

**PRESIDENTIAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND
ABUSE OF POWER**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

—————
Serial No. 116–46

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

—————
U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2022

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JERROLD NADLER, New York, *Chair*
MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania, *Vice-Chair*

ZOE LOFGREN, California	DOUG COLLINS, Georgia, <i>Ranking Member</i>
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas	F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee	STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia	LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida	JIM JORDAN, Ohio
KAREN BASS, California	KEN BUCK, Colorado
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana	JOHN RATCLIFFE, Texas
HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES, New York	MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
DAVID N. CICILLINE, Rhode Island	MATT GAETZ, Florida
ERIC SWALWELL, California	MIKE JOHNSON, Louisiana
TED LIEU, California	ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland	TOM McCLINTOCK, California
PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington	DEBBIE LESKO, Arizona
VAL BUTLER DEMINGS, Florida	GUY RESCHENTHALER, Pennsylvania
J. LUIS CORREA, California	BEN CLINE, Virginia
SYLVIA R. GARCIA, Texas	KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
JOE NEGUSE, Colorado	W. GREGORY STEUBE, Florida
LUCY McBATH, Georgia	
GREG STANTON, Arizona	
MADELEINE DEAN, Pennsylvania	
DEBBIE MUCARSEL-POWELL, Florida	
VERONICA ESCOBAR, Texas	

PERRY APELBAUM, *Majority Staff Director & Chief Counsel*
BRENDAN BELAIR, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

	Page
OPENING STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Jerrold Nadler, Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of New York	2
The Honorable Doug Collins, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Georgia	4
WITNESS	
Mr. Corey Lewandowski, Former Campaign Manager, Donald Trump 2016 Presidential Campaign Oral Testimony	7
APPENDIX	
Slides submitted by Democratic Members of the Committee on the Judiciary ..	122

PRESIDENTIAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND ABUSE OF POWER

Tuesday, September 17, 2019

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Washington, DC

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 1:16 p.m., in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jerrold Nadler [Chair of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Nadler, Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Cohen, Johnson of Georgia, Deutch, Bass, Jeffries, Cicilline, Swalwell, Lieu, Raskin, Jayapal, Demings, Correa, Scanlon, Garcia, Neguse, McBath, Stanton, Dean, Mucarsel-Powell, Escobar, Collins, Chabot, Jordan, Buck, Ratcliffe, Gaetz, Johnson of Louisiana, Biggs, McClintock, Lesko, Cline, Armstrong, and Steube.

Staff Present: Barry Berke, Consultant; Aaron Hiller, Deputy Chief Counsel; Arya Hariharan, Deputy Chief Oversight Counsel; David Greengrass, Senior Counsel; John Doty, Senior Advisor; Madeline Strasser, Chief Clerk; Moh Sharma, Member Services and Outreach Advisor; Susan Jensen, Parliamentarian/Senior Counsel; Sarah Istel, Oversight Counsel; Julian Gerson, Staff Assistant; Priyanka Mara, Professional Staff Member; Bobby Parmiter, Minority Deputy Staff Director/Chief Counsel; Jon Ferro, Minority Parliamentarian/General Counsel; Carlton Davis, Minority Chief Oversight Counsel; Ashley Callen, Minority Oversight Counsel; Danny Johnson, Minority Oversight Counsel; Jake Greenberg, Minority Oversight Counsel; and Erica Barker Minority Chief Legislative Clerk.

Chair NADLER. The Committee on the Judiciary will come to order.

Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare recesses of the Committee at any time. We welcome everyone to today's hearing on Presidential Obstruction of Justice and Abuse of Power.

Before we begin, I would remind all our Committee Members that we should refrain from making inappropriate references to protected parties: Namely, the President, Vice President, Members of the Senate, the Members of the House. This would include accusations of dishonesty, criminality, treason, or other unethical or improper motive. The critical issues we are addressing today which go to the very core of our constitutional democracy, understandably bring out strong passions in us as they do in the American people.

I hope that in what should be a spirited discussion of these issues today, we will stay focused on the issues and take care to keep our comments from being directed personally toward the President.

I will now recognize myself for an opening statement.

Today's hearing is entitled Presidential Obstruction of Justice and Abuse of Power. This hearing is the first one formally designated under the Committee's procedures adopted last week in connection with our investigation to determine whether to recommend articles of impeachment with respect to President Trump.

We subpoenaed three Witnesses to this hearing: Rick Dearborn, Robert Porter, and Corey Lewandowski. Unfortunately, we learned last night that the White House is blocking the first two from even showing up and tightly limiting the third. The White House has no authority, legal or otherwise, to give these orders. We had wanted these three individuals to testify before the Committee and the American people, because they are critical Witnesses to the incidence of obstruction of justice laid out in the Mueller report.

