







































































































there?

MS. DENMAN: When the request came from the committees here to come and meet with you, I went back through -- I didn't really know what to do. And so I went back in my office to my computer and just simply tried to print off all the emails that -- and I hope I got every one of them -- that came during this timespan.

MR. CONAWAY: All right. So these would be emails back and forth with your Texas colleagues? Is this after the convention? Before the convention? When did you start the document search, in terms of -- would this include stuff for just Texas convention or just --

MS. DENMAN: No, no. Well, it goes back to -- you know, it goes back to the beginning of being elected to be --

MR. CONAWAY: The beginning of what now?

MS. DENMAN: To be elected out of the Dallas -- the Dallas meeting of the Dallas convention.

MR. CONAWAY: Okay. Do you recall offhand, are there emails or correspondence with the Trump campaign, direct?

MS. DENMAN: Well, in the first place, no.

MR. CONAWAY: Okay.

MS. DENMAN: But I'm just thinking if there were any requests for money.

I --

MR. CONAWAY: Right. Right, right, right.

MS. DENMAN: I didn't figure they were very important here.

MR. CONAWAY: Okay.

MR. DRISCOLL: Just so you know, I've got a copy of what was

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

submitted --

MR. CONAWAY: All right.

MR. DRISCOLL: -- if you guys want to make a copy.

MR. CONAWAY: No, we've got that.

Let's go off the record real quickly.

[Recess.]

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[12:01 p.m.]

MR. CONAWAY: We'll back on the record.

And, Mr. Schiff, the floor is yours.

MR. SCHIFF: So, in your discussions, Ms. Denman, with J.D. Gordon, did he say what objection Mr. Trump reportedly had to the language?

MS. DENMAN: I want to clarify that I'm still unsure that it was Mr. Trump he was talking to.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, that's why I say "reportedly."

MS. DENMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: But he at least represented to you he was talking to Mr. Trump.

MS. DENMAN: He did.

MR. SCHIFF: And did he represent to you what Mr. Trump thought of the amendment or what objection he might have to your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: No. The only things that were addressed was what his name was, where he was calling, and who he was talking to.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you feel that the language that was changed in your amendment had the effect of watering it down?

MS. DENMAN: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you recall, was this the only amendment in the national security/military defense subcommittee that was amended in this way? Were there any other amendments that were either defeated or where the author was forced to change their language?

MS. DENMAN: I believe not. I believe this was the only one.

MR. SCHIFF: So, to the best of your recollection, the only -- was this the

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

only time you saw the Trump campaign people -- Mr. Gordon, Mr. Miller -- intervene with respect to an amendment?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. Absolutely. But it was the only -- yes. I didn't see them after that session.

MR. SCHIFF: And so, when you later brought the amendment back to the attention of the committee, before it was apparently about to recess, and there was a discussion about changed language to the amendment, were you presented with a new draft to look at before there was a final decision of the subcommittee?

MS. DENMAN: I believe not.

MR. SCHIFF: Did they verbally express to you what they were going to do to change the amendment?

MS. DENHAM: No -- yes. It was certainly discussed that those were the words that they felt should be amended.

MR. SCHIFF: And those words were "lethal assistance"?

MS. DENMAN: "Weapons of lethal decision," yeah. "Weapons of lethal defensive." Those were -- of all the what I felt were the things that focused on and addressed what's happening in the Ukraine currently, that wording was the only thing that they felt should be changed.

MR. SCHIFF: And was it apparent to you that but for the intervention of Mr. Gordon and Mr. Miller the Republican Party platform would have included your language providing defensive lethal assistance, military assistance to Ukraine?

MS. DENMAN: I would love to be able to speculate on that, but I have not an answer for that.

MR. SCHIFF: But the only feedback that you received from other delegates was supportive of your amendment.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. DENMAN: That's true.

MR. SCHIFF: And in the absence of that intervention, there was no reason for you to believe other delegates would have opposed your amendment.

MS. DENMAN: That's accurate. But you and I both realize you never know until something comes up for discussion what process and what road it will take forward.

MR. SCHIFF: Certainly.

So, when this change was proposed, did you agree to the change so that at least some of your language would go forward?

