



JON KYL  
1942 -

Honored as 2017 Historymaker  
United States Senator



The following is an oral history interview with Jon Kyl (**JK**) conducted by Carolyn Hartman (**CH**) for the Historical League, and video-graphed by Collen O'Brien at Sun Studios of Arizona in Tempe, Arizona, on September 9, 2016.

*Original tapes are in the collection of the Arizona Historical Society Museum Library at Papago Park, Tempe, Arizona.*

**CH** This is Carolyn Hartman interviewing Senator Jon Kyl for the Historical League's Historymaker Program. The date is September 9, 2016. Senator Kyl, I would like to first offer congratulations on your selection as a 2017 Historymaker for the Historic League. How would you describe your first job after college? What was your specialization?

**JK** I joined the firm of Jennings, Strauss and Salmon, one of the large fine law firms in Phoenix and did a variety of things. The nice thing about that firm is they let you do - what work was available, you could try your hand at it. I did trial work, I did planning and zoning work; eventually I became the attorney primarily responsible for one of the large clients of the firm, Salt River Project.

They had a lot of different kinds of things that needed legal support, including issues dealing with water, obviously. Eventually toward the end of my law career, I did some lobbying. I had become pretty active in the Republican party at that time, knew several of the legislators and the people in the firm said, "Well, why don't you do some lobbying for clients of the firm out there as well?" So, I did that in the latter part of my career. Probably the thing that I enjoyed the most was the appellate work that I had an opportunity to do. I had a wide - wide variety of legal experiences and enjoyed them all.

**CH** What were some of the highlights of your lobbying with various clients?

**JK** A lot of interesting things. One of the firm's clients was St. Joseph's Hospital. I have mentioned them now about three times, but I did some lobbying for St. Joe's. Did lobbying for

the Salt River Project and for some other clients. I would have to say, though, that the experience in the law practice that I am probably most proud of and that I remember the best, was arguing before the U.S. Supreme Court, which not a lot of lawyers get to do. And we had a very important case for Arizona that I was fortunate to be able to argue and won, by the way. And that was kind of the top of my law career.

**CH** I read that your legal practice moved increasingly into the areas of water and natural resources. What influenced that direction?

**JK** Well, as I mentioned, over time, the partner in the firm that did most of the Salt River Project work brought me into that work and eventually he retired, and I became the responsible attorney. And, as you can imagine with a very large and interesting entity like SRP which has both an electric energy component, a federal reclamation component water...there's just a lot of different things that you are exposed to. And that is, as I said, where I learned of the water law that I know. And, some of the natural resource items, but - but obviously, there were large water issues facing the State of Arizona during that time, one of which was the 1980 Ground Water Act and ...as a representative of agriculture generally and the Salt River Project specifically, um, I got involved in those issues deeply and, you're not going to be successful if you don't learn the subject, so that's how I learned water law.

**CH** Thank you. Tell me how the Arizona Crime Victim's Foundation was created in 1983. What was its purpose? Is it still active?

**JK** As that particular entity, no. But there are offshoots that are. A friend of mine, a lawyer who had been in the Attorney General's office whose name is Steve Twist, asked if I would help participate in the creation and sit on the board of the group, which I did. This happened just as I was getting ready to run for Congress. So I didn't have a - a lot of time with the group, but one of the most satisfying things I did as a member of the U.S. Senate was to pursue one of the goals of that group, which was for states as well as the federal government to adopt constitutional amendments or statutes that protected the rights of crime victims. And I got deeply involved in that and, it was a very rewarding experience.

**CH** And you did that with one of your colleagues, Feinstein?

**JK** Dianne Feinstein of California and I have - I did that in the Senate, yes.

**CH** Right.

**JK** And we got the legislation passed.

**CH** Throughout your life you have been involved with a variety of boards and commissions. Several were in Arizona, like Chamber of Commerce in 1985. Can you describe a time that gave you the most satisfaction?

**JK** Well you mentioned the Chamber. I sat on boards and commissions. Margie Hance, the Mayor of Phoenix, was a good friend and she had me serve on a couple of commissions for the City of Phoenix and I was active in the Bar Association, did things there. But you mentioned the Chamber. That was pretty special. I was the lawyer for the Chamber's Board, the City of Phoenix, and at the time, the City of Phoenix Chamber of Commerce was the primary business organization. There were- today there are a half a dozen organizations in the Valley that promote business interests and the like. The Arizona Chamber is very big now, but it was just barely starting back then. So, if you wanted to be involved in the promotion of Arizona business, the Phoenix Chamber was the place to be and I guess one year they didn't have a businessman in the queue to become the chairman, so they said, would you be the chairman elect this year, and then the chairman the following year and I said sure. And so, I think it was 1985, I was the Chairman of the Phoenix Chamber. And, not that lawyers aren't business people too, but it was a little unique to have a lawyer in that position. I learned a lot from my business colleagues and also a lot about what attracts people to come to Arizona and specifically to Phoenix for business. We did a study on that when I was Chairman Elect, and it might be interesting for folks to know our climate is a big part of it. Our lifestyle is a big part of it. We have an outdoors, fairly easygoing kind of lifestyle.

Because we can be outdoors so much of the time. Our schools, our civic activities are important. But the best - the thing that people said most of all was, you have a good business climate. Your taxes are pretty low. You do not have very much in the way of regulations. You do not force people to join labor unions to be involved. The combination of all of those things is what attracts people to come to Arizona. And I have found over the years that that remains the case.

**CH** Let us go to Congress now. What nudged you to consider running for the House of Representatives? And what was your first campaign like?

**JK** In the 70s, I was active in the Republican Party. I supported other candidates. I helped to run some state legislative campaigns. I became more and more active. On July 4, 1985, my Congressman, Eldon Rudd, called me and said, "I've decided I'm not going to run for reelection. I think you ought to think about it." Well, we were at a friend's home in Sedona celebrating the 4<sup>th</sup>, and on the drive back to Phoenix my wife and I had a pretty serious conversation. Great law

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

career, good family life, but I'm thinking, okay, I know what my father did. I really admired his work. I like government. I like politics. If I do not do this now, I'll probably never have the chance. I would never run against a congressman, you know, at least one of - of my party. The office would be open. And I thought, well, if I win, it will be a great experience. If I do not run, I'll never know what it would've been like. And if I lose, I can always go back to a great law practice. Well, one little lesson on that, after a few months where you have got all kinds of people helping you, really working hard, volunteering, contributing money, you have to win. You have to win for them. So, you don't have the option of losing and going back to the law practice. Oh sure, you might lose, but I resolved I've got to win this for the people that are putting so much effort in for me. And so, I worked really hard on that first election. The primary election that I - when I first ran in 1986, was the toughest election I ever had because I was running against two other Republicans, one of whom had held the office before. He was very well known. I was not. I had to do it all from scratch. I did not have the party behind me because in a primary, it's all you and your friends. So that was probably the toughest thing I ever did, and my wife helped a lot and friends, as I said. And I ended up being victorious in the November 1986 election, went to the House of Representatives.

**CH** When you were running, did you receive any advice from your dad?

**JK** Yes, his first thought was why are you doing this? And I said, "Well, why did you do it?" And, he said, okay. He told me a story that when he won his election to the U.S. House of Representatives from Iowa, he called his mother. His mother and father were Dutch immigrants and his mother never even really spoke excellent English. Let's just put it that way. She did not understand our political system. I am not sure whether she ever voted. I don't know. But my father was very proud. And he said, "Mama, I want you to know I was just elected to the United States Congress." I doubt that she really quite understood what that was, but her advice to him was, "Well, just don't get the big head." And, my father's advice always was, just remember who you work for. You work for the voters. Understand that they are your boss and, you just do your best job of workin' hard to serve them. And of course, that is the best advice you could get.

**CH** You served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1987 to 1995. Describe the process you went through as you were assigned your committees in the House.