In at least five of those episodes, evidence laid out in the special counsel's report established that all the elements of obstruction of justice were met. Today, despite the roadblocks the White House has thrown up, we will focus on one of the most concerning of those five episodes. It is the President ordering the Attorney General, through Mr. Lewandowski, to stop the special counsel's investigation into the President and his campaign. As the report detailed, Mr. Dearborn was enlisted as part of that effort as well. Mr. Porter has other critical evidence regarding obstruction.

As our hearings with the special counsel and other outside experts established, anyone else involved in these episodes of obstruction would have been charged with a crime. Anyone else. Let that sink in. The President knows this, and the White House is intent on preventing the American people from hearing the details. So, it is no surprise that the White House blocked two of our Witnesses, Mr. Porter and Mr. Dearborn, from showing up today.

On behalf of the President, the White House and the Department of Justice are advancing the same spurious legal doctrine they did when this Committee called on the most important obstruction Witness to testify, former White House counsel Don McGahn. They claim Porter and Dearborn, like McGahn, are absolutely immune from testifying before Congress. There is no such thing. The only court ever to consider this purported absolute immunity doctrine totally rejected it. That is why we have gone to court in the McGahn case to set it aside.

What is happening today is more troubling than McGahn's failure to appear, because even if we apply DOJ's own made-up rules of absolute immunity, I question how Mr. Dearborn fits under those rules.

According to DOJ opinions, absolute immunity applies to, quote, "the President's immediate advisors who serve as the President's alter ego," closed quote. To extend this already dubious doctrine to someone like Mr. Dearborn, who is far more removed from the President than McGahn, is a dangerous new stretch. I think we should call this what it is: An absolute coverup by the White House. Mr. Lewandowski is here and has vital information about

Presidential obstruction of justice. The White House wants to limit our and your ability to hear it all.

Mr. Lewandowski is called alone, one-on-one, into the oval office on June 19, 2017, and again on July 19, 2017. The President did something I find startling. He dictated a speech to Mr. Lewandowski, a speech not for Mr. Lewandowski, but for Attorney General Sessions to deliver, then-Attorney General Sessions. He secretly told Mr. Lewandowski to put the following words in the AG's mouth, quote, "I am going to meet with the special prosecutor to explain this is very unfair, and let the special prosecutor move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections so that nothing can happen in future elections." That quote is from volume II, page 91 of the Mueller report.

As the Mueller report found, limiting the investigation to future elections would have cut off the investigation of any past conduct, and struck at the heart of the special counsel's mandate. It would have ended the investigation of the President's conduct. The evidence found by the special counsel met all the elements of obstruction of justice.

Mr. Lewandowski was nervous about this demand from his former boss, as he should have been. It raised serious questions about criminal conduct. The AG was recused, forbidden from doing anything regarding the Mueller investigation. He was certainly not allowed to curtail it.

So, Mr. Lewandowski tried to surreptitiously meet with the AG. When that failed, he tried to pass the buck to Mr. Dearborn. Mr. Lewandowski gave Mr. Dearborn the script that had been dictated by the President all while telling the President that he would follow through on the President's order.

So, that is what we want to try to learn more about today. As we learned with Special Counsel Mueller, Witness testimony is critical to any investigation. The White House does not want us or the American people to hear this story in full. Late yesterday, the White House sent us a lettering claiming that Mr. Lewandowski's conversations with the President, quote, "are protected from disclosure by Executive Branch confidentiality interests," closed quote. They say he may testify about Presidential communications that are already disclosed in the Mueller report, but no more.

They make that claim despite the fact that Mr. Lewandowski was, at all times, a private political operative, apparently was not offering advice of any kind, the usual prerequisite for Executive privilege, and was enlisted for apparent wrongdoing.

No court has ever said that the President is entitled to confidentiality under these circumstances. Indeed, the Department of Justice has said Executive privilege should not be invoked to conceal evidence of wrongdoing on the part of Executive officers.

The White House is advancing a new and dangerous theory: The crony privilege. It makes absolute immunity look good by comparison. Where are the limits? This is a coverup, plain and simple. If it were to prevail, especially while the Judiciary Committee is considering whether to recommend articles of impeachment, it would upend the separation of powers as envisioned by our Founders.

Today's coverup is part of a pattern of the White House blocking Congress. The President announced his desire to, quote, "fight all

the subpoenas,” unquote. The White House’s obstruction of Congress ranges across nearly every committee, and virtually every investigation of the Administration, whether related to children in cages, botched security clearances, or their failure to defend the country from ongoing attacks by a foreign adversary.

Well, Mr. Lewandowski, you are here under subpoena. That means you are required to answer our questions, all our questions, completely and truthfully. Our investigation also extends beyond the four corners of the Mueller report. We are looking at corruption and abuse of power more broadly, so we will inquire about other subjects as well. We will not be daunted by the coverup. We intend to secure accountability for any wrongdoing, because no one is above the law, not even the President of the United States.