MS. DENMAN: Absolutely.

MR. SCHIFF: And you mentioned earlier that you made a personal decision not to relitigate this before the full -- would've been before the full convention or the full platform committee?

MS. DENMAN: I felt that it was -- that it should go forward. And if it could not go forward, as I personally thought it should go forward as such, that it was more important for it to go forward. Because we were coming, quite frankly, into a convention. Mr. Trump had won. He was our candidate, or would be by our process. And I felt that it was more meaningful and more important to go forward with it at least being addressed and not going to, shall I say, combat along the way or dissension along the way.

MR. SCHIFF: Let me, if I could, go through some of the documents with you.

There's a document that begins on Bates stamp page 4. It's a Washington Post article written by Josh Rogan entitled "Trump Campaign Guts GOP's Anti-Russia Stance on Ukraine."

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

In that article, on Bates stamp page 6, it quotes you as saying, "On the sideline, Denman tried to persuade Trump staffers not to change the language but failed. 'I was troubled when they put aside my amendment and then watered it down,' Denman told me. 'I said, what is your problem with a country that wants to remain free? It seems like a simple thing.'"

Is that consistent with your recollection of your conversation with Mr. Gordon?

MS. DENMAN: I didn't go into it with Gordon in that -- I did not go into it at that length with Gordon. With Gordon, it was, who do you work for, who are you calling, and what is your problem with my amendment? And he didn't give me an answer to what his problem was with my amendment. He simply said he had to clear it.

MR. SCHIFF: The article then goes on to say, "Finally, Trump staffers wrote an amendment to Denman's amendment that stripped out the platform's call for providing lethal defensive weapons and replaced it with softer language calling for appropriate assistance."

Is that the change that was made in the subcommittee?

MS. DENMAN: It was discussed in the subcommittee it would be worked on to go forward in the platform.

MR. SCHIFF: And then when you ultimately saw the language that they arrived on, it went from your language of providing lethal defensive weapons to "appropriate assistance"?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. And I saw that when I then went into full committee and we were given the printout of what would be in the platform to vote on as a whole.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

And I would like to clarify, if I may, sir, that I have never once sought out the press, called the press, in any way. The only interviews have been when the press has called me.

MR. SCHIFF: Bates-stamped document number 9 is an email to you from R.D. Fisher, Rick Fisher, dated July 21st, that says, "Thank you for offering an amendment on Ukraine that I understand was rejected by our nominee. I fear that many more issues of common sense will require that the brave stand up and continually demand that our freedom be defended. I hope that we are not headed toward a period of new darkness but stand ready to join you in shining the light. Sincerely, Rick Fisher."

Was Mr. Fisher also a delegate?

MS. DENMAN: No, no, no. If you don't know him, I'd like for you to sometime know him. But Rick Fisher I've known over a period of a number of years. He worked at the Heritage Foundation; he has worked elsewhere. I'd really like for you to know him sometime.

But he has focused primarily on international issues and primarily on China and the Chinese weapons that I've read his reading on for many years.

MR. SCHIFF: And how did he come to be aware of your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: Well, I guess people who are believing in the national foreign policy under Reagan, we keep in contact.

MR. SCHIFF: Let me turn your attention to Bates stamp number 12. It says: Diana Denman, RNC National Security/Military Platform Subcommittee Proposed Plank on Ukraine.

If you could take a look at it, is that the language, precise language, you offered at the platform subcommittee?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. DENMAN: Yes. This is what I submitted.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

If you look at the document that begins with Bates stamp number 13, are you able to identify in that document -- it lists on Sunday, July 10th, a platform committee meeting at 3:00 p.m. and subcommittee meetings the following morning.

Would you be able to identify when your subcommittee meeting met by looking at that?

MS. DENMAN: For the discussion -- when we went into the Sunday afternoon meeting, that was simply to sort of tell us where we were going to go and what we were to be working on as a committee.

MR. SCHIFF: So the subcommittee meeting that you had, then, does not appear on this schedule?

MR. DENMAN: No, it should be on the one on the 11th.

MR. SCHIFF: Oh, it's the one on the 11th. I see.

MS. DENMAN: Uh-huh. We were there that morning meeting from 8:30, theoretically, to 12:30.

