week. Kantor and I felt the story would not hold any longer, and that we should prepare for publication the following Sunday.

Kantor and I agreed that I would telephone the Congressman personally to confirm the general outline of what the situation was, and to doublecheck the Congressman's position at that time.

Accordingly, I telephoned Congressman Runnels at his Washington office on Wednesday, February 21, 1973, to discuss the story. After the conversation I wrote a memo outlining what he said. The memo reads—which I might add the committee has in the form of a letter I wrote to Mr. Reddan.

Mr. HÉBERT. We do have that in our files.

Mr. POORMAN. Yes. Would you like me to read it?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, please.

Mr. POORMAN [reading]:

On Wednesday, February 21, 1973, I phoned Congressman Harold L. Runnels, Democrat of New Mexico, at his office in Washington, telephone number 225-2365, at 9:30 a.m. My purpose was to discuss with him a news story based on interviews he had had over a period of several months with Seth Kantor of the Detroit News Washington bureau. In those interviews Congressman Runnels had told Kantor of his purchase of confidential military information from civilians.

I identified myself as managing editor of the Detroit News and said that Seth Kantor suggested that I phone. The Congressman said yes, he was expecting my call and was happy to talk with me.

I explained that we had two concerns about the story. I said first this story about his purchase of confidential documents had been in the works since last September. He interrupted to say yes, that he had brought it to Kantor's attention at that time.

I said that a story pending for that length of time was bound to get out, that we had delayed printing it at his request, but that knowing the quality of reporters in Washington it was only a matter of time until someone else learned of it.

I said secondly that we felt there was a potential national security risk here, and that the public should know if there were people selling secret Pentagon documents in the streets or the halls of Congress.

He said yes, he was bothered by that, too. I asked Congressman Runnels if these men had approached him first and he replied "That is correct—but I am now having second thoughts as to if they were trying to help this country."

I told the Congressman that he was in a good position to bring this practice to an end, but that if it came out some other way he might not look good no matter how careful he was.

He said yes, he knew that. He recounted back in 1970 he had been sued for \$10 million for libel and that he didn't "want to be caught in any more danged traps." He said that even though he won that case he was now nervous about possible libel, hence was being very careful with this one. I said I didn't think he as a Congressman could be sued for such a thing. He said he didn't know, but that was the reason he wanted to consult the Justice Department. He said he had talked with "my attorney friends" in New Mexico who advised him to go to the Justice Department to seek clarification of his position. He told me he would do that "today if I get a chance or tomorrow" (Thursday, February 22, 1973).

I said that I felt we could hold off on a story for another day or so, but that we had waited a long time and might have to consider proceeding with the story regardless of what he did.

At this point he became agitated and his voice rose in apparent anger. He said I should do whatever I wanted. If I wanted to run the story "today" I could. He said he was tired of being hounded by Mr. Kantor and was not going to be "stampeded" into anything by "you, Mr. Poorman, or anyone else." I said that I felt September to February was hardly stampeding and he said again to do whatever I wanted but that I would have to bear the responsibility for it.

He said that he was sorry now that he had ever mentioned the story to Seth Kantor. He said he had responsibilities as a Congressman, and couldn't spend two or three hours every day talking to Kantor and me about this.

I replied that I felt he would appreciate our talking with him rather than proceeding without contacting him. I said our intent was not an attack on Congressman Runnels, but an effort to print a story about the possibility that someone was going around selling confidential Pentagon documents. The conversation ended shortly thereafter as we parted cordially on the phone.

That, to the best of my recollection, is the substance of my telephone conversation with Congressman Runnels.

Kantor then wrote the story, which I edited, and we printed it in our Sunday editions on February 25. I should note that our first Sunday edition actually reaches the streets in the late afternoon on Saturday. At that time, it was also available to the Associated Press, which distributed a summarized version of the story nationally.

Later Saturday evening the Associated Press distributed a new lead, or top, to the story, saying that Congressman Runnels had denied the story. The Associated Press reported that the Congressman said he had paid some individuals for research material, "but only because I did not have adequate staff to handle the project."

The Associated Press report continued:

He said that when he was a freshman Congressman he was approached by a couple of individuals who offered their services at \$1,000 a project or \$1,000 a project to work on as many projects as he wanted researched.