I now recognize the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Collins, for his opening statement.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for introducing this hearing, which is now, as you said, under the new rules. Sort of the old school, the old rules, or the new rules and the old rules. These were these rules all along. Yet, here we go again. We’re going to say that they’re new because we like the packaging. I’ve never seen a majority so amazed with packaging in all my life. You know why? Because they can’t sell what’s inside. They can’t sell the product, so they just keep packaging it differently.

I think we should—I agree with my Chair. I think we should call this for what it is. It’s just another simple oversight hearing. In fact, no, I think it’s actually become this. It has become, let’s read the Mueller report for audio book. That’s what we’ve become.

We had Mr. Mueller here. Had a long day of it. Judging by all accounts, it didn’t go really well for the purpose of what you’ve proclaimed for over 9 months and almost 2 years, that there’s impeachable offenses, as my Chair has said, clearly in the Mueller report.

Here’s the problem: Seventeen of the Members of the Judiciary Committee have said that they think the President ought to be impeached. So, why are we still investigating it? Seventeen, you get some more, the problem is you don’t have the votes. You don’t have the numbers. Even if you have it from of this Committee, you don’t have it on the floor. That’s your problem.

So, the thing that we’re going to do is to drag this Committee through oversight hearings talking about things that have been talked about ad nauseam, ad nauseam, and ad nauseam. We’re going to talk about it. We’re going to put filters up, we’re going say what it really is and really is not. While in all the things, we’re going to try to imply that this President shouldn’t be President.

It is really interesting to me that we just heard just a moment ago, it was said that these made-up rules at DOJ. Well, it’s interesting that now they’re made-up rules. They weren’t made-up rules when the Obama Administration used them. Were they made-up rules then? Just asking for a friend.

This is amazing, as we come into this situation. The Chair also said that while we’re doing this and stopping committees from searching into products like the immigration issue and foreign influence, I just want to remind everybody here watching and every-

body here to see the show today, and also to remind the majority, that they have complete jurisdiction over immigration. We have complete and total jurisdiction over immigration, for the most part. All we have to do if you want to fix the border, put a bill up. You don't want to do that. You like this. You like having the press here. You like the cameras, because it makes it appear like something's happened that's not.

The real thing that is coming out starting—the American people are starting to get it. They're starting to get it, that if you're just howling at the wind, you're not doing anything. You're making them think you are, but you're not.

So, don't bring to me immigration anymore that you want to deal with it. You just want to bring Administration officials in here and yell at them because you don't like what's happening. I agree. We need to fix it. Bring us a bill. Bring my bill. Bring your bill. Do something about it. Quit talking about foreign influence. The only real thing we all agree on in the Mueller report was foreign influence from Russia, but, yet, where's the bill? Where's the bill? Where's Waldo? Where's the bill. We don't do anything about it. We like to talk about it, because we think it makes the President look bad, because that's the implication we've been given for 2 years.

Unfortunately, we also don't really want information in this Committee either. If we did, we'd work like the Intel Committee had done. You know, we've had that issue before. That we have had to actually work with Witnesses to get them to come in. Mr. Lewandowski, I believe, said he would come without a subpoena, but we subpoenaed it anyway, because it looks—oh, as I was told earlier this year, from the Chair's perspective, a subpoena is a start of the dialogue. Not according to Blacks Law Dictionary, but who cares? We're just the Judiciary Committee. This is the problem we're having.

This Committee does not want to interview Don McGahn behind closed doors. They want him in front of everybody. They want to do this out front. They don't try to actually get information. That's what real oversight is. Real oversight is trying to get information, but we don't do that.

I understand it's tough making a promise and not keeping it. I understand. All of us in this room can relate to a time when we made a promise, and we couldn't keep it. My majority made a promise, we'll impeach him. We'll investigate him. For most of them, it happened in November 2016, because they couldn't believe that Donald Trump won. They still can't get over it today.

So, what do we do? We have public hearings, lots of flashbulbs, embarrassing the President, not gathering facts, not investigating, and not doing oversight. This is certainly not being fair. We like to issue subpoenas. We're setting a world record at that, 40 times faster than the previous Chair. We don't want any answers because we're not willing to engage in dialogue to get information from folks. You know how I believe that this is more just wanting to get at here is because—it's not like Mr. Lewandowski has had silence on this issue. He's testified before Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He's testified before House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Now, he's also voluntarily testified before the special counsel by way of Mr. Mueller. We've had access to all his

summaries of his testimony. This is not new, but, it is new because it's another time to rehash an old story.