MR. SCHIFF: Alrighty.

If I could turn your attention to the document Bates stamped number 25. This is an email from -- well, at the top of the page, it's an email from you to Victor Ashe (ph). The subsequent line says, "Re: Proposed insertion into 2016 RNC platform committee."

And it references a July 10th email from Victor Ashe (ph) that says, "I fully agree. I also feel we should endorse visa waiver status for Poland. I'm a former ambassador to Poland, 2004 to 2009, was an election observer twice in Ukraine,

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

and did two IRI programs in Ukraine in L'vov and Odessa. Victor Ashe (ph)."

Was this an email along the lines that you were describing earlier of someone that wrote to you in advance of the committee meeting to express support for your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. He was answering when I had previously sent out the copy of the plank I was going to propose. He was answering that. And I took the reading -- the way I read it, I took it to mean that he would potentially be supportive.

MR. SCHIFF: Was he on the subcommittee as well?

MS. DENMAN: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And if I could direct your attention to Bates stamp number 29 --

MS. DENMAN: I believe so.

MR. SCHIFF: -- which is an email from Matt Miller to yourself, the subject matter, "platform committee." Was this the email you referenced in which Mr. Miller introduced himself and forwarded a copy of his resume?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. I believe this is my only email from him. I believe. I think that's the only one -- I really had no contact with those people until I got into the subcommittee meeting.

MR. SCHIFF: Alrighty.

[REDACTED] Five minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: If I could direct your attention to Bates stamp number 124, there is an email from Chuck Cunningham to Diana Denman in which I think there's an earlier referenced email from you. "Who do I submit mine to? Plus, the other members don't know the structure. Have one on the Ukraine."

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Were you seeking his help in terms of the process for introducing your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: I was really seeking -- Chuck Cunningham I've known for many years. He's a member of an organization I also -- I believe he is -- that I belong to. But he comes from the Christian right community. And I think I'm right in saying he still works on the right -- the gun -- what's the gun committee?

MR. DRISCOLL: NRA?

MS. DENMAN: NRA. I think he's still hired by the NRA.

But I found out that he was assigned to work on the platform process. And so it seemed a logical reach for me to reach for someone who knew me, that I could ask him how it should be submitted or the process about it.

MR. SCHIFF: If I could direct your attention to Bates stamp number 136, which includes an email from h-e-r-p-i-r-c-h.

MS. DENHAM: That is Herman Pirchner.

MR. SCHIFF: And is he with that institute that you mentioned earlier?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. He runs the American Foreign Policy Institute.

MR. SCHIFF: And there's an email from Mr. Berman (ph), or Elian Berman (ph), to him, with the subject, "Blurb on Ukraine, does this work?" Was that an internal discussion within the institute, or who was he emailing whom on this?

MS. DENMAN: Just Herman and ultimately to me, as far as I know.

MR. SCHIFF: And this was part of your vetting language on Ukraine?

MS. DENMAN: Yes. He has worked for Pirchner for many years. And, again, this foundation addresses first years ago into Eastern Europe and into Russia. They've done a lot of writing on Russia through the years, but also on, gosh, India and that area of the world with nuclear, et cetera, and then now China.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SCHIFF: If I could direct your attention to Bates stamp 143 from Philip Wilson to yourself that begins: "Hi, Diana. Thank you for your proposal. I just received a report last week from some missionaries that I've spent time with in Safarhozia (ph), Ukraine."

With this another response to your sending a draft of your --

MS. DENMAN: For my email that went out to delegates, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay.

I'm probably out of time, so I'll yield back, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CONAWAY: Ileana.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: Yes. Thank you so much.

Thank you, first of all, for your life of activism and being involved in the clear and present dangers that our country faces. Thank you for your work in helping the freedom fighters in Nicaragua and in El Salvador. So I appreciate your concern. Having been born in Cuba, we know that this action is still alive and well.

I wanted to cite a few statements made by Byron York -- I don't know him -- in the Washington Examiner on March 18th, 2017. And he says a key talking point in the theory that -- paraphrasing -- that Trump and the Russians conspired in the election is the allegation that, during the Republican Convention, the Trump campaign changed the GOP platform to weaken its stance on Russia's aggression in Ukraine.