**JK** That was quite a trick because you've gotta work hard to get your assignment that you want. I wanted to be on the House Armed Services Committee. I always had a big interest in national security matters. There was a - only in Congress would you have something called the Executive Committee of the Committee on Committees. Yes. And Arizona congressman Bob Stump was on the committees. They met and basically made a recommendation as to who

would serve on what committees. And I lobbied him hard, um, he agreed to support my effort to get on that committee and, I worked with some of the other people in the leadership and - that was my primary assignment. So, for eight years in the House, I served on the Armed Services Committee, and it was very rewarding.

**CH** This assignment to committees - is the process the same for the Senate as it is for the House?

**JK** No, the committee assignments in the Senate are quite different. And both parties have a different system as well. In the Democratic party, it is pretty much the majority leader, or the minority leader makes the picks, so you better be his or her friend. In the Republican party, it is a combination of things, but it is primarily based on seniority. So, when it comes your time, you pick whatever is left as your first committee and it goes around a second time. You pick what is left for that committee. We have changed that since, so that our Republican leader has a little bit more authority in that. And he is the person who selects members of the Intelligence Committee and a couple of others. He selected me to serve on the Intelligence Committee right away. I got my first pick, the Judiciary Committee, which I wanted to be on. I also wanted to serve eventually on the Senate Finance Committee, which is probably the premier committee there, although John McCain might argue that it is the Armed Services Committee. But in any event, I eventually was able to serve on the Finance Committee as well.

**CH** Do you remember what your first office was like? Is there anyone who was with you during those first days...

**JK** Yeah.

**CH** ...who is still with you today in some capacity?

**JK** Well, my first chief of staff, a very fine fellow, just served for me for two years, but I wasn't in Washington when they had the draw to see what the order of selection for an office would be of the 50 members - I think it was 50 or 51 - in my class coming in in 1987. He drew second. Therefore, I got a really good office. I got an office on the third floor of the Cannon Building, just above Bob Stump's office essentially. And so, I was very, very lucky in my House years. So, I was the number two House member and I kept that number. So, I had good offices while I was in it, but it's not about the office, obviously.

**CH** In the House, you served on the Armed Services Committee that you talked about, and Budget, Accounting. Are there any significant memories that you would like to share about the Armed Services and Budget in the House?

**JK** A couple of things. First, in the Armed Services Committee, what an experience to be there on the - on the dais looking at the witnesses and to have people like Cap Weinberger ... there might be a few people that are mature enough in the audience to know or remember who Cap Weinberger was, but he was the Secretary of Defense. And to have all these admirals and generals come testify. After a while, you get to know something about it, and you get to ask them tough questions and they get to dodge - or answer them. And so that, you know, what a great experience, somebody that never served.

The other thing is, I had a good friend who was a nuclear physicist at Los Alamos Laboratory. We were in the same class together at the University of Arizona and remained good friends and Caryll and his wife were best buddies. So, I spent some time at Los Alamos, and I took an active interest in our strategic nuclear deterrent and got to be fairly knowledgeable about that. And worked with a Democrat from South Carolina, so the two of us were actually given an assignment to have, in effect, a subcommittee of our own on our strategic nuclear weapons and I spent a lot of time on that while I was in the House, as well as later in the Senate.

**CH** While you were in the House of Representatives in 1989, Governor Bruce Babbitt was in the middle of potential litigations with several Arizona Native Americans over water rights they felt due them from the government. How did you and Babbitt initiate action as a team to address the issue?

**JK** First, now you said in 1989, I'm gonna correct ...

**CH** Please do.

**JK** Well, in 1979, Governor Babbitt understood the importance of resolving some pretty critical issues relating to the use of Arizona ground water. I was at that time an attorney as I mentioned, for Salt River Project, and some other agricultural groups, the Farm Bureau and others. And an exceptionally large dispute arose between cities, the mining industry and agriculture over how to use ground water. And it had to be resolved legislatively. Eventually the governor got a group together. It was called the elegant name of the Rump Group. And it had representatives of all three of those segments of our economy as well as Governor Babbitt. And he put a staff together and for about a year there were some very intense negotiations over how to deal with the challenges to ground water - a need to regulate ground water usage with all of the property rights that are somewhat associated with that.

We eventually came out with recommendations to the state legislature which in 1980 passed the 1980 Ground Water Act. And that has stood as really a model for other states and has been a

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

very important reason why Arizona has enjoyed the ability to be somewhat sanguine about our water use in the state over all of these years. Because we had a regime for managing the use of ground water that respected property rights, respected the industries in the state, but where you needed to have some - some political control, impose that control over the system as well. So, I had worked with Governor Babbitt and I give him a tremendous amount of credit for his leadership in that Ground Water Act.

He came to me when he was Secretary of Interior and I was in the Senate. And told the story that you told about having some difficulty negotiating between Indian tribes, the Central Arizona Project which had water that he could allocate as Secretary, and the various industries and interests in the state, the cities and Salt River Project and others who were having quite a squabble about how all of the CAP water should be allocated. At the same time, the State was involved in a lawsuit against the Department of Interior, essentially over how much we had to repay for the cost of building the CAP. We had agreed to pay a portion of it that was in dispute.

And I'll never forget the day he came into my office and he said, "Look," he said, "there's a conflict of interest here. I cannot represent both sides to this conflict. I've gotta defend the Department of Interior. I have an obligation to defend the Indian through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, their claims, and for some reason all of our business and industry buddies out in Arizona don't trust me to also represent them, but I think they might trust you. We had good work together on the Ground Water Act, would you get involved in that?" And he was right to ask me. And I knew enough about it that, that I could step in, and I did. And through his leadership, through my involvement and others, a lot of people deserve credit on this, we were able to put together the building blocks for the ultimate resolution of a lot of the tribal claims of Indians here in the State of Arizona. And I am very proud of those achievements during the time that I was in the Senate. But all credit to a lot of other people who were involved in that as well.

**CH** I heard it took 15 years to be resolved with a huge number of affected parties involved standing up for their own survival needs. Could you describe some of the key management points in getting organizations with differing needs to come together?

**JK** Sure. You had first, Indian tribes who have a legal right under law to a substantial claim to water. If they can irrigate their land like the Gila River Indian Community just south of Phoenix does, they have claim to a lot of water in the Gila River. Well, there are also a lot of other people that have claim to that same water. Some of it, which comes down the Verde River, for example, is almost all spoken of as a result of claims that were made very early in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and resolved by something called the Kent Decree. Salt River Project represents most of those landowners in the Valley here. They have a claim to Salt and Verde River water.

Well, as you know, the Salt and Verde flow into the Gila. And there are other landowners, like mines, that have used the water out of those streams. The cities count on a lot of that water. About a third of the water used in Arizona is from our own Salt, Verde, Gila River system. About a third of it is ground water. Now about a third of it is CAP. Actually, a little more CAP water today. So, when everybody is competing for the same water, and there's not quite enough water to meet all the competing claims, what do you do?

**CH** That is the question.

**JK** Well, God is not making any more water. So, you have to negotiate down to the amount of water you have. The good news was that CAP water was a new, although limited, source of water that was coming into the state then. And because of that, most of the water users were able to continue pretty much as they had been, and we were able to allocate a great deal to the Indian tribes because of the CAP water. So, nobody had to sacrifice too much, but there was still a tremendous amount of negotiation to figure out exactly how much everybody should have and under what circumstances, under what priority and so on. We also had to settle the lawsuit, which we did. And a third thing we did was basically to create - this is an over generalization, but we created a pot of water and a pot of money to help solve future Indian water settlements as they came along. So, the Gila, that was one of the first, but we also did subsequent water settlements while I was in the Senate based on that precedent.

**CH** Who were some of the key players that helped perpetuate movement toward ameliorating concerns and working for compromise?