This is the fall. This is when ABC and NBC and all the broadcast folks, they bring out their new shows. This isn't the summer rerun season. We should get in there something new.

I just want to show you one last thing before I turn it back over and we'll get the popcorn and the show going. The Judiciary Committee is the Judiciary Committee for a reason. It's because we oversee the court system. For any person who has actually been here and actually has an attorney in this room who's actually appeared before a judge, a judge is a pretty stickler for rules.

I just want to point out something. It may be trivial, and I know some will laugh and some won't care. For some of us, it does matter. It the subpoena today for Mr. Lewandowski and the others said 10:00 a.m. this morning. This just shows you how impulsive and poorly designed this entire sort of faux impeachment charade we're doing. The subpoena is not even properly. The subpoenas we here for all three to compel them all 10:00 this morning. Today's hearing's at 1:00, not 10:00. The Witnesses lack appropriate notice for the hearing today. That's a simple basic subpoena issue.

We're the Judiciary Committee. I can understand this, and no offense, Natural Resources, I can understand if they get it wrong, or Transportation. I don't understand how Judiciary gets this wrong.

The Chair wants to hold people in contempt for not showing up. Try to enforce this in court, because there's no extra letter, there's no clarification of time. When I was given a subpoena for my client to appear in court, what time do you appear in court? Whenever you feel like it? No. At the time it says, unless the court or the officer giving the subpoena says differently.

The Chair is only offering for success here is to issue, well, we could do this because we've wasted enough time on other things. We will issue new subpoenas with a new date and new time and hold a new hearing. There's probably a date somewhere in October we haven't filled up with this mess somewhere.

So, with this, here we go. Mr. Chair, there's so much that we could actually do together. There's so much. As long as we don't have time, we'll continue with rerun season. The popcorn still tastes good. I don't know why we do this, except maybe we just have a deficiency of flashbulbs, I don't know, because we just like the show. The show is going to get even more as it goes today, because the new rules are in effect. Oh, wait. They're not new, they're just old, but we're applying them today because we want it to look better.

I have one more of those, and we'll talk about it later when we get to some other questions later.

With that, I yield back.

Chair NADLER. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

I will now introduce today's Witness.

Corey Lewandowski is a political consultant and commentator. He previously serves as the first campaign manager for Donald Trump's 2016 Presidential campaign. Mr. Lewandowski received a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Massachusetts, and a master's degree in political science from American University. He also attended the Naval War College.

Former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Rick Dearborn and former White House Staff Secretary Robert Porter have refused to appear today despite dually issued subpoenas from this Committee. As I discussed in my opening statement, I strongly disagree with the White House's assertion of absolute immunity. As to Mr. Dearborn and Mr. Porter, we are considering all available options to enforce these subpoenas.

We welcome Mr. Lewandowski. We thank him for participating in today's hearing.

If you will please rise, I will begin by swearing you in.

Do you swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you're about to give is true and correct to the best of your knowledge, information, and belief, so help you God?

Let the record show that the Witness has answered in the affirmative.

Thank you, and please be seated.

Please note that your written statement will be entered into the record in its entirety. Accordingly, I ask that you summarize your testimony in 5 minutes. To help you stay within that time, there's a timing light on your table. When the light switches from green to yellow, you have one minute to conclude your testimony. When the light turns red, it signals your five minutes have expired.

Mr. Lewandowski, you may begin.

TESTIMONY OF COREY LEWANDOWSKI

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Chair Nadler, Ranking Member Collins, and the Members of the Committee, good afternoon.

I'd like to start off by expressing my hope that today's hearing will be productive in revealing the truth both to the Committee and to the American people.

For the record, and as you likely know, I have already testified before Congress on three separate occasions. I sat at length with the staff of the special counsel's office. There, too, my time and answers were given freely and without hesitation. I think in one form or another, I've already answered questions for well over 20 hours.

So, now, here I am before the House Judiciary Committee to answer the same questions again. Just last week, this Committee, over the objections of the minority, unilaterally changed the rules to make this an impeachment proceeding, which is very unfair. However, in the spirit of cooperation, I am prepared to move forward today.

I'd like to start by recounting the events that brought us to this point. My story of joining the Trump campaign, working through a historic election, and continuing to have the privilege to be part of the greatest political movement in our Nation's history. I present this summary in the interest of truth and transparency to the American people, the very same reason and rationale that this Committee offers as the basis of today's hearing.

Growing up in a blue collar single-parent family in Lowell, Massachusetts, I learned the value of hard work. That work ethic helped me to put myself through both college and graduate school, prior to becoming a congressional staffer, and ultimately a certified peace officer in the State of New Hampshire. However, the world of politics was always a passion. In January of 2015, Donald J.

Trump, then a private citizen, hired me to help him explore a possible run for the presidency. It was an honor and a privilege to play a small part of such a historic campaign.