"These fellows were selling a service, not particularly any information, all of which I could have obtained myself had I had the time and staff to handle it."

The News said Runnels felt that as the junior member of the 43-member Armed Services Committee, he believed he needed the privileged information to better quiz generals who appeared before the Committee in private hearings in 1972 and to impress his colleagues with his questions. The nature of the hearings was not known.

He said the secret files were slipped under his office door in the middle of the night in what he called "a real cloak and dagger operation," according to the News.

"I had some material slipped under my door one night but that was where I told them to leave it, if I wasn't there," Runnels said in his statement Saturday night.

"It certainly wasn't a cloak and dagger operation as charged in the Detroit newspaper article," he said.

"Much of the information contained in the Detroit story is so absurd and asinine that I hesitate to comment on any of it," his statement said.

He said at no time did he use any of the information in Committee meetings and that one of the military projects on which he received research information, a new military tank, was cancelled.

I wish to make perfectly clear that at no time in my conversation with the Congressman did he deny any part of the story, nor did he offer any explanation such as he later gave to the press. He did not tell me that our information was wrong in any way.

That is the end of my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Reddan.

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Poorman, did you read a copy of the story to Congressman Runnels during that telephone conversation?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir. It wasn't written at that time.

Mr. REDDAN. How did he know what story you were going to print?

Mr. POORMAN. I can only tell you that I told him I was talking about the story that he had been talking about with Seth Kantor. I used the reference to the confidential documents, his purchase of confidential documents, and people selling secret Pentagon documents in the Halls of Congress, and he acknowledged—he didn't argue with me, to my reference to the story.

I want to make it clear, I didn't go into the story in detail with him.

Mr. REDDAN. At any time during this conversation, did he confirm that he was buying classified information, or confidential information?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir, he acknowledged only that he knew what I was talking about in the conversation.

Mr. REDDAN. Am I correct in assuming that that bit of confirmation you are referring to appears in the memorandum you just read? The confirmation consists in this—tell me whether or not I am correct. "I asked Congressman Runnels if these men had approached him first and he replied, that is correct—but I am now having second thoughts as to if they were trying to help this country." Is that it?

Mr. POORMAN. That is one part of it, yes, sir.

Mr. REDDAN. I see. What is the other confirmation that you refer to?

Mr. POORMAN. I said that I was calling about the story about his purchase of confidential documents which had been in the works since last September, and he said, yes, he had brought it to Kantor's attention at that time. And then the part you just read.

Mr. REDDAN. And what was your understanding of why he was going to the Justice Department?

Mr. POORMAN. To say that people were doing this, that is my understanding of it, yes, sir. I did not understand it that he was going to the Justice Department to seek advice about his position. I thought he was going to report this to the Justice Department.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you go into any further detail with him on that?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir, other than what I have read here.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you think he was going to the Justice Department to state that he had been purchasing confidential or classified information?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir, I thought he was going to talk to the Justice Department about the same story that he had talked to us about, and which we printed in the paper.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON. Just three questions, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Poorman, I am intrigued by some of the words that you use, and I would just like to know how near to direct quotes they are. For example, when you say that you used the term "confidential documents," is that the exact term you used, or did you use "secret"? As far as you can recall, what is the verbatim term you used?

Mr. POORMAN. I think I used "confidential." I will stress I didn't use that in the precise sense of an exact classification of a document, but confidential document, meaning a classified document.

Mr. DICKINSON. The quote that you ascribe to Mr. Runnels, that he was worried about that too, is that verbatim?

Mr. POORMAN. It is paraphrased here, but I think what he actually said was, "yes, I was worried about that." or "I was worried about that too." This is not a verbatim transcript of the telephone call. These are my notes to myself.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is what I understood. That is why I am trying to bring out with some particularity what actual terminology, or phrases were used, because it is possible it would be relevant.

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. In the part where you quote him as saying he was sorry that he ever mentioned the story to Kantor, did he say why? Was this paraphrased, or is this his statement?

Mr. POORMAN. No, he said he was sorry he had ever mentioned it to Kantor. He said that in some heat, in the context that he was agitated about this. He had told me he was tired of being hounded by Kantor, and said that he was not going to be stampeded by me into doing something, and that he was sorry he had ever mentioned it to Seth Kantor.