**JK** Well, I mentioned Governor Babbitt to begin with.

**CH** Right.

**JK** Rita Pearson, who - head of Department of Water Resources at the time. By the way, Kathy Ferris, who is still active in water issues, both of those women are very active in the Ground Water Act and she - she and I remain active with the Kyl Center at the Morrison Institute of ASU. There - there were so many, but I will pick at one name you mentioned who would bring us to compromise. There is a fellow, a lawyer, a very good lawyer, Mike Brophy by name, now deceased, who had a knack for coming up with a crazy solution when there was an impasse. After everybody had argued themselves out and saw no way forward, total block, what do we do? Well, let us come back in three weeks, think it over and maybe something will turn up. He'd come back and he'd say, "I have this kind of crazy idea, I don't know if any of you would be interested, but..." and usually there was a kernel of - of a way forward there. And it is one of the things that taught me, never give up. Never say never. There is always a way if you just -

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*



if you just keep workin' at it, keep thinkin' about it. And if you can break a problem down into small enough pieces, make 'em bite size, you just tackle it, you know, one bite at a time. The next thing you know, you're about halfway through the apple and at that point you're figuring, hey I think I can finish this apple let's - let's keep going. That is how these negotiations eventually, reached a positive conclusion.

**CH** I think some of the comments that you made probably answer this question, but I still wanted to ask it. Talk about some of the highlights of the act that benefitted not only the Arizona Native American tribes, but the citizens of Arizona.

**JK** Yeah, these negotiations had to be win, win, win for everybody because almost everybody had a veto. So, you had to satisfy everybody. And, um, I am proud to say that by the time it was done, everybody was about 80% happy which was not bad for something like this. And that is the way that it has to be. In a negotiation over something as precious as water, where you've got very hard fought legal claims, you have to be very imaginative, you have to be open-minded, you have to think constructively, you have to think out of the box, and find ways of bringing people together to finally agree to get it done. It is not easy, but it taught me to be a lot more tolerant, open-minded, and imaginative than I had been when I was just representing somebody as a lawyer.

**CH** What were some of the important impacts for Arizona's management of water resources in the future for Arizona?

**JK** Yeah. That - that was one of the most important things was certainty. When you have a lot of claimants all claiming the same something, in this case, water, how does anybody get financing for a project, for example. The bank says, "Well how do I know it's your water?" "Well, we think we're gonna win this lawsuit." That does not cut it. The Indians have always complained about having paper water, but not wet water. It is fine to have a legal right, but until you have actually gotten it confirmed by Congress, which has to approve a claim that the Indians have made, because of the federal law. Until you actually turn it into wet water, all they have is a hope for a project, for example. So, the challenge of making everybody a winner is tough. But if everybody is not a winner in these water settlements, then you are not going to have a settlement. Almost everybody has a veto right. Veto in the sense that they can - they can cobble together enough political opposition that you can't get it done. Legislation is hard. And the leadership in the Senate and in the House like to say, "Okay, come to me when you have everybody together." In other words, they want to get it on the floor, get it passed, moved on, next subject. Time is a big enemy of the leaders in the Senate. And if you come to them and say, "I have a huge problem. I want to bring it to the floor of the Senate." They will say, "No, you get it resolved first and then bring it to the..."

**CH** Though research was conducted for this interview, please feel free to clarify or add to any statements or questions I propose.

**JK** Thanks very much. I am honored. Thank you very much.

**CH** Let us begin with your life story, Senator and the early years. For the record, when and where were you born?

**JK** I was born in Oakland, Nebraska, 1942 if you must know the year.

**CH** What is your earliest memory of Nebraska?

**JK** Well, my parents were both teachers and we moved around a little bit. I have some early memories of a couple small towns that we lived in in northeast Nebraska. But most of the time, until I was about 10 years old, we lived in Wayne, Nebraska. Have a lot of good memories of Wayne, which is a nice town.

**CH** It was soon afterwards that your family moved to Bloomfield, Iowa in the 1950s. Can you share some highlights growing up in a small town like Bloomfield?

**JK** Sure. First of all, my father always had livestock, cattle, that he and I cared for. So, from the time that I was even in kindergarten, I cared for both beef cattle and dairy cattle. We had a little farm on the outside of town and that meant chores every morning and every night. That was pretty good life lessons in taking care of the livestock. The school that I went to was 500 people. My graduating class was just about a hundred, so it was pretty small. You got to know everybody and, I learned a lot of good lessons there as well.

**CH** How did you spend time with your friends?

**JK** Well, again part of it was - was doing all the chores. But we did the things that I think everybody all - we played baseball; we rode our bikes. I got to be on the golfing team. Did a lot of practice on basketball. I was on the basketball team and so after a while, there is not a lot of free time when you add all that together.

**CH** Let us talk about schooling for a minute. Can you think of a favorite grade in elementary school and why you liked it so much?

**JK** I do not really have any memories there. I will say that in high school, I had a very good English teacher, freshman English. And she inspired me to really try to understand how one should express oneself, both orally and in writing, and I think she had a lot to do with my interest in communications, which was part of my education in college as well. I also did debate in high school. My father actually helped to teach some of us who were interested in that since there was no debate class. He had been a debater when he was younger and helped us understand the basic principles of it. And I did a lot of debating when I was college.

**CH** What kinds of outings did you and your family enjoy together? Where would you all go? Vacations?

**JK** Well, we did not do a lot of vacations. Again, we had a lot of chores to do around the house. However, on two or three occasions in the summer, we traveled to the Black Hills of South Dakota. I will never forget that because it was my first exposure to country outside of the Iowa and, Nebraska landscape. And I loved the - the rocks and the pine trees - Mount Rushmore kind of environment.

**JK** Later on as I was able to enjoy that more here in Arizona, it became something that I really feel kind of in my bones that's - that's the outdoors that I like.

**CH** Your dad, John Kyl, served in the United States House of Representatives representing Iowa during the 1960s and early 1970s, about ten years.

**JK** Right.

**CH** At that time, many families who had a person serving in Congress lived in Washington, D.C. What did your family do?

**JK** Well my father drove because there was only one free airplane trip, or one government paid airplane trip per year. So, he drove to and from Washington. He lived in Washington when he was first elected - had one semester left of high school and so once I finished that, then I came to Arizona to go to college and the rest of my family, my mother and my two sisters, remained in Iowa. Now, when my two sisters had graduated, then my mother moved to Washington, D.C. to be with my dad all the time.

**CH** Let's go back to your two sisters. Tell me a little bit about them.

**JK** My first sister, the second eldest, I'm the eldest in the family - lives in Des Moines, Iowa still.

She was a paralegal during most of her career, is now retired. My other sister was quite a bit, six years younger, she lives in Phoenix and she was a English high school teacher and retired not too long ago.

**CH** Tell me about your mother's activities in Bloomfield. As you said, she was a teacher. Was she also involved in the community?

**JK** Yes, she had retired from her teaching once, I think, my sister came along. She was pretty much the head of the household from that time forward. She did some - she wrote for the newspaper and one thing when you have livestock and you're bringing home milk, for example, you make butter. Well, she made butter and, her parents - she grew up on a farm with her parents, so she knew all the things, you know, how to do the canning and how to - how to do the other things that a frugal family does to survive based upon what they can grow and - and what they can raise. And again, I keep going back to lessons learned, but learned a lot of lessons from that, too.

**CH** That goes to my next question. It has been said that many times parents pass down guiding principles and ideals to their children. You have followed in your dad's footsteps. How did your parents impart their values to you?