The campaign started as a small group of individuals helping Mr. Trump to make the decision in June of 2015 to ride down a golden escalator and seek the Republican nomination for presidency of the United States.

For more than a year, I served as campaign manager to then-candidate Trump in his historic campaign where I led a lean and dedicated operation that succeeded in helping him capture the Republican nomination. My job was simple: Provide Mr. Trump with my best advice, spend his money like it was my own, and give him the support he needed to win.

I also set long-term objects and managed day-to-day decisions. I had the privilege, and it was a privilege, of helping transform the Trump campaign from a dedicated but small makeshift organization to a historical and unprecedented political juggernaut. I am proud to say, Mr. Trump won 38 primaries and caucuses, and received more votes than any candidate in the history of the Republican party all while being outspent most of the way.

The historic campaign helped Mr. Trump secure the Republican nomination, and, ultimately, the Presidency of the United States. However, since Election Day, whether it was bad actors at the FBI, in the intelligence community, or lies coming from Members of the current House majority that there was evidence of collusion, the American people continue to be sold a false narrative with the purpose of undermining legitimacy of the 2016 election results. No matter the size, campaigns are not always the most efficient organizations. While you run in single congressional districts, just imagine what it's like to lead a national campaign that spans all 50 States of the union.

During my time as campaign manager, there were competing interests for the candidate's time, and a sea of ideas, some laudable, some sound, a few not so much, many of which were dismissed out of hand; others were passed on to staffers to be handled.

I also received hundreds of thousands of emails, some days with as many as 1,000 emails. Unlike Hillary Clinton, I don't think I ever deleted any of those. Many of them were responded to with either one-word answers or forwarded to other staffers for additional follow-up.

Throughout it all, and to the best of my recollection, I don't ever recall having any conversations with foreign entities, let alone any who were offering the help to manipulate the outcome of an election. As I have said publicly many times, anyone who attempted to illegally impact the outcome of an election should spend the rest of their life in jail.

Let me stress this fact. During the 2016 election cycle, Mr. Trump held no elected position. He was not a government official. Rather, the Obama-Biden Administration and the intelligence community overseen by James Clapper, Jim Comey, and John Brennan, had the responsibility to the American people to ensure the integrity of the 2016 election. I will leave it to this Committee and the American public to decide how successful or not they were in doing their jobs.

Regardless, as the special counsel determined, there was no conspiracy or collusion between the Trump campaign and any foreign governments, either on my watch or afterwards. Not surprisingly, after the Mueller report was made public, interest in the fake Russia collusion narrative has fallen apart.

In conclusion, and it's sad to say, this country has spent over 3 years and \$40 million taxpayer dollars on these investigations, and it's now clear that the investigation was populated by many Trump haters who had their own agenda, to take down a dually elected President of the United States. As for actual collusion or conspiracy, there was none. What there has been, however, is harassment of this President from the day he won the election.

We as a Nation would be better served if elected officials like yourself concentrated your efforts to combat the true crises facing our country as opposed to going down rabbit holes like this hearing. Instead of focusing on petty and personal politics, the Committee focuses on solving the challenge of this generation. Imagine how many people we could help, or how many lives we could save.

As I stated earlier, I have voluntarily appeared in front of Congress on three separate occasions and spoken to Members of the special counsel's office for multiple hours. I will continue to be forthright and cooperative, and I will be as sincere in my answers as this Committee is in its questions.

Chair NADLER. Thank you for your testimony.

We will now proceed under the 5-minute rule with questions. At the completion of the Members' questions, pursuant to the Chair's September 12, 2019, resolution for investigative procedures, and pursuant to notice, this will be followed by 1 hour of staff questioning equally divided by the majority and the minority.

I will begin by recognizing myself for 5 minutes.

Mr. Lewandowski, we received a letter from the White House just yesterday that they will not let you answer any questions beyond what you told the special counsel and was publicly released. The White House's instruction to you is based on bogus claim of Executive privilege, even though you did not work a single day for the Administration, let alone in the Executive branch. My colleagues are going to get into the specific events in detail, but I'm especially troubled by the President's attempt to obstruct Congress' investigation and prevent the American people from learning the truth about what he's done, and I want to ask you questions relevant to that issue.

Mr. Lewandowski, is it correct that, as reported in the Mueller report on June 19, 2017, you met alone in the Oval Office with the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry. Is there a book and number you can reference me to, please? I don't have a copy of the report in front of me.

Chair NADLER. Volume II, page 90.

I simply ask you: Is it correct that, as reported in the Mueller report, on June 19, 2017, you met alone in the Oval Office with the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could you read the exact language of the report, sir? I don't have it available to me.

Chair NADLER. I don't think I need to do that, and I have limited time.