And he says it's been cited many times; he says, the only problem is that it's wrong. And he cites Rachel Maddow, who said, "Donald Trump changed the Republican platform to what some experts would regard as pro-Russian." And then this is repeated by Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook and other folks.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

And NPR does a whole story.

So I look at the platform that was adopted --

MS. DENMAN: Yes.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: -- and I'm reading it. And it says, "We support maintaining and, if warranted, increasing sanctions together with our allies against Russia unless and until Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity are fully restored. We also support providing appropriate assistance to the Armed Forces of Ukraine and greater coordination with NATO defense planning."

So that's the platform language.

MS. DENMAN: That's the way it ended up, yes.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: Now, would you say that -- let me just have your opinion. Do you think that Maddow is correct when she says Donald Trump changed the Republican platform to become what some experts would regard as pro-Russia? Do you see anything in that platform language that hints at being pro-Russia?

MS. DENMAN: I don't recall that the subject of Russia was even discussed or we were aware of it before or during the convention.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: Because this seems rather strong. It says sanctions; they talk about Ukraine's sovereignty that should be fully restored, territorial integrity. It talks about appropriate assistance to the Armed Forces of Ukraine. I would not classify that as pro-Russia.

And, furthermore, in this --

MS. DENMAN: And I have to say, neither would I.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: I know. To call this pro-Russia, oh, my goodness, it's flabbergasting.

Now, this article, this op-ed, also points out that, had your terrific amendment been adopted as you proposed it, whether one agrees with it or not, that it would have given the Ukraine section of the platform a lot more space, many more lines, many more words than other sections of the platform, perhaps an outsized section.

MS. DENMAN: That's true. That's realistic. And it would've added, certainly, length of wording to what had to be combined with the many issues that the party supports.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: That's right. So it would've been longer than, perhaps, some other issues that may be --

MS. DENMAN: Yeah.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: -- important or as important to others.

It also says that in your amendment you basically repeated points that were already in the platform. So it's probably unlikely that it would've been added in its entirety. A lot of what -- and I wish Ms. Stefanik was here, because she really knows about the platform. I have just a cursory knowledge of it, having been in conventions before -- that when people propose amendments and they get discussed --

MS. DENMAN: You can't get it all in.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: You can't get it all in. Right. It doesn't mean that they disagree, but perhaps stylistically or the length limitations or -- there's a lot of discussion about everything in platform language.

But I would say that, in my point of view, the sum and substance of this platform language is rather strong. And I feel strongly about Cuba and Nicaragua, and I would think that the sections about those areas, of which I feel

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

very strong, should've been lengthened or should've been stronger. But they're mentioned, and it's got a few sentences, and that's pretty good.

But to characterize this platform language that speaks about sanctions and Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, that speaks to providing appropriate assistance to the Armed Forces of Ukraine, is pretty strong.

MS. DENMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: And I would say that if you are a person who wanted to -- not you -- but ingratiate himself or herself with Russia, that would not be language that you would like, because it's not pro-Russia. And if you're a Ukraine native who doesn't want the Russian interference and doesn't like your territory to be eaten up by Russia, you would like the language that was finally adopted.

So I don't know the process worked, and we'll find out more about this, but it seems to me that to conclude that the platform was weakened in the end and that it favored Russia has a lot of interpretation and a lot of it is wrong.

MS. DENMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: So I thank you for the work that you did in proposing these amendments. I would think that you probably, if you had the time or the interest, you would've done it in many other areas, as well.

But you would probably agree with that kind of language. And I'm going read it again. I just want to make sure -- "We support maintaining and, if warranted, increasing sanctions together with our allies against Russia unless and until Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity are fully restored. We also support providing appropriate assistance to the Armed Forces of Ukraine and greater coordination with NATO defense planning."

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

That's a pretty strong statement.

MS. DENMAN: And it certainly is a matter of record now.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you very much.

MS. DENMAN: Thank you.

MS. ROS-LEHTINEN: Thank you, Mr. Conaway.

MR. CONAWAY: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Nothing.