**JK** Well, I did not know at the time, but the older I get, the more I realize A, what they did and B, how they did it. And, of course, it's living by example. And having the right attitude towards your kids. Kids have enormous capacity to learn and to do things if you will just expose them. And I think today perhaps parents are a little bit light on kids, not challenging them in ways that would make them more productive later on, if they had been challenged as kids. Well, I was challenged as a child. Again, with all the chores that we did for the livestock and other things around the house. My mother's garden. That's another big thing she did, and my sisters and I weren't quite appreciative enough of that, particularly when it came to picking beans, which none of us liked. But the lessons had to do with what it takes to be successful in life. And you have to work hard, and you have to prepare. You must be responsible. And you have to have an optimistic attitude that you can do things. But you gotta get to work and get 'em done. All of those are the kind of things that you just picked up as you were growing up. My father also, as I got old enough to understand things about government and civic matters, taught me a great deal, probably the best lesson had to do with human nature. Once you know human nature pretty well, you have the possibility of being a good public servant and I - I think it's hard to otherwise. But he understood people. He was very widely read, and really kind of understood what made people tick. Understanding that has certainly helped me a lot in what I've done in my life.

**CH** Thank you. While in high school, what thoughts did you have as to your future after graduation? Were you even thinking public service at that time?

**JK** No, I did not have much in the way. I did not even know what my career would be. Even starting out at the University of Arizona, I did not know for sure what I wanted to do, whether I would go to law school or what I would do. I probably did not think ahead as much I should ... I know young people today really think ahead and they set their goals and they have their plans. You kind of have to with the cost of education the way it is and the difficulty of getting into schools and so on. I must say, I did not do that. I was fortunate to be able to go to school where I wanted to and to do well, but I did not really have any big plan when I started out.

**CH** Well you were raised in the Midwest. How was the decision made for you to attend the University of Arizona?

**JK** I had been pretty sick during my high school time with pneumonia. I basically had pneumonia a lot. And the doctors finally said if you wanna get over this, you probably need to move to Tucson, Arizona. They were very explicit. Exactly Tucson, Arizona. I remember my father saying, "Well, do they have a - a college there?" Well, of course, there is a very fine college there we found out and I applied very late, but I got in okay. And so, I had never been west of South Dakota. But a friend and I - a friend, who was going to attend ASU, and I got in his old 1946 Dodge and headed out to Arizona. Site unseen. And that was in August of 1960. Arrived in Tucson. It probably was 110 degrees. I do not know. And after a couple days of walking around in that heat, believe it or not, I said, "This is for me." Mostly because I am looking up at the Catalina Mountains which are just incredibly beautiful as you know.

**CH** Mm-hm.

**JK** And it was just an incredibly new but wonderful experience for me to come to Arizona.

**CH** Please share about your student life in Tucson. Like your fraternity experiences.

**JK** I completed my undergraduate work in three years, so I took a lot of units in order to do four years' worth of work in three years. I joined a fraternity, Pi Kappa Alpha. I was a little bit active in student government. Met my wife to be, Caryll, at a Sunday school for college kids at the Presbyterian Church nearby. And so, I must confess, that occupied a fair amount of my time after Caryll and I got well acquainted. We did a lot of studying together, shall we say. But she was a nursing student and didn't have any spare time. That is a very rigorous academic course and she graduated with her nursing degree after I finished my first year in law school at the

University of Arizona. So, then we were married right after that.

**CH** When you were a junior in the summer of '63, your dad took you to Washington, D.C. where he was a United States congressman at the time.

**JK** Mm-hm.

**CH** With many things happening at that time in D.C., what was the experience like for you?

**JK** Well that was the summer of the march on Washington, with Martin Luther King. It was an incredibly interesting year politically. It was just a few months prior to the assassination of John Kennedy, the President. The big issue of the time was the 1964 Civil Rights Act being debated in 1963 and I attended most of those hearings. I also attended the hearings of the nuclear testing treaty. Saw Edward Teller, the famous physicist, and a lot of fascinating things that exposed me to government in a way that, well, let's just put it this way, I was very fortunate to have the ability to stay with my folks in Washington that summer, be with my dad. Uh, reflect with him on what I had seen and to be a part of that history, even just as an observer. And I am sure that had some influence on my later desire to get involved in politics.

**CH** You graduated with a degree in political science in 1964. How did that choice come about?

**JK** The courses I took were primarily in history, communications, and political science. I think I got a double major in communications and political science. And I could have taken an extra history course and got a degree in that too. All three of those things combined into a nice, I think, understanding of the politics in this country, but also the foundations for our government and our civic society, which is one of the subjects I hope we can return to a little bit, the foundations for our country which I don't think get enough attention these days. But all of that gave me an appreciation for what we have here and a desire to continue to be involved in it. I was also involved in debate as part of the communications I mentioned earlier, and probably the combination of all of those things, in addition to simply not having any better alternative, is what convinced me to go on to law school.

**CH** You and Caryll married right after graduation and then you immediately entered law school. That must have been a very busy time for you two.

**JK** I had actually completed one year of law school before we got married.

**CH** That is right.

**JK** We committed not to get married until after she got her degree and after I got my degree. Since I was a year ahead, I then had finished one year of law school, so I had two years to go after that, after we were married.

**CH** What did she do during your law school days?

**JK** Well she helped me.

**CH** After she graduated?

**JK** Yeah, she graduated from nursing school and each summer she was a nurse at St. Joseph's Hospital in Phoenix. I clerked for a law firm here in Phoenix, and then during the year, she worked at actually same name, St. Joseph's Hospital in Tucson. After we moved to Phoenix, after my graduation, she worked as a nurse at St. Luke's Hospital here. And, and then she did some other nursing as well. She eventually retired after our kids were born, but she put me through school. And nurses, by the way, did not make a whole lot of money. And so, you've got to have it all worked out where nobody is complaining.

**CH** Let us talk about running for the Senate. When did you decide to run for the Senate and why?

**JK** I did not have a good reason. I had never thought about running for the Senate. In my last two years in the House of Representatives, I served in the minority the whole time. That is not the most fun thing. And a lot of Republican colleagues and others, essentially said, look, we need a candidate to run against the incumbent, Dennis DeConcini, who had represented Arizona for three terms in the U.S. Senate. And presumably was going to run for reelection. As I said, deciding to run simply because the party really needed a good candidate, and they thought that I represented the best opportunity to defeat Senator DeConcini, was not the best reason. But I did not have the sense of fulfillment in the House of Representative that I had hoped, which is hard for a member of the minority in the House. And I saw opportunities in the Senate and was more experienced now. I thought I knew what I was doing, finally, and could make a contribution and therefore, did decide to run. Fortunately for me, because I am not sure I could've defeated him, Senator DeConcini eventually decided not to run for reelection. And so, I ran against another congressman and was able to be elected in 1996.

**CH** You served then for 18 years. Please describe some major differences in service in the House and the Senate, besides the large difference in the numbers of people from 335 to 100 in the Senate.

**JK** The first - I already mentioned in the House of Representatives if you are in the majority it's life is great. But if you are in the minority, you have no rights. And you are essentially a potted plant. That is the way the House is. The majority runs everything and so you can get stuff done quickly and that is the way it's supposed to be. The House is supposed to reflect the current mood of the people. They are elected every two years. So, you listen to the people. You get elected. You come back and you legislate.

The Senate was set up differently by the Founding Fathers. They said, no, no. There has to be a body that says wait a minute, let's think this over. Let us take our time. Let us get everybody involved in the process, minority, majority, and if it is still a good idea, well then, the Senate will pass like the House did. If it is not, then they have been a check on the House. And there are only 100. So, you have a lot more power. And in the Senate, the minority has a lot more power since almost everything is done by unanimous consent, any one senator can say I object. What does that do? People say, well that is the filibuster. That is not good. Yes, here is what that does. As soon as you say I object, then the person propounding the request comes over and says well why did you object? You tell the person why. The response is, well, let us negotiate about that. And the next thing you know, you have negotiated your differences so that the matter can proceed, but you have some right, maybe the right to offer an amendment, which is usually what the argument is about. Well, I want to offer an amendment. Well, I do not want you to. Well then, I object to considering the bill. Well okay, if I let you offer the amendment, will you withdraw your objection? Yes. Okay. Why isn't that a good thing? That enables the Democrats and the Republicans to work together, to negotiate the terms under which legislation is considered. And it is a body that requires a lot more collaboration as a result. Well that is fine, because you do not have that as much in the House of Representatives. So, I think both bodies complement each other. It is one of the reasons I like the Senate a lot because you have to work with people on both sides of the aisle and your colleagues. They may be objecting to what you want to do, too.