Did you meet alone with the President on that date?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I'd like you to refresh my memory by providing a copy of the report so I can follow along.

Chair NADLER. You don't have a copy with you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't have a copy of the report, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. The clock will stop.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I request that the clock be stopped while this charade is sorted out.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry, Congressman. What page was it?

Chair NADLER. The clock should have been stopped and should remain stopped.

Page 90, volume II.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. Which paragraph, sir?

Chair NADLER. I don't have it in front of me.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'd like a reference, sir, so I can follow along on what you're asking.

Chair NADLER. Do you not have an independent recollection of whether you met with the President on that date?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I'm just trying to find it in the Mueller report where it states that.

Chair NADLER. Well, you have it in front you. I gave you the page number.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. Where on page 90 is it, sir?

VOICE. Mr. Chair, you got to start the clock.

Chair NADLER. No, I don't have to start the clock when he's filibustering.

Bottom of page 90.

Mr. COLLINS. Filibustering is across the hall in the Senate. This is actual questions being done now.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, point of Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair.

Mr. COLLINS. That's not a—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will State his point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, is it appropriate for a Witness to refuse to answer a question, and instead demand that we reference and point him to—I'd ask that Mueller report be closed and the Witness be directed to answer the question.

Chair NADLER. The answer is not appropriate, but it's on the bottom two lines of that page.

Mr. COLLINS. The clock can start now. There's a question.

VOICE. Point of Order. When will the clock start, Mr. Chair.

Mr. COLLINS. Once the question's asked, Mr. Chair, the clock should start.

Chair NADLER. Right under overview, second line.

Mr. COLLINS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman—the Witness—

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. The Witness has the time—

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order.

Mr. NADLER. The question—

Mr. COLLINS. Point or Order overrides that. A Point of Order overrides that, Mr. Chair, and you know that.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. The Point of Order is once the question has been asked and referenced properly to the Witness to answer the question, the clock should start. It cannot be held while you and your counsel go over notes.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman is correct. The clock will start, and the Witness will answer the question without further delay.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I see that in the report.

Chair NADLER. Thank you.

During that meeting, did you tell the special counsel that the President, quote, “asked you to deliver a message to Sessions who was then the Attorney General of the United States”? Page 91.

I asked you a question, sir.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I’m looking for that reference on page 91, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. Do you not have an independent recollection?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No. I’m looking—Mr. Congressman, I’m trying to adhere to the White House’s request. I answer questions that are provided in the Mueller report only. So, I’m trying to reference that report directly by your question, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. Were you a White House employee at that time?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. If—did you have—okay.

You did not hold any position in the government whatsoever, did you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct.

Chair NADLER. Now, sitting behind you are counsels for the White House, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s my understanding.

Chair NADLER. You understand those lawyers actually work for the President at the White House?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that’s accurate.

Chair NADLER. Nevertheless, the President’s lawyers have told you not to answer any question by this Committee, other than what has already been disclosed in the special counsel’s report; is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I have to read from the letter that the White House provided the Committee, if that would help clarify.

Would you like me to do that, Congressman?

Chair NADLER. No. I’d like you to answer the question.

Have you been directed—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I’ve never spoken to any Members of the White House counsel’s office other than saying, “hello,” about 15 seconds ago.

Chair NADLER. You were directed by letter.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I was provided a letter that I believe this Committee was assigned. It says as explained below, “Mr. Lewandowski’s conversation with the President and with senior advisors to the President are protected from disclosure by long-standing—long settled principles protecting the Executive branch confidentiality interests. As a result, the White House is directing

Mr. Lewandowski not to provide information about such communication as beyond the information provided in the portions of the report.”

Chair NADLER. We'll take that as a yes.

The basis for their direction is a claim of Executive privilege; is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can read again, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. The answer is you're not answering the question.

We've already established that you were never employed by the White House or the Executive branch. That is correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have never been employed by the Executive branch.

Chair NADLER. Sir, did you ask the White House counsels to be here?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, as I just reiterated, I've never spoken to anyone in the White House counsel's office.

Chair NADLER. The answer is no.

Was it your idea for you not to answer questions based on the claim of Executive privilege?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can reiterate. I didn't ask—I've never had a conversation with someone from the White House counsel's office regarding this matter.

Chair NADLER. So, it was not your—so it was your idea not to—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've never had a conversation with someone from the White House counsel's office—

Chair NADLER. Was your idea not to answer these questions based on Executive privilege, yes or no?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I can only go by the letter that was provided. It was not my idea to provide this letter.

Chair NADLER. Not your idea.

Did you ever suggest to the President or anyone else that you thought your communications with him were official White House communications?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, the White House has directed not—I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisors to protect Executive branch confidentiality. I recognize this is not my privilege, but I am respecting the White House's decision.

Chair NADLER. Let me ask you some questions about your relationship with the President after he assumed office.