MR. CONAWAY: Adam, 15 minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to ask you about some of the comments that J.D. Gordon made publicly and if they're consistent with your recollection of what took place.

In an article in TPM, it references an interview that CNN's Jim Acosta did with J.D. Gordon and states, "CNN's Jim Acosta reported on air that J.D. Gordon, the Trump campaign's national security policy representative at the RNC, told him that he made the change to include language that he claimed Donald Trump himself wanted and advocated for at a March 2016 meeting at then-unfinished Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C."

Apart from telling you that he was on the phone with Donald Trump, did he make any other reference to this being consistent with candidate Trump's position?

MS. DENMAN: In no way.

MR. SCHIFF: In an article in Business Insider, it was reported, "One of the staffers, J.D. Gordon, the Trump campaign's national security policy representative for the RNC, told Business Insider last week that 'Ms. Denman's memory of events is inaccurate.'"

Do you know what Mr. Gordon was taking issue with with your recollection of events?

MS. DENMAN: I really have no idea. But I only know what I know and what I witnessed.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know whether Mr. Gordon ever represented publicly that he never left the table to discuss the matter with the chairmen?

MS. DENMAN: I have seen in a press interview that he said that he did not -- I believe I'm right, that I read that he said he had not left the table, or he had not approached the delegates, and the fact that he did not, as far as I can recall, approach the delegates, he went to the committee chairmen.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, the committee chairmen were also delegates, were they not?

MS. DENMAN: It depends on how -- yes, as far as I know, they were delegates, but it depends, I guess, how you read the reading.

MR. SCHIFF: In a --

MS. DENMAN: But I will certainly reconfirm that he got up from that table and went and talked to the tri-chairmen. I stand by my memory.

MR. SCHIFF: So if Mr. Gordon ever did represent that he never left the table to discuss with the chairmen or the delegates, that would not have been an accurate representation.

MS. DENMAN: It is not accurate. He did get up, and he did go over to the tri-chairmen.

MR. SCHIFF: In a First Reading politics blog, you were quoted as saying, "Then the chairman sort of said would I agree to removing the use of lethal weapons out of it, and I said I really hated to see that removed. Because, again,

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

if a country asks for weapons and we okay it, to not send them the appropriate weapons that they are coming up against in their enemy, it seems foolish, it seems irresponsible. But I said, if that's the only way it will pass, I would agree to seeing it removed. But I hated to see it being done. And, obviously, they were going to remove it one way or the other."

Is that an accurate recollection of what took place at the subcommittee?

MS. DENMAN: I think that's pretty accurate. My gut feeling, if we can call it that, my gut feeling was that they felt very strongly, whoever they were that were there, that they felt very strongly perhaps the wording should be changed.

MR. SCHIFF: And it was your sense that if you didn't agree to the watering down of the language, they would either remove it or defeat your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: I guess my priority, sir, was really that it go forward in the best way possible. And I did not want to defeat the potentiality of it moving forward.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Ros-Lehtinen asked you whether the language that was included was pro-Russian, and I think you indicated that it wasn't?

MS. DENMAN: No, I don't view it that way.

MR. SCHIFF: The language that you had proposed, though, was far stronger, was it not?

MS. DENMAN: In my judgment call, yes, it would have been stronger. Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And it would have been in Russia's interest, if Russia had a vote on this, to water down the language along the lines that it was ultimately watered down. Is that a fair statement?

MS. DENMAN: I don't know that. I don't know that they were involved. I

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

realized there's been a lot of press written about the situation. I do not know.

MR. SCHIFF: And I'm not asking you to speculate about that. But in terms of your understanding, with your experience, of what Russia sees in its interest, Russia would not see it in its interest to have Ukraine receive lethal defensive weapons, would it?

MS. DENMAN: Is that not the nature of war?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes, I believe it is.

So it would be your understanding that the change from your language to what was ultimately incorporated moved the language in a direction that Russia would favor, as opposed to your original language?

MS. DENMAN: Perhaps I was not, at that moment in time, thinking specifically whether it was Russia or any other nation that has entered the borders of the adjoining nation.

MR. SCHIFF: Let me ask you this way. From the Russian perspective, would they have wanted your language incorporated in the platform?

