

December 4, 1990

C-SPAN
400 No. Capitol Street N.W.
Suite 650
Washington, D.C. 20001

✓cc: T. Murphy

00433 DEC 10 90
JAN 16 AMS'D

To Whom It May Concern:

Let me begin by stating that I am a regular viewer of your network coverage, and greatly appreciate your public service. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to verbalize all that I would like to say in this particular letter. However, I have viewed the so-called "Keating Five" hearings without missing a single minute of testimony, whether it be during the live coverage or taped viewing in the evening. As a result, I have drawn some of my own conclusions based upon the testimony and evidence presented thus far. I should also add that I have made numerous attempts to become involved during the caller segments without success. As a result, I feel obligated to direct this letter to your attention.

As far as a quick observation is concerned, it appears to me at this point in time, that Senator Glenn is the least implicated in these proceedings. Conversely, it appears that Senator DeConcini is the most implicated in terms of any misconduct and/or impropriety. While I do have compassion for the present ill health of Senator Cranston, it appears that he is running a close second to DeConcini. Since the proceedings have made it quite clear that in part, we are dealing with "appearance" to some degree, there is no doubt in my mind that my observations are well-founded at this point in the investigation.

Please let it be known that I am absolutely appalled at the fact that your network permitted Senator DeConcini to appear at some length during today's lunch break, without permitting the public to call and ask questions or make statements to DeConcini. I would wager a large sum of money that DeConcini insisted upon that stipulation. The fact that you permitted calls from viewers after DeConcini made his feeble attempt to convince the viewers of his innocence and virtuosity, was no consolation prize for me, and I suspect others. On the other hand, I vividly recall that after Senator McCain made his opening statement, he did appear during lunch break or at day's end, but apparently agreed to be subjected to calls from the viewing public. In fact, I recall that a number of callers had some rather unkind words for Senator McCain. Regardless, I believe your decision to permit DeConcini to speak today in the absence of permitting call-ins, was improper at best.

Now I would like to make my most important point relative to the hearing in general terms. Let us assume that I was on trial for allegedly having taken part in some type of misconduct or act of impropriety, and let us assume that the trial was conducted before a jury of my peers. That is the democratic process. Without the necessity of revealing my personal feelings relative to the six Senators who presently sit on the Ethics Committee in the "Keating Five" hearing, the fact remains that all six Senators are co-workers with the five Senators under investigation. As I understand it, the worst that can happen as a result of these hearings to any or all of the "Keating Five", is expulsion from the Senate. Under those circumstances, I would hardly call this a fair hearing, whereby the

committee of judges are co-workers of the "Keating Five". The fact that three members of the committee are Republicans and the other three are Democrats is purely academic. Let's get back to my point. If I was on trial, the jury would consist of citizens who don't know me or know anything about me. With that in mind, could it not have been arranged whereby, for example, six legitimate and impartial judges could have comprised this committee? Does that not seem to be the most impartial and equitable manner by which to conduct such proceedings? I just don't understand it! If I was on trial, I would love to have the luxury of the judging committee consist of co-workers! I believe my point is made. Whether or not you agree with my point is another issue.

One final note. In my opinion, Special Counsel Robert Bennett is an absolute genius! He was employed by the committee to gather all of the facts available to assist in this hearing. Yet, Senator DeConcini continues to refer to Mr. Bennett as the special "prosecutor", which he did again today. If I am not mistaken, DeConcini is the only one of the "Keating Five" to refer to Mr. Bennett as such, at least on a regular basis. As an outsider looking in, there is no doubt in my mind that DeConcini is referring to Bennett as a "prosecutor", as a ploy to divert the attention from his, meaning DeConcini's probable guilt, due to the facts being brought to light by Mr. Bennett. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Bennett is merely doing the job which was asked of him by the committee. For what it's worth, I have also drawn conclusions as to the five defense attorneys involved. In my opinion, the most effective attorney is Mr. Dowd, and the least effective is Mr. Hamilton. I suppose I am entitled to my opinion, regardless of the topic.

In any event, I appreciate the fact that someone in your office has presumably read this letter. I would like to obtain one piece of information, and that is the mailing address for Special Counsel Bennett.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Richardson, TX 75083
[REDACTED]