How many times has the President asked you to meet him in the White House?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed me not to disclose the substance of any discussions.

Chair NADLER. How many times did you meet with the President alone in the White House in 2017?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know the answer to that.

Chair NADLER. How many times did he direct you to deliver a message to a Member of his cabinet?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President.

Chair NADLER. Did he ever discuss with you any concerns that he may have committed a criminal offense?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed not to disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch confidentiality.

Chair NADLER. All right.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I recognize that is not my privilege.

Mr. NADLER. You won't—

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, I want to make a Point of Order.

Pursuant to clause 2(j)2(a) of Rule 111, that the gentleman is out of order. He has exceeded the time limit under the 5-minute rule.

Chair NADLER. I will enforce the time limit under the 5-minute rule.

VOICE. I challenge the rule.

Mr. COLLINS. I challenge the ruling of the Chair.

Chair NADLER. The ruling of the Chair is challenged. All those in favor of overriding the rule of the Chair say aye. Opposed, no.

Mr. COLLINS. Roll call.

Chair NADLER. The noes have it.

Roll call is asked. The clerk will call—where is the clerk?

The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler.

Chair NADLER. Question is, the question is will the ruling of the Chair be overruled? My vote is no.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler?

Chair NADLER. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler votes no.

Ms. Lofgren?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.

Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cohen votes no.

Mr. Johnson of Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Georgia votes no.

Mr. Deutch?

Mr. DEUTCH. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Deutch votes no.

Ms. Bass?

Ms. BASS. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Bass votes no.

Mr. Richmond?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries?

Mr. JEFFRIES. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries votes no.

Mr. Cicilline?

Mr. CICILLINE. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline votes no.

Mr. Swalwell?

Mr. SWALWELL. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Swalwell votes no.

Mr. Lieu?

Mr. LIEU. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Jayapal?
Ms. JAYAPAL. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jayapal votes no.
Ms. Demings?
Ms. DEMINGS. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Demings votes no.
Mr. Correa?
Mr. CORREA. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Correa votes no.
Ms. Scanlon?
Ms. SCANLON. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Scanlon votes no.
Ms. Garcia?
Ms. GARCIA. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Garcia votes no.
Mr. Neguse?
Mr. NEGUSE. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Neguse votes no.
Ms. McBath?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton?
Mr. STANTON. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton votes no.
Ms. Dean?
Ms. DEAN. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Dean votes no.
Ms. Mucarsel-Powell?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Escobar?
Mr. Collins?
Mr. COLLINS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Collins votes aye.
Mr. Sensenbrenner?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot?
Mr. CHABOT. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot votes aye.
Mr. Gohmert?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan?
Mr. JORDAN. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan votes aye.
Mr. Buck?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe?
Mr. RATCLIFFE. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes.
Ms. Roby?
[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz?
Mr. GAETZ. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz votes aye.
Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Louisiana votes aye.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
Mr. McClintock?
Mr. McCLINTOCK. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. McClintock votes aye.
Ms. Lesko?
Ms. LESKO. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Lesko votes aye.
Mr. Resenthaler?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline?
Mr. CLINE. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline votes aye.
Mr. Armstrong?
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. Steube?
Mr. STEUBE. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Steube votes yes.
Chair NADLER. Has everyone voted who wishes to vote?
Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, how am I recorded?
Mr. NADLER. Madame Clerk?
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Buck, you are not recorded.
Mr. BUCK. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Buck votes yes.
Chair NADLER. Is anyone else?
The clerk will report.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chair, there are 13 ayes and 19 noes.
[The vote was as follows:]

Roll Call No. 1

Date: 9/17/19

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
House of Representatives
116th Congress

Subject: Overriding the Rule of the Chair

PASSED

FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)		✓	
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)			
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)		✓	
Steve Cohen (TN-09)		✓	
Hank Johnson (GA-04)		✓	
Ted Deutch (FL-02)		✓	
Karen Bass (CA-37)		✓	
Cedric Richmond (LA-02)			
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)		✓	
David Cicilline (RI-01)		✓	
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)		✓	
Ted Lieu (CA-33)		✓	
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)		✓	
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)		✓	
Val Demings (FL-10)		✓	
Lou Correa (CA-46)		✓	
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)		✓	
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)		✓	
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)		✓	
Lucy McBath (GA-06)			
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)		✓	
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)		✓	
Debbie Mucarsel-Powell (FL-26)			
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)			
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Doug Collins (GA-27)		✓	
James F. Sensenbrenner (WI-05)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)		✓	
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)			
Jim Jordan (OH-04)		✓	
Ken Buck (CO-04)		✓	
John Ratcliffe (TX-04)		✓	
Martha Roby (AL-02)			
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)		✓	
Mike Johnson (LA-04)		✓	
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)		✓	
Tom McClintock (CA-04)		✓	
Debbie Lesko (AZ-08)		✓	
Guy Reschenthaler (PA-14)			
Ben Cline (VA-06)		✓	
Kelly Armstrong (ND-AL)		✓	
Greg Steube (FL-17)		✓	
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	13	19	

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, Point of Order. Mr. Chair, it says the Chair has refused—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman is not recognized.