Mr. DICKINSON. What was your understanding of what he meant by being "stampeded into something"? Those were his words?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir, those were his words, again in the context. I was pressing him about just when he was going to go to the Justice Department.

Mr. DICKINSON. This was about going to the Justice Department, not about giving permission to print the story?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir, I wasn't asking permission.

Mr. DICKINSON. I see.

Mr. POORMAN. Going to the Justice Department and printing the story, and it was in that context I believe he said he didn't want to be stampeded by me. That is how I understood it.

Mr. DICKINSON. It is your understanding he is referring to being pushed to go to the Justice Department with the story, is that how you understood it?

Mr. POORMAN. And in our going to print a story, yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Stratton.

Mr. STRATTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POORMAN, did you at any time, prior to the actual publication of this story, make any effort to check it out in any way, to try to find any confirming data, other than the telephone call that you made to Mr. Runnels?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir. The story basically was being handled by Mr. Kantor as the reporter, and it was an unusual story in that the sole source of the story was also the subject of the story in a way. I didn't personally seek additional confirmation, other than Mr. Kantor has described over that 5-month period.

Mr. STRATTON. Here you were writing a story in Detroit about a Congressman from New Mexico. The only connection with Detroit was the fact that the fellow that you had on your payroll previously had covered New Mexico. Did you ever make any effort to check out Mr. Runnels in any way?

Mr. POORMAN. In a biographical sense, yes, sir; as to who he was and the facts about him. We saw the story as a Washington story, sir, not a New Mexico story, about the sale of documents, or possible sale of documents.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, as the Chairman has indicated here previously, regardless of whether it is a Washington story or not, before you fly with something that hot you ought to have some kind of confirmation, shouldn't you?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir, we felt we did. We had the Congressman himself telling us this. And in my opinion, confirming it to me on the phone.

Mr. STRATTON. Looking back on it, would you say that you might have acted as a managing editor a little bit hastily and perhaps should have looked into this a little bit further, rather than just going on Mr. Kantor's say-so alone?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir, I can't say that in all honesty. I am not sure—I cannot say looking back on it, I think I acted hastily or I should have done something different than was done.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me ask you this—

Mr. HÉBERT. Let me interrupt you, Sam, for a moment. I want to ask this so it doesn't escape in connection with the language you and I both understand, Mr. Poorman. When this first came to my attention I checked out Mr. Kantor, and he comes with high marks from his colleagues.

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Because I wanted to know what kind of reporter was writing this sort of thing, I checked him out. I didn't take a biographical sketch or anything, I checked the press gallery and everything, to find out what Kantor was, and he is highly regarded by his peers and colleagues, but I did check him out.

Mr. POORMAN. I had, too, not too much previous to that.

Mr. STRATTON. We are sitting here, I suppose, in a kind of quasi-judicial position on this particular case. Nobody has any documents. Nobody saw any documents. Nobody even claimed to have seen anything marked higher than confidential, which in the Pentagon hierarchy, as I say, almost represents nothing. There is actually one classification lower than that, which is "For Official Use Only."

We are in a difficult position. Isn't it possible, Mr. Poorman, looking back on this case, you had a freshman congressman who sat on a large committee. By the time they got down to him, as he indicated himself, most of the questions had already been asked. I have been in that position myself at one time. He was running for reelection. He was anxious perhaps to try to create in the impression of the newspapermen who were attached to him that he really was a pretty important wheel on that committee. Earlier Mr. Pike said maybe Mr. Kantor was the fellow who was being had. Well, perhaps we had here simply an attempt to try to create a little impression with Mr. Kantor that the gentleman from New Mexico, in spite of the fact of being a fairly junior member, still was as knowledgeable on that committee as any of his colleagues. Isn't it possible that this really is all that it is, and that Mr. Kantor, without checking it out, had decided this was a big inside Washington scandal, and it better appear on the top of page one of the Detroit News?

Mr. POORMAN. Mr. Stratton, with all respect, I don't believe I follow your conjecture that precisely. Your question to me was, is that possible? And I would have to say yes, sir, that is possible.

Mr. STRATTON. Well, we have to make a decision, and as I say, we are confronted with an unusual situation where we don't have any corpus delicti. Nobody has seen any documents. Nobody has any documents. And even the documents that were referred to were not really of a serious classified nature. So what could be the explanation?