MS. DENMAN: As far as I know, they weren't there, so I would not have known.

MR. SCHIFF: But would it have been in Russia's interest to see Ukraine receive lethal defensive weapons, as you were advocating?

MS. DENMAN: How can I answer what I don't know?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you know a lot about Russia and --

MS. DENMAN: Yes, that's true.

MR. SCHIFF: -- their involvement in Ukraine. And you were proposing this amendment, as I understand it, because you felt Ukraine ought to have the right to defend itself against Russia. Is that accurate?



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. DENMAN: I think that is accurate. I feel that any country that wants to control or support its future freedom has the right to have the availability of what is needed for them to stay free in combat or in a war against an encroachment. Yes, I feel that way.

MR. SCHIFF: And that might have required lethal defensive weapons.

MS. DENMAN: Well, it's pretty accurate -- thanks to the press, it's pretty accurate what level of sophisticated weapons are now being used in the Uranian war and what experimental weapons, as I understand it from my reading, that the Russians are producing to test in this combat.

MR. SCHIFF: If Mr. Gordon were representing that he never told you that he was talking with Mr. Trump, would that be a false statement?

MS. DENMAN: All I know are the three times he told me who he was talking to.

MR. SCHIFF: And that was Mr. Trump?

MS. DENMAN: But there are many Mr. Trumps.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, are there?

MS. DENMAN: Well, if I think about it, at least three. So I -- I just believe that --

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let me put it this way, that --

MS. DENMAN: -- he was overstating what I would simply call his job role or his position. I cannot identify from the other end of the phone who he was actually talking to or perhaps which member of the Trump family he was talking to, if he was.

MR. SCHIFF: But he did specifically tell you three times he was talking to Mr. Trump?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. DENMAN: He did.

MR. SCHIFF: I'll be happy to yield to Mr. Heck.

MR. HECK: Actually, Adam, you were covering the final two points I was actually going to follow up on.

But I do want to belabor a little bit this exchange in which you ask him, who are you clearing this with?

MS. DENMAN: Sure.

MR. HECK: To the best of your recollection, Mrs. Denman, his exact words in response to that question were what?

MS. DENMAN: What I have conveyed.

MR. HECK: Well, it isn't -- I don't know that we've ever discussed it or asked you in a way that asked you to specifically recall his exact words. Did he say, "I'm talking to New York"? Did he say, "I'm talking to Donald Trump"? Did he say, "I'm talking to Mr. Trump"? Did he say, "I'm talking to the candidate"? There are a lot of ways in which he could have conveyed that same information.

MS. DENMAN: All right. Let me convey it as accurately as possible. He said he was talking -- very succinctly -- I'm talk to New York. Where are you clearing it? I'm talking to New York. Who are you talking to? I am talking to Mr. Trump. He did not use -- other than that, he just said three times, I'm talking to Mr. Trump.

MR. HECK: So, in that answer, you used "New York" twice and "Mr. Trump" once.

MS. DENMAN: No. In that answer, he used "New York" once and "Mr. Trump" three times.

MR. HECK: Okay. So, on three different times, you asked him who are

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

you talking to and he used the words "Mr. Trump."

MS. DENMAN: But it was successive, because it was still in the same conversation, quickly, back to back, when he said he was talking to Mr. Trump, and I kind of did a double-take and said, who are you talking to, and he said Mr. Trump. And I said, I'm going to, frankly, ask you one more time, who are you talking to? Mr. Trump.

MR. HECK: Why did you ask him a third time?

MS. DENMAN: Because I just simply didn't believe him. And when he said was on -- from my being involved as a volunteer politically all these years, we, frankly, have those who are hired to get on a campaign, and then they go to another campaign and they go on with their lives. And the campaign's over, you win or you lose, and those hirees gone.

And without, obviously, knowing the background, I'd never seen this man before in my life, I didn't even know his name, never heard it, in the world I've volunteered in, I just didn't believe that staff had the priority, nor did whoever was perhaps at that level, perhaps, that they had the time to be sitting on the cell phone or a phone somewhere following the time it took to go through our subcommittee meeting. There was a convention the next week coming up; there was a convention to go through. There were priorities certainly more than I felt on this. And we had a campaign, as the Republican side, we had a campaign to go and win America or lose it. And for what Gordon conveyed, for someone to be sitting there spending important moments in time to be focused on the one or two things coming out of the platform subcommittee, I just felt was, frankly, unrealistic and not sensible.