**CH** While in the Senate, you contributed to the U.S. Patent law reform. What part of that process were you particularly proud of?

**JK** The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over patent law, and it was in need of some reform. Protecting patents in this country is critical. It is one of the reasons why we have been so successfully - successful economically. And if you look at all of the - the inventions, all of the companies, look where they were started. And I do not want to mention specific companies, but just take your mobile device. Let us just put it that way, wherever it came from. Well, it might be made in Korea, but I guarantee you that it - originally a lot of the things that were devised



were patented here in the United States. That patent protects the property right in it. It enables investors to fund something on the theory that they will get their money back and then some. That is called some profit. And so, the system needed some reforming and I had a very smart staffer who understood the issues very well. He did most of the work on it. I worked with Senator Leahy, my Democratic colleague, after both of our two staffers put it together, essentially, and said okay, here are the only two issues left to decide for you guys, go ahead. That is, by the way, what good Senators do. They rely a lot on their staff and then they make kind of the final decisions and because of their relationships, are able then to work together to get it passed in the Senate. And that is what we did with this - with the patent reform. By the way, it was not perfect. There are still arguments about whether this or that should be changed. Which is fine. But it was, I think, a big step toward modernizing the process.

**CH** I would like to switch from national discussion to your service for Arizona Native Americans. Back in your House days, you began creating bills focusing on the needs of our Indian tribes. Let us talk about those. First, the bill you introduced jointly, I believe it was 1990, with Ben Nighthorse-Campbell from Colorado that became law regarding arts and crafts. What was happening that pushed you two to create that particular bill?

**JK** Well, thanks for the question because it gives me an opportunity to talk about my father again.

**CH** Good.

**JK** My father served on the Interior Committee in the House, which had jurisdiction over all of the Native Americans. And he had tried - he had seen, in fact, he and I together had visited both the Hopi and Navajo reservations and the pueblos in New Mexico and he had seen all of these cheap knockoffs of incredibly interesting art by our own Native Americans. For example, you know, the Hopi jewelry or, the Kachinas, the Navajo jewelry or the rugs, other baskets and so on. He had seen the cheap knockoffs coming from other countries. And the poor artisans in our country were not getting the benefit of the hard work that they put into creating these things. There needed to be a way - I talked about patents before - there needed to be a way to put some kind of a trademark kind of designation on these American made items so that when tourists come out to Arizona to the trading posts and want to have a genuine article, they know that this was made by a particular Navajo artisan or whatever. So, my father never could get that passed. I said, "Is there anything leftover, from your agenda you'd like me to take a crack at?" And he told me about that. Well, Ben Nighthorse-Campbell was a Democrat at that time, House member from Colorado, so you know, knowing that you gotta have people on both sides of the aisle. Remember I was in the minority in the House. You reach across the aisle. You find somebody that, - and by the way Ben is quite an artisan himself. So, he immediately understood the issue and we worked together, and we got a bill passed. And it became law. When I got to

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

the Senate, by the way, by then Ben had gotten to the Senate before me, changed his registration to Republican, but he was still well respected as an Indian artisan and what we found was that the law was not being enforced properly.

**CH** Mm-hm.

**JK** And it needed more teeth. Interior Department had better things to do and not enough staff and all of this. So, I went to him and I said, "Let us really tighten this up. Make it tougher so it really works." We did. We got that passed. I still cannot say that it has been perfect, but it's helped a lot more than the original legislation and a lot more than if we hadn't done anything.

**CH** Thank you. How did you discover that Arizona's Native Americans were in need of monies for their law enforcement? What was the result?

**JK** Every year, groups of Native Americans would come to Congress and tell the stories about what they needed. The school board members needed more money for education. The law enforcement people needed money for the jail. The school people would talk about the need for better school buses 'cause they have to drive such long distances. The people in the clinics would talk about how they were not getting enough money for the health care that the folks needed. And on and on. The needs are ubiquitous. So, members of Congress have the responsibility of trying to sort this out and through the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other programs, try to get the resources to them that are necessary. The federal government has a trust responsibility to provide a lot of these things. With all due respect, a lot of the tribes could do a better job of prioritizing their own needs and trying to be more involved as tribal governments to help these different parts of the communities. But specifically, you mentioned law and order. Uh, one of my Navajo friends, by the way the daughter of Peter McDonald, Hope, was a very active member of the tribe. She said, "I want you to come to Tuba City and see something." I said, "What are you gonna show me?" Said, "Well, I'm gonna show you how our jail leaks like a sieve." I said, "Fat chance, it never rains." She said, "You come up." Well the night I got there was Saturday night. It was raining like heck. And sure enough the roof leaked and, you know, here I am looking at all these poor souls that are in there, most of them inebriated; they were picked up by the tribal police either causing trouble or maybe they just needed a place to stay and the roof is leaking like crazy. She was right. We got some money for a new jail and the other problem, by the way, juveniles were thrown in with adults. Never a good thing. They had no option. So, she was right. They needed help. We got 'em the help.

**CH** Indian education was also a part of your agenda as a Senator. How did you help the Tohono O'odham Community College?

**JK** Actually, here's how it works. The government has a list of projects that need funding to get done. It is a long list. And each year they would fund about five of them through the appropriations process. So, the object was to get on the list. And then each year, make sure that your people keep moving up the list. And so, I won't pick one out, but, I mean, the Tohono O'odham, Gila River, I remember going to the dedication of the Hopi High School, for example, which they had long needed. So almost every tribe had - and, the Navajo tribe for example, every tribe had needs in their education system of one kind or another. And we dealt with them every year. So, it was not just - just one tribe.

**CH** I have read that you were a strong advocate of the nation's natural resources, including those on tribal lands. Share how your actions in the 2004 Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act helped with our state's restoration of Arizona's forests.

**JK** First, the problem, which now fortunately almost everyone agrees is a problem, and most agree to the solution, is that our national forests have not been managed properly. It's a combination of in the last century, the white settlement grazing, putting out forest fires, and in more recent years, uh frankly, the environmental movement and some components of it, preventing the cutting of trees. As a result, it is a situation where our national forests are choking with trees. It is like a garden that never gets weeded. What kind of a tomato crop do you have when the weeds are getting all of the nutrients, all of the water, all of the sunshine, that's what happening in our forests.

So, the solution is to thin the forests. And there are two basic techniques. One is mechanical thinning where you go in and you snip out primarily the smaller trees so that the bigger trees can finally have some room to grow, with the soil, with the nutrients, with the sunlight, and once you've achieved that kind of stability, then you induce fire or allow fire to come through on a periodic basis, which is the way nature always did it and clean out the underbrush. But because there isn't so much underbrush, it moves through there without ever hitting, without ever getting big enough that it hits the crowns of the trees. That's what you see on the TV newscast - big explosions of the crowns of the trees as they get real hot and burn.

So, management of the forest is critical. This particular act is one of several that we worked on that made modest gains, Senators Flake and McCain are working now on - on another approach to it. A lot of it has to do with resources. What happens is every year, they set aside money to manage the forest. It costs money to go in and do this thinning. And, the Forest Service has the best of intentions and then the fire season starts, they have to grab all of that money to fight the fires. That lasts all season long and at the end of the season, there is not enough money left to do the planting and the restoration of the forest. We have had some great work done in

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

Arizona at Northern Arizona University. And I was responsible for getting the legislation passed that funded the restoration institute at NAU, also at one in two other states. And what they'd do was scientific and it's all science based, with Dr. Wally Covington and his team up there to figure out exactly how to thin what plants, what trees in what proportion, and get the forest ready for then the inducement of fire and to do that, subsequently, and to help restore the forest to the way it was before we all got here and messed it up. That is having an effect, but it cannot be done on a large enough scale, to have the kind of effect that it needs to. As a result, we have got bark beetle infestations. We have got huge forest fires, the latest the Wallow fire five years ago in the White Mountains. The Rodeo-Chediski fire ten years before that.