Mr. POORMAN. The explanation of what, sir? I am not sure what your question is?

Mr. STRATTON. I am asking you whether this may not really be the explanation of the story that appeared in your paper.

Mr. POORMAN. I suppose it could. I don't know. How do you want me to answer that, sir? I don't agree with your explanation, but that is a personal opinion.

Mr. STRATTON. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Hunt.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret that I have not been here sooner, but several other conflicting committee assignments kept me out of the meeting here today.

So most of the testimony that has been adduced here, of course, I didn't hear. But in going over your letter, Mr. Poorman, to John Reddan, the counsel, dated March 5, 1973, in the next to the last paragraph I note you said that "we had delayed printing it at his request." Do you mean to say you delayed printing the story that Mr. Kantor had filed at the request of Mr. Kantor, or Mr. Runnels?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir. I am guilty of an imprecision there. We felt that this was—the source of this story was the Congressman. And the Congressman said in essence, over a 5-month period—I had not spoken with him this time, this is second hand. He said, in essence, no, I am not ready yet. That is what I meant by "at his request." However, no, we did not have a story written on paper until Saturday morning before we printed it on Sunday.

So there wasn't a story that Mr. Kantor had filed that I was delaying.

Mr. HUNT. How many editions of the story did you print in the Detroit News?

Mr. POORMAN. How many copies, sir?

Mr. HUNT. No; how many times did you print the continuing story? I have seen three copies of three different dates.

Mr. POORMAN. We had, in all, four stories, four different dates. They were four different stories.

Mr. HUNT. What was the first date of the first story?

Mr. POORMAN. February 25.

Mr. HUNT. February 25, 1973.

Mr. POORMAN. Excuse me one moment, I will be certain. Yes, February 25, Sunday, February 25.

Mr. HUNT. The beginning of the story coming to you through Seth Kantor had been back in September of 1972?

Mr. POORMAN. I believe October was when I first knew about it, sir; early October.

Mr. HUNT. This is what you are referring to in your letter?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. That you held it up; after the first portion of the story. When was the next time you printed something about it?

Mr. POORMAN. We had a story on Monday the 26th, and Tuesday the 27th. And I have lost track of whether February has 28 days.

Mr. HUNT. As I recall that story, it first started out by saying that Mr. Runnels had been approached by someone who sold him some papers. Mr. Runnels had talked to Mr. Kantor?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Later, as the last interview developed, it came down to a point of where there was some denial on the part of Mr. Runnels that he had said certain things?

Mr. POORMAN. No; he didn't deny that to us.

Mr. HUNT. He didn't deny it to you?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HUNT. That is the point I wanted to clear up.

Mr. POORMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. You printed that part, though?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, on Monday.

Mr. HUNT. Who did he deny it to?

Mr. POORMAN. I don't know who physically spoke with whom on this. I don't know whether Mr. Runnels spoke with someone or whether someone in his office here spoke with someone. But the denial or retraction or comment on the part of Mr. Runnels was carried by the Associated Press. And that is where we got it.

Mr. HUNT. In other words, that is the portion I am coming to, the portion of the denial came to you through the medium of another reporter?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. At no time did your paper, in connection with Mr. Runnels, deny the story you had printed?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Poorman, first I would like to say to you, and on your behalf, that I agree with the concept that all other things being equal, a reporter has the right to rely on statements made to him by a Congressman as being accurate and news. But did you ever get any report in the course of talking about this story with either Mr. Kantor or any intermediary, to the effect that other Congressmen didn't believe the story?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir; I think we had that in our first article, or in the second article, that other Congressmen—no; excuse me.

Mr. PIKE. Didn't believe the story; that is what I am saying?

Mr. POORMAN. No; I don't think it was put exactly that way.

Mr. PIKE. You never got that report from Mr. Kantor?

Mr. POORMAN. No; Mr. Kantor never told me other Congressmen didn't believe this story. He did tell me the comments made by the Congressmen he spoke with. I don't remember all of them, but he named them this morning.

Mr. PIKE. In your conversation with Mr. Runnels, you stated, according to your letter to Mr. Reddan, and this is almost verbatim what your testimony was, that you told Mr. Runnels that he was in a good position to bring this practice to an end, but that if it came out some other way, he might not look good, no matter how careful he was.