Mr. COLLINS. I will be.

Chair NADLER. The Point of Order is sustained.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair.

Mr. NADLER. I am very troubled that the White House sitting behind you are preventing you from answering these very basic questions that go to the heart of the President's conduct we are investigating.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, I have a motion.

Chair NADLER. Not only—

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, I have a motion.

Mr. NADLER. You will wait for your motion until I finish this.

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order, then.

Chair NADLER. Not only—

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order has got to be recognized.

Chair NADLER. Not in the middle of—

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, it does.

The motion is—since the Chair is not following the House rules, I move to adjourn.

Chair NADLER. The motion is to adjourn. The motion—

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair.

Mr. NADLER. The motion to—

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of—if the Republicans on this Committee are successful in this motion to adjourn, does that mean there will be no hearing and the American people will not hear from Mr. Lewandowski about his efforts to obstruct justice?

Chair NADLER. Yes, that's exactly what it means.

Mr. CICILLINE. Okay. That's what I want—

Mr. COLLINS. It also could read they could read the—

Mr. GAETZ. I have a point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The motion is not debatable. As many as are in favor, the motion to adjourn—

Mr. GAETZ. I have a motion of Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. As many our favor—

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Cicilline gets recognized for his inquiry, but I'm not recognized.

Mr. NADLER. The motion is not debatable. As many as are in favor, the motion to adjourn say aye. Opposed, no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

Mr. COLLINS. Roll call.

Chair NADLER. Roll call is requested. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler?

Chair NADLER. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler votes no.

Ms. Lofgren?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.

Mr. Cohen?

Mr. COHEN. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cohen votes no.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia?
 Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Georgia votes no.
 Mr. Deutch?
 Mr. DEUTCH. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Deutch votes no.
 Ms. Bass?
 Ms. BASS. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Bass votes no.
 Mr. Richmond?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries?
 Mr. JEFFRIES. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries votes no.
 Mr. Cicilline?
 Mr. CICILLINE. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline votes no.
 Mr. Swalwell?
 Mr. SWALWELL. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Swalwell votes no.
 Mr. Lieu?
 Mr. LIEU. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu votes no.
 Mr. Raskin?
 Mr. RASKIN. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Raskin votes no.
 Ms. Jayapal?
 Ms. JAYAPAL. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jayapal votes no.
 Ms. Demings?
 Ms. DEMINGS. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Demings votes no.
 Mr. Correa?
 Mr. CORREA. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Correa votes no.
 Ms. Scanlon?
 Ms. SCANLON. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Scanlon votes no.
 Ms. Garcia?
 Ms. GARCIA. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Garcia votes no.
 Mr. Neguse?
 Mr. NEGUSE. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Neguse votes no.
 Ms. McBath?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton?
 Mr. STANTON. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton votes no.
 Ms. Dean?
 Ms. DEAN. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Dean votes no.

Ms. Mucarsel-Powell?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Escobar?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Collins?
Mr. COLLINS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Collins votes aye.
Mr. Sensenbrenner?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot?
Mr. CHABOT. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot votes aye.
Mr. Gohmert?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan?
Mr. JORDAN. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan votes aye.
Mr. Buck?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe?
Mr. RATCLIFFE. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe votes yes.
Ms. Roby?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz?
Mr. GAETZ. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz votes aye.
Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Louisiana votes aye.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
Mr. McClintock?
Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. McClintock votes aye.
Ms. Lesko?
Ms. LESKO. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Lesko votes aye.
Mr. Reschenthaler?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline?
Mr. CLINE. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline votes aye.
Mr. Armstrong?
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. Steube?
Mr. STEUBE. Yes.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Steube votes yes.
Mr. Chair, there are 12 ayes and 19 noes.
[The vote was as follows:]

Roll Call No. 2

Date: 9/17/19

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
House of Representatives
116th Congress

Subject: Motion to Adjourn

PASSED

FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)		✓	
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)			
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)		✓	
Steve Cohen (TN-09)		✓	
Hank Johnson (GA-04)		✓	
Ted Deutch (FL-02)		✓	
Karen Bass (CA-37)		✓	
Cedric Richmond (LA-02)			
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)		✓	
David Cicilline (RI-01)		✓	
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)		✓	
Ted Lieu (CA-33)		✓	
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)		✓	
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)		✓	
Val Demings (FL