We are not even catching up to the problem. The challenge that we have is to create an industry that was destroyed when the radical environmental movement prevented the cutting of any trees. There was no place, in other words, to mill lumber. We had to buy it all from Canada. Well, I am not for cutting the big trees either. But there are plenty of small trees that can be cut if you can find a market for those trees. The industry will come in and then you can put the contracts out, so that instead of the federal government having to pay \$800 an acre to do the thinning, they put the contract out and a commercial interest comes in, takes the product off of the forest, mills it, sells it, and makes a modest profit. That is what you call a win-win situation. But it is kind of a chicken and egg. You have to have the guarantee that you're gonna have the product before you'll invest in the timber mill. And it is very hard to get that guarantee because the Forest Service isn't sure whether it's going to be sued. And it gets sued all the time by people who do not want you to cut a particular part of the forest. Even though the cutting is very scientifically done. So, that is a challenge that we still have. And by the way, that would go a long way toward helping with our water; not a long way, but it's a contributor to our water supply. Because a watershed that is not so absolutely crowded with plants, with timber, that it sucks up every drop of water, will allow some of that snow melt and water to run off into the rivers that then feed our reservoirs that provide water for the Salt River Valley, for example.

**CH** I have read that health care was a critical issue on reservations and that the tribes had been underserved by the government's health care system. How did you intervene on their behalf?

**JK** Frequently and not particularly effectively. This is the best example I can think of a single payer system. It is Indian health care. It is totally controlled by the federal government. There is a certain amount of money allocated by Congress every year. That has to last. And so, the saying in Indian country is you better be sick by July. Because if you are sick after July, they do not have any more money. You have to wait till next January. Now, they save a little bit back for emergencies. That is the sad story of Indian health care in this country. There needs to be options. Senator McCain is trying to work on options for veteran's health care. Which is also largely the kind of system we are talking about. Better funded, however. And

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

Senator McCain would like to see veterans have an option. If they're not getting the care they need or it's too hard for them to go to a veteran's hospital and they can get it locally or at a closer hospital, in effect, take a voucher there and get your care. There needs to be something like that with the BIA. Very difficult to reform it. And one of the difficult things is that people get used to a situation, even though they do not like it. And, there is not even a consensus, I think, on Indian country as to exactly how to do this. But the whole system needs to be reformed and as long as it's gonna be totally government run, and just funded by whatever Congress can appropriate, people are going to suffer.

**CH** In 1999, there were discussions that President Clinton should be impeached for lying under oath. What was your involvement with the Judiciary Committee's activities at that time?

**JK** I was involved in it as a member of the Judiciary Committee, and actually Senator Arlen Specter, who became the chairman of the committee or ranking Republican, and I were detailed some significant responsibility in helping to negotiate with the House as to what the procedure in the Senate would be. We understood that the Senate was not as interested in having as many witnesses and as many depositions and all of those things as the members of the House were. They could not understand why we could not agree to it. Well, obviously a lot of Democrats opposed the impeachment of the President. They were not going to agree to it. And it befell Senator Specter and I to go over and talk to our friends in the House to say, "Sorry, this isn't gonna fly." Well, it should fly. Well it is not going to fly. Shall we do something positive and constructive to try to resolve the situation? And through that process, we eventually got to a compromise on the kinds of things, the procedures that would be used, and the process that would be followed. So, I had some direct and substantial role in that whole process.

**CH** I've read that you have a strong belief in America's mission of a strong missile defense.

**JK** Mm-hm.

**CH** How did this conviction develop over the years? And translate into your Senate actions?

**JK** Before I ever ran for Congress, I had been at the programs where speeches were made about it. I had read a lot about it. And I became convinced that Ronald Reagan was correct that it's much more moral to be able to defend your people than to base your defense on the proposition that if you do it to us, we will do it to you, too. Now that was mutual assured destruction. And that's what we had before the IDF missile defense actually became a reality through the research that Ronald Reagan helped to fund, to begin the process of creating the radars that would detect, the satellites that would de- well, actually the satellites would detect a launch first, radars would then pick it up, another set of radars would follow it, so that the missile could then be keyed to

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

intercept the other - the bad guy's missile. That is basically what missile defense is. And during the Reagan time on the Armed Services Committee we supported all of the funding that we could do on that; all the different programs that - that he could get going. We protected it during the first Bush administration. Then had to kind of fall back a little bit during the Clinton administration, but then when George W. Bush became President, advanced it again. We have had to protect it again during the Obama - the Democratic administrations have never been as favorable to it.

I am convinced it is a much better way, uh, at least as a compliment towards strategic nuclear deterrent, a much better way to deter an attacker from ever attacking. Because the reality is that if a country like Iran or North Korea were to attack us today and North Korea just finished a big missile, I mean a nuclear test, I don't know that the United States would throw everything in our arsenal at the poor, pitiful people of those countries as a nuclear deterrent. I am not sure that it's strong enough. And I think our allies, question that to some extent too. So, I would like to have a second way. If a big country like a - like a Russia or a China decided to start a war with us, you have to have your strategic nuclear deterrent to deter that and maybe even to use it if the worst should happen. But at a minimum with these countries that may not be deterred, you better be able to protect yourself instead. The best evidence of that is what Israel has done. Israel has decided to protect its people. And it has developed systems which do that. And they have had to use them over and over again. Their ability to go attack every citizen in Gaza is not enough to prevent Hamas from launching thousands of missiles at Israeli citizens. It is not going to stop them. The terrorists do not care if other Palestinians are killed. In fact, they use them as human shields. You've gotta have a way of stopping the missiles themselves and the Israelis have proven that it can work. We need to do more in the United States.

**CH** You co-sponsored the 2007 Comprehensive Immigration Reform Bill with Ted Kennedy. What was happening in Congress that hampered its passing?

**JK** There were problems on both sides of the aisle. We negotiated for a long time and got a, a truly compromised piece of legislation, but it was subject to attack from the right by some Republicans who felt that it went too far in what they called amnesty, allowing people who are illegally in the United States today to eventually, after a long process, um, have the opportunity to become U.S. citizens. On the left it was opposed primarily because of the influence of some labor unions who didn't like the provisions for temporary guest worker provisions and, early in the process of its debate on the Senate floor, adopted a kind of killer amendment, a poison pill amendment, that really crippled the legislation and made it very difficult to push it off, and push it over the finish line. As a result, it was eventually withdrawn.

**CH** Thank you. What was it like around your home during 2000 when you were being interviewed

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

as a possible running mate for George Bush?

**JK** Well very few people knew about it. I think I eventually shared it with our kids, but my wife and I had a lot of private conversations about it. But there was not a lot of discussion about it. I would've been very, proud to have been selected and - and to serve, um, but I think that, um, then candidate Bush made a very wise decision to select Dick Cheney as his vice president running mate and I'm very glad that he did.

**CH** You have been described as a master bridge builder with ardent conservatives and pragmatic centrists to achieve the good of the country. What do you think contributed to this skill?