In your judgment, did he look good the way it did come out in your paper?

Mr. POORMAN. I guess, since I said that, I should offer a judgment on it. No, I don't think he did.

Mr. PIKE. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Randall.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POORMAN, in your memorandums, I was intrigued by some wording you used on the first page. You said a story pending that length of time is bound to get out—delayed printing, and so forth, but knowing the quality of reporters in Washington, it was only a matter of time.

Do you regard that as good quality or bad quality? What did you mean? You mean you were in there really with investigative reporters?

Mr. POORMAN. I think they are, some of them are, yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. You weren't afraid you would be scooped—was that your fear? You had done a lot of work on it, and you were afraid somebody might scoop you?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RANDALL. That is why you went ahead, you wanted to make sure someone didn't get ahead of you?

Mr. POORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. I have one more question, Mr. Chairman.

We all waited with bated breath when Mr. Kantor was asked if there were any other corroborations or witnesses, and his answer was "Not quite." You heard Mr. Kantor say that, and the Chairman said silence must be the answer. I just want to be certain on the record.

You have no further corroboration of any kind?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir; my testimony today involves the conversation with Mr. Runnels.

Mr. RANDALL. I thought there must be some new witness out in the hall we hadn't heard of. You are the witness he was speaking of?

Mr. POORMAN. I was the witness Mr. Kantor referred to, yes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Poorman, you have written a memorandum here, and then you read from some notes there. I ask you if this telephone conversation was monitored? Was there a tape made on it?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. No one listening in on the line?

Mr. POORMAN. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. In other words, this is the memo, this is the letter, this is all there is to it. There is not going to be anything else coming up in the future on it, any monitoring or tape transcription?

Mr. POORMAN. No.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Daniel.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Poorman, I came out of a highly competitive industry just like yours is, and I realize the necessity of doing certain things, but you said something in the early part of your statement that bothers me. When you were talking about Mr. Runnels calling on the Justice Department, I believe you said that you felt the story would not hold any longer. That bothers me. I realize that the Constitution does not require that the press be factual, it only requires it to be free. But it occurs to me at the same time that that freedom imposes upon the press a tremendous responsibility to be accurate.

I haven't found any evidence yet to indicate to me there is any corroborating evidence to support such serious charges as were made in this story.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think that is all, Mr. Poorman. Thank you very much.

Mr. POORMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Do we have another witness?

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Lally.

Mr. HÉBERT. Wait a minute, I want to ask Mr. Kantor. Do you have any more witnesses?

Mr. KANTOR. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. This is your case?

Mr. KANTOR. Yes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you.

All right, Mr. Lally.

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Lally makes a statement, I thought perhaps it might be helpful to a better understanding of his presentation if I explained briefly for the record that our primary concern in this investigation was the national security aspect of the case, and if I also state, for the record, the facts we had to work with. They were relatively few.

We were told that there were three men involved in the sale of this information. We were given the names of two men, a Walter Snyder and a Ben Thomas. We did not know how the name "Snyder" was spelled, so we checked out all possible spellings of the name. The third man was unidentified.

We were told these men had done legislative work. We had a very general physical description of the men. Snyder, we were told, was 28 to 31 years of age, about 5 feet 10 inches, 170 to 180 pounds, brown hair and brown eyes.

Thomas, we were told, was 28 to 31 years of age, about 6 feet 1 inch, 190 pounds, black hair, hazel eyes and glasses.

The third man we had no name for. We were told he was about 30 to 31 years of age, 5 feet 6 inches to 5 feet 7 inches, 200 to 210 pounds, dark hair and acne marks on his face.

We were told these men, at least two of them, made five or six visits to Congressman Runnels' office in the Longworth Building. We were told that one of those visits probably occurred during the nighttime hours, when visitors were required to sign in before entering the House Office Building.

We were also told that Mr. Snyder had furnished a Washington telephone number to Congressman Runnels, but that that telephone reportedly had been disconnected when Congressman Runnels tried to contact him in February 1973.

With that background, Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Lally to proceed.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Lally.