I hope I've answered that. I just thought he was trying to impress me and

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

that he was --

[12:39 p.m.]

MR. HECK: Did it work?

MS. DENMAN: Well, obviously it didn't. It hasn't. Didn't.

MR. HECK: And won't.

MS. DENMAN: And I have to honestly say that, as many of you have heard, I just thought he was overreaching his pay grade.

MR. HECK: Thank you.

Adam.

MR. SCHIFF: I just have a couple more questions. After the convention, did you have any further discussion either with Mr. Gordon or anyone else affiliated with the Trump campaign about the whole experience at the convention?

MS. DENMAN: No, I don't think -- no. Other delegates reached out to come and say -- it's something you just read, where the gentleman from Washington had been there with his father on a bible class he was teaching. I believe that's the Washington delegate. I believe that's him.

People came up to me, not a great many, but our delegations were -- it's a big convention. You've been to yours in your Democratic field. And there are a lot of people, and the delegates, the Texas delegation was pretty far to the back, and not many people dropped by.

MR. SCHIFF: But in terms of either later at the convention or after the convention to this date, has anyone from Trump campaign or Trump Organization reached out to you to --

MS. DENMAN: On this subject?

MR. SCHIFF: On this subject.

MS. DENMAN: Not one.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. In the -- in one of the articles I was drawing your attention to a moment ago, it also provides that another GOP delegate on the platform committee, Rachel Hoff (ph), is a national security analyst with the America Action Forum and believes the final platform language signals that a Trump administration would refuse to send lethal defensive weapons to Ukraine. Quote, "This puts Trump out of step certainly with the Republican leadership, but I would also say mainstream conservative foreign policy or national security opinion," Hoff (ph) said.

Did you meet with Hoff (ph) at all at the convention?

MS. DENMAN: Only in that she was seated to the left of where I was seated in the platform, the subcommittee.

MR. SCHIFF: And did she indicate to you at the time that she was very supportive of your amendment?

MS. DENMAN: She did, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And did she discuss with you her disappointment with how it worked out afterwards?

MS. DENMAN: Not particularly. Her issues were not -- as far as defense and military, her issues were very different from mine.

MR. SCHIFF: My staff may have a couple questions, but I'll yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CONAWAY: Ms. Denman, thank you very much.

Since we're delving into your opinion on things, "lethal defensive weapons" is a pretty narrow term. It was in your language. What wound up in the platform was appropriate assistance to the armed forces of the Ukraine. Under that heading, would lethal defensive weapons be included in the appropriate

assistance or be excluded?

MS. DENMAN: I think, when you take a broad look at it, that could certainly convey.

MR. CONAWAY: All right. So would body armor be appropriate assistance?

MS. DENMAN: Oh, absolutely.

MR. CONAWAY: MREs, meals-ready-to-eat?

MS. DENMAN: AK-47s, the whole list of the sophisticated weapons today.

MR. CONAWAY: All right. So, just to make sure I understand, the language that wound up in there, in your view, did not limit the platform to -- or did not exclude the administration being able to provide that lethal defensive weapons that you wanted directly in your statement?

MS. DENMAN: Yes, I believe so.

MR. CONAWAY: Okay. All right. We're done.

MR. SCHIFF: Just one followup question on that, Mr. Chairman.

But removing "lethal defensive assistance" from the amendment that you offered --

MS. DENMAN: The original, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: -- did mean that the Republican Party platform would not be on record explicitly supporting lethal defensive weapons for Ukraine. Isn't that correct?

MS. DENMAN: I think they had another -- they chose another way to say it.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CONAWAY: Anything else?

 No, sir.

MR. HECK: Mr. Conaway, can I go on record agreeing with you that I also believe, having consumed some of them, meals-ready-to-eat can, in fact, be lethal weapons?

MR. CONAWAY: Ms. Denman, thank you so very much for participating this morning, and we're adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the interview was concluded.]