**JK** I will mention maybe three things. First, I had talked about my father helping me to understand human nature. If you understand people, you realize almost always they are well motivated. They - they want to do - people run for the Senate, does not matter which party they are in, to do good. Now they may have a little different idea of what is good. But they have good motives by and large. And if you just understand what people want to achieve and what kind of people they are and how - how you can be persuasive with them, that's - that's part of it. You - you operate under the realization that without bipartisan support, very little is going to happen, at least in the U.S. Senate. Because the other side always has the ability to stop you. So, there is a pragmatic part of it. You have to be willing to work with others. And then the third thing is, through the negotiations on the Indian water settlements, for example, I figured out that if you continue to work at it hard enough, long enough, there's usually a way to get it done. Now that does presuppose one thing. It presupposes a common desire to get it done and I will say that a lot of negotiations that I was involved in in the Senate failed because there was not the necessary ingredient of an overwhelming desire to get it done. More important than that desire, sometimes was the desire to take political advantage of the other side. And when that is there, you are not going to succeed. So, you try as hard as you can. When you run into that kind of a wall, you might as well just say let's don't waste any more time on this. We are not on the same page. I wanna do this, you wanna do something else, we will just have to fight it out another day.

**CH** Tell me why you considered the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks the most momentous event of your 26 years in Washington. Can you share what that morning was like for you and other members of Congress?

**JK** I'm no- I must've said that at some point. Uh, there were a lot of other momentous things - you

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

know, the impeachment of Bill Clinton was a momentous situation. There was some legislation that we adopted that was really momentous and - and some other things, but certainly in terms of a threat to the Congress, to the nation, that attack which was probably aimed at the U.S. Capitol, which hit the Pentagon in Washington, and then also destroyed the twin towers in New York, and the airliner in Pennsylvania, the feeling in Washington, D.C. with the combination of those things, was that our nation was under attack and that the Congress specifically was under attack.

And that there was a need to react - first of all, to understand it well and to protect the people as best as possible, and then to react properly to it. It's as if, I mean as many people died there as died in Pearl Harbor. That was a momentous event in our nation's history, and this was somewhat similar to that. Moreover, it had occurred right there in that city. And everybody knows exactly what they were doing at the moment that the attack began. So we had to respond and one of the things that, as members of Congress, we resolved to do, that night was to join together on the Capitol steps to demonstrate to the American people that we were there. We are open for business in the morning. We are not gonna be cowed. And we are going to find a way to deal with the situation as it needs to be dealt with. And we did that that night. The next night, in the rotunda of the capitol, we had a very unique House and Senate prayer event, a public service where only the members of Congress spoke briefly, a few of us had the opportunity to speak. Again, to express our condolences to those who had lost their lives, or friends and family's lives had been lost, to demonstrate our resolve. Frankly, most of us called upon the Lord, as we understood Him to be, for assistance at this time of a crisis in the country. But to again present to the - to the country the idea that we were united, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, in working through the problems for the people and developing a response to the attack.

It was - and by the way, not long after that, the anthrax scare occurred, and I was kicked out of my office because it wasn't far from Tom Daschle's office. This was the time when all of these envelopes were sent to members of Congress, some of which had anthrax in them. And people died in the postal service because of that. We did not know what kind of a challenge was going to be presented to the rest of us in government. We got very practiced at donning our - the hoods that resisted either a chemical attack or an anthrax attack, something of that sort. I had to do it because as one of the leaders, I had to demonstrate how to do it and this is - and when you meet with a bunch of staffers who are in their 20s and you're responsible for them, you know that their parents are all worried sick that they're back in Washington. You have had the terrorist attack. You have got this anthrax stuff going on. I had a lot of office meetings where I talked to them about the challenges and how we were to evacuate the building. How we were to don all the protective gear and all the rest of it. So, it was a big part of our lives for quite a long time. And therefore, yeah, it was a momentous time in the life of the Congress and certainly in my life.



- CH** You and your wife have been married for 52 years. That is incredible. What do you credit for being able to balance a political Washington, D.C. and Arizona lifestyle?
- JK** It is hard on the spouse. My wife was able to join me in Washington, which was very important because both of our kids were in college. Our daughter then graduated from college and came back to Washington. But for those families where the spouses are apart because of that service is very, very difficult. And I would hope that people who sometimes get upset with public servants would just stop and think a minute that there is a great deal of sacrifice in it. I am not asking for anything at this point because we were fortunate to be able to be together most of the time, but that is an important part of it.
- CH** Let us talk about your final time in the Senate. You came out and announced that you would retire. How did that decision come about?
- JK** Being a senator is not the most important thing to me. I had spent a great deal of time in public service. There were some challenges that my family had that I thought required my attention. And, I was ready to give up that part of my life, 26 years in public service. I had practiced law for 19 before that, so this was the longest piece of my professional life. And I was ready to do it and it's just one of those things. Some of the race car drivers like to say, well, you know, I just knew when it was time to retire. And I was happy with what I had done. Best job in the world. Did not do it because I was upset about anything. I just knew that it was a good time for me and go out when you're on top, to the extent I was on top.
- CH** You were quoted as lamenting how biting partisanship increasingly trumped honest debate on foreign policy. Was this partisanship present when you first entered Congress? What factors in our society have contributed to this?
- JK** We have always been somewhat partisan in foreign affairs, though less so than in domestic affairs. But it became increasing, I think particularly during the George Bush years. There was a real antipathy toward almost everything he did from the other side of the aisle. I am not going to really go into detail to answer...
- CH** That is fine.
- JK** ...your question because...
- CH** That is okay.

**JK** ...it would get me into a discussion that partisans on both sides would have some disagreement with...

**CH** Okay. Then we will...

**JK** ...but it does illustrate that there is a lot of partisanship today.

**CH** You have traveled all over the world as a Senator on fact finding trips, conferences. Can you think of one trip that stood out as the most significant to you personally? Or perhaps contributed to your success as a senator?

**JK** A lot of good trips, uh, I might say John McCain led a lot of those trips. He is probably the most traveled person in the Senate. He has more experience with foreign policy, national security than anybody else in the Senate. And I appreciate his attention to making sure I was involved in those trips as well. And there were many. I remember the first time I went to Saudi Arabia before the Desert Storm when we took Kuwait back from Saddam Hussein.

Maybe the most memorable was as an Intelligence Committee member with the chairman of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees, just the three of us and our spouses were there. We went to Pakistan and I was on the Khyber Pass just two weeks before the 9/11 attack and we were the guests of the Pakistani Intelligence Service. They were largely believed to be involved in supporting the same group of terrorists and on the morning of 9/11, I was in the security facilities of the Intelligence Committee in the Capitol on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor - that's where they were located at the time - having breakfast with the head of Pakistani Intelligence. We reciprocated the visit when my staff came in and said you've better terminate the meeting. And I had asked him about Osama Bin Laden, and he was talking about that when she came in and said, "There's been an event in New York City, and you need to terminate the meeting." We immediately went out and saw what was happening on the monitors. I escorted him and the Pakistani Ambassador out, so the trip before that was always memorable to me just having occurred just before the 9/11 attack.

**CH** I would like to bring up the American Enterprise Institute, the national conservative non-profit think tank. Over the years, you attended several conferences of AEI. What was it about the organization that inspired you to eventually join and create a project with Senator Joe Lieberman who was a strong Democrat?

**JK** AEI is one of the largest and it is center right, but I don't think it would characterize itself as

conservative per se because it has scholars that go all over the board. They don't control what their scholars do. They are free to research whatever they want to, write whatever they want to. But they are really smart. They are some of the best experts on all subjects. And Senator Lieberman and I left the Senate at the same time concerned about the same problem, namely an increasing number of political leaders and Americans generally who did not believe that we should be exercising robust leadership around the world anymore. Part of that was a response to the Iraq war. Part of it was an isolationist, an element that's always been out there to a small extent in our body politic. We were both concerned about that because we believe robust American leadership is important. Not only for others, but importantly for the United States. And so, we commenced a project under the auspices of AEI called the American Internationalism Project to study the issue, try to come up with better ways of describing why our leadership was so important in the world. We have completed the written part of that project and continue to talk about it as opportunities arise.

**CH** As a result of the report that came out, can you share - I'd like to hear some of the results that groups have taken in carrying forward the report's recommendations.