Identify yourself for the record.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN F. LALLY, ASSISTANT COUNSEL, ARMED SERVICES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. LALLY. John Lally, assistant counsel for the Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to corroborate the details of Congressman Runnels' statements, specifically (1) the identification of Walter Snyder and Ben Thomas, and (2) fixing the date of delivery and identification of the persons who delivered an envelope to his Longworth Building office, the subcommittee staff personnel took the following actions:

(1) Each of the three Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone companies operating in the Washington metropolitan area was subpoenaed for any and all telephone numbers, both published and unpublished in the name of Walter Snyder under the various spellings of that name—Schneider, or Snider, et cetera. The companies reported eight listings under various forms of the name. Staff interviews conducted by Mr. Ransom established that each of those persons appeared to be over 40 years of age, and for one reason or another, did not fit the physical description of Mr. Snyder furnished by Congressman Runnels.

(2) The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency were requested to conduct examinations of their indices to determine whether they contained the names of any Walter Snyder or Ben Thomas who could possibly be identified with the persons described by Congressman Runnels. Both agencies reported that their files contained no person by those names whose physical description would match those furnished by Mr. Runnels.

(3) The Department of Defense was requested to conduct an examination of its personnel records to determine whether any persons bearing either of those names had been employed by the Department in the Washington metropolitan area in either a military or civilian capacity during the past 5 years. That search produced seven persons by those names. Six were eliminated for failing to fit the physical descriptions furnished by Mr. Runnels—four for age, two were Negro. The remaining man, Walter J. Snyder is 29 years old and a former Navy enlisted man. He was subsequently employed by the Navy Investigative Service as a civilian employee at grade GS-5. In a telephone interview, Mr. Snyder reported he left the Washington area in 1969 and has not returned here since that time.

(4) The General Accounting Office was requested to determine whether either of those men had ever been employed at that agency. It reported that no person by either name in the 28- to 35-year age bracket had been employed by GAO in the Washington area.

(5) The House Disbursing Office reported that an examination of the records for that office back to 1900 reveals that no individual by either name had been employed in any House office since 1941.

(6) The Personnel Office of the Library of Congress reported that neither Snyder nor Thomas had been employed at the Library during the past 5 years.

(7) In attempting to identify the person or persons who slipped an envelope under Mr. Runnels' office door, the sign-in sheets to all entrances of the House Office Buildings were examined for the 3-month period from April 1 to June 30, 1972. All persons entering any of the House Office Buildings between 6 p.m. and 7 a.m. from Monday to Saturday, and between 1 p.m. Saturday and 7 a.m. Monday, are required to produce identification and sign a sheet listing their names, destination and time of entry.

These sheets were examined for the names Walter Snyder, and its variations, and Ben Thomas, and for any person who listed room

1727 or 1728, Congressman Runnels' suite, as his destination. The names in question were not found on those sign-in sheets. Except for Congressman Runnels' staff personnel and their spouses, only three persons were found to have entered the building outside of normal business hours citing Mr. Runnels' office as their destination. Each of those persons was subsequently identified by Mr. Runnels as having gone to his office for some purpose other than the delivery of the envelope in question.

That is the extent of the efforts of the staff, sir.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you also check the city directory?

Mr. LALLY. We did check the city directories for Walter Snyders and Ben Thomases, and we came up with just about the same people that we came up with on the telephone companies' and Defense Department records.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Stratton.

Mr. STRATTON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Gubser?

Mr. GUBSER. No questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Lally, in the course of your investigation, did you establish the date at which this research was allegedly done for Mr. Runnels?

Mr. LALLY. As best we could determine from Mr. Runnels' statement, it occurred some time between April and the end of June, and that was the period in which we concentrated our efforts.

Mr. PIKE. In the backup which you have provided us with in this investigation, you have said that the Cheyenne study was delivered over a 6-week period. Can you tell us when those deliveries were made?

Mr. LALLY. Recalling the interview of Congressman Runnels with Mr. Reddan, I believe that those deliveries occurred during the month of May, and possibly the first week in June. The second package, then, followed in the next, roughly, 3 to 4 weeks.

Mr. PIKE. Do you recall when the Cheyenne contract was canceled?

Mr. LALLY. I believe that it was canceled in August of 1972, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE. All right. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Hunt.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Lally, during the course of your investigation, are we to understand now that you have been unable at any time, checking the names, the physical descriptions that you have received from Mr. Runnels, unable to come up with any one person answering those descriptions?

Mr. LALLY. In that particular age bracket, yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. During your investigation, did any other instances of alleged attempted sales to other Congressmen come to your attention?

Mr. LALLY. We were informed by Mr. Kantor that he had interviewed other Congressmen who had been approached by certain persons who were offering to do research work for them, yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Did those persons in any way resemble the physical descriptions given to you by Mr. Runnels, any of those three?

Mr. LALLY. One of the men would roughly have fit the description furnished by Mr. Runnels, yes, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Have you made the names known to the other members of the committee today?

Mr. LALLY. There are letters in the back of the book provided to the members from two of these gentlemen.

Mr. HUNT. So they really do know?

Mr. LALLY. Yes, they are known to the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. HUNT. All right, then, coming into a different vein. Have you found anyone else, either on Mr. Runnels' staff or in the adjoining offices, or any other person in the halls of Congress, who at any time saw people answering the description provided you by Mr. Runnels in and about his office?

Mr. LALLY. First of all, let me say we didn't talk to the people in the adjacent offices, Mr. Hunt. We did talk to all the people on Mr. Runnels' current staff, as well as some persons formerly employed by him. One of the ladies on Mr. Runnels' staff, Mrs. Hapke, has a recollection of some gentlemen coming into the office at roughly this period. She has a physical description which tallies generally with that provided by Mr. Runnels. She recalled a name which was not similar to the names provided by Mr. Runnels. She recalled the name of Howard, and that is the only one on the staff who had any recollection of any persons who possibly could be identified with these people.

Mr. HUNT. Did the name "Howard" appear on any sign-in sheets in Mr. Runnels' office during that period?

Mr. LALLY. No, sir.

Mr. HUNT. It did not?

Mr. LALLY. No, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Randall.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I understand it, all of your investigation has been during the times everybody has to check in and out at night?

Mr. LALLY. That is correct, sir. The rules provide any person entering the buildings must present identification and state the office of his destination.

Mr. RANDALL. In other words, the story we read, whoever was delivering these things and slipping them under the door had to know the times that the maids came and cleaned up to avoid those.

Is it your testimony that you checked the register, and have you gone so far as to talk to any of the guards that are on duty at night over in the Longworth Building?

Mr. LALLY. It would be all entrances to the House Office Buildings, Mr. Randall, at the Cannon, Longworth, Rayburn, and the subway entrances.

Mr. RANDALL. If you were to read the part of the story which said that they could, in a clandestine way, sort of cloak and dagger, slip it under the door at night and avoid the maids, do you think that could be possible today?

Mr. LALLY. It could be possible, Mr. Randall, for while persons are required to provide a destination and a name, somebody with identification could have provided a destination other than Mr. Runnels' office.

Mr. RANDALL. We are turning on the word "possible" or "likely." Have you found in your investigation, a lack of security then?

Mr. LALLY. I don't know that there is a lack of security, Mr. Randall. I haven't had the experience with it myself to know how tight it is, but the regulations appear clear enough.

Mr. RANDALL. Have you ever come in yourself without registering?

Mr. LALLY. I have never come in myself without registering, no, sir. There is one possibility, though, Mr. Randall, the sign-in requirements are lifted at 7 a.m.

Mr. RANDALL. Lifted at 7 a.m.?

Mr. LALLY. A person coming in after 7 a.m. could come into the building without signing in.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Daniel?

Mr. DANIEL. I have no questions, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Reddan.

Mr. REDDAN. Mr. Lally, did you also examine the telephone records and the appointment books in the Congressman's office?

Mr. LALLY. Yes, we did.

Mr. REDDAN. Did you find there any reference to either Ben Thomas or Mr. Snyder?

Mr. LALLY. No, we didn't.

I should say that with respect to the telephone records, the lady who keeps those records said that they might not have been the complete sheets that she had for the entire period, but it was all that she had retained, though.

Mr. REDDAN. Nothing further.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Lally.

Mr. RUNNELS, do you care to add, or rest on your statement?

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the other members of the committee for taking of your time and energies and your efforts. I could not think that there is much that I can add to what has already been said.

I would like to clarify one statement. I have not mentioned nor involved any other Senator or Congressman in any of my conversations with anyone.

Mr. HÉBERT. Thank you very much.

Mr. RUNNELS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 4 p.m. the subcommittee hearing was concluded.]