**JK** It is mixed right now, partly because the Republican nominee for President does not appear to share our views, at least not totally, and on some issues like trade issues, I don't think the Democratic nominee does either. And they both have significant followings. What I would prefer to do is to be able to educate people of the reasons why, to the extent their positions differ from what Senator Lieberman and I agree, why they are wrong and why we are right. And to me leadership is about education. And if you cannot persuade someone to your point of view, well then either maybe you are not right or maybe you're not good enough to be in the business. So, I hope that we will be able to continue to speak out on these issues, to talk about why, done right, free trade is a good thing, not a bad thing.

That you do not have a winner and a loser like the Chinese or the Americans. You have 50/50. Any bargain has to satisfy both sides or it's not a good bargain. But the beauty of the free enterprise system is, it is the most moral system. You want a car. I am a car dealer. I need money. We agree on something. You are happy with your car. I am happy I got the money. That is the free enterprise system. What could be more fair, more moral, and more advantageous for both sides of any bargain than that? So, it's not a zero-sum game. If you have the right kind of freedom to bargain the way you want to, that free enterprise system will produce more wealth and more happiness than any other system.

**CH** What attracted you to join the Washington, D.C. law firm of Covington and Burling?

**JK** Covington and Burling is one of Washington's oldest law firm. It's the largest firm

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

headquartered in Washington. It had a relatively small public affairs group and that is the group that they wanted me to participate in and I've been doing that. That group helps clients, primarily large corporate businesses, understand how both the executive and legislative branch work, help them work through problems that they may be having on Capitol Hill, for example. A lot of times just giving strategic advice. And by the way, helping foreign companies as well. It is kind of interesting to a lot of foreign businesses how we do business here in the United States. And it can be confusing to Americans as well. But anyway, part of my job is to help people work through those things.

**CH** Describe how the idea for the Kyl Center for Water Policy at Arizona State University's Morrison Institute originated.

**JK** You're gonna have to ask Richard Morrison and some other people about that because the idea was presented to me as a fait accompli. Yeah, I had been very supportive of the Morrison Institute for years. Richard and his family had contributed a lot of money to ASU to create this nice think tank environment. Friends of mine like Grady Gammage were participants in it. And I had been involved in water policy for a long time as you mentioned.

**CH** Right.

**JK** One day they came to me and said, "We've created, and if it's okay with you, we've named it the Kyl Water Center, and let's help get it off the ground. Here are some people we think might be interested in interviewing for the head of it." And, it was not my choice, but I was very happy to be involved in the process. A wonderful woman, Sarah Porter is her name, is the director of the center and they are doing great work. And I have the good fortune of working very closely with them providing some guidance and maybe encouragement from time to time.

**CH** How do you see Arizona water issues being solved in the future?

**JK** It is going to have to be through a process of collaboration by all of the mutual interests. And there are a lot. Leadership from the governor and the state legislature, the development of new experts in water law; the old timers like myself are about ready to exit the scene. Our success in dealing with water issues in Arizona has always been based on leaders coming to the fore working together. It is not a partisan issue. Democrat, Republican does not enter into this. Working together, having foresight as to what the challenges are that we've gotta meet and then having the ability to work together to solve the problem in time. We now have a bunch of new challenges. If we do not get at 'em, they're going to become real crises sooner rather than later. We have a little bit of time, but it is important for the Kyl Water Center, for others, both ASU and U of A have programs that work these issues. The governor has an active program going.

*From Jon Kyl 2016 Video Interview*

And a lot of the lawyers and other people who work with the water entities in the state appreciate the fact that the time has come to tackle some of these problems. And so, they are working together. And I think if we can keep that spirit going, we can do it. But it does take leadership. Sometimes it takes a crisis. I don't want the crises to develop first. I would rather get the solution so that we never get to that point.

**CH** You teach law at ASU's Sandra Day O'Connor Law College, in addition to everything else in your life. Share what it is like to work with college students.

**JK** Oh, it is great. I just, from our interview today, just got back from the Barrett College at ASU, the honors college. Very bright group of students just talking about issues, whatever they wanted to talk about. A lot of it relates to government as you might imagine. But, to work with Rhett Larson, who is the water law professor at the law school. Uh, the folks. I've been teaching a course in tax policy because of my membership in the Finance Committee and being involved the Super Committee and trying to come up with tax reform policies. All of that is rewarding for me as - and I hope, it elucidates some of these things for the students, too, from a different point of view than their professors can.

**CH** Let us talk personally for a minute. How and when did you become interested in NASCAR racing?

**JK** Ever since I was a little kid, I loved auto racing. At the county fair and at the state fair...

**CH** Oh.

**JK** ...and, when I got to Phoenix a friend of mine exposed me to Phoenix International Racetrack and the people out there. He was a track observer and so I volunteered as well. It's just a volunteer job to work one of the corners of the track and, you know, call for the yellow flag or, an accident or whatever might be in your vicinity of responsibility and, more and more I got into it. And, it's just something you either like it or you don't. It is kind of like hockey. It's probably like a lot of other things and, if you understand it and you like it, great. If you do not, you are really bored. So, that - that is probably enough.

**CH** What other hobbies do you have?

**JK** I like to be an observer at the NASCAR races and the Indy car races, but I like to participate in outdoor activities, primarily hiking, splittin' wood up at our cabin. You know, gettin' the old chainsaw out and something needs to be cut down, doin' that. Um, but just enjoying the

outdoors.

**CH** And how do you relax?

**JK** Believe it or not, I can get pretty relaxed doin' that. I also get pretty achy.

**CH** Tell me about your family life with your wife, children, and grandchildren.

**JK** Well, Caryll and I, are now nearing this time when I'm gonna be able to spend more time with them because I'm out of the Senate. I will be withdrawing slowly from the law practice and spending more time with them. But we are fortunate that our daughter Kristy, our son John both live in Phoenix. Uh, they have two kids each who are in college or just about - one is out now, but the other three are in college. And they are a joy. They are real - very smart, as you might imagine. And a lot of fun to be with. And, as I said, my mother, 96 years old, we still get to spend a lot of time with her and that is enjoyable. And I've got a sister here and good, good family and you know, when you get to be as old as I am, it's all about your faith and your family and your friends. And by the way, a lot of good memories, too.

**CH** How would you like to be remembered?

**JK** Mostly for - in terms of the public ser- you know, the most important thing is that you were a good dad, you were a good - good husband, a good uncle, and you tried to do what was right in your own life. But because I've been involved in the public life as well, I hope people appreciate that I always tried to approach my job with honesty, with a lot of hard work, which I think is critical to doing a good job, and to the extent I was successful, a lot of that is attributable to trying to work hard at it. Being willing to compromise when necessary because you have to. But always sticking up with your principles. That is not always easy to do, and you don't always succeed because sometimes those two things do conflict. But frequently you can find a way to adhere to your principles and still find a way to get something worthwhile accomplished. And over the course of 26 years, I think I contributed, in a satisfactory amount to...

**CH** You did.

**JK** ...the security of our country, to the health of our own state here; to the fiscal policies of our country and also hopefully as an example to younger people of how you can serve the public and do so consistent with your own values and, yet working with people with different points of view to try to get things done.

**CH** What one piece of advice would you give someone who wanted to go into public service?

**JK** Prepare. Preparation, the old saying, success is the intersection between preparation and opportunity. And if you prepare hard, if you do it - if - whatever you are doing, do it well. Somehow or other a chance is gonna come along, an opportunity will - will come along you may not be aware of. But if you are prepared to meet that challenge, that's - you can be successful. If you are waiting till the last minute to get prepared, you are not gonna be able to seize the opportunity and you will never reach your full potential. So, prepare.

**CH** Well, thank you very much for your time today and sharing your oral history with the Historical League as you are honored as our 2017 Historymaker. We so appreciate your time, Senator.

**JK** It is my pleasure and honor.

**CH** Thank you very much.

**JK** Thank you.

End of Interview

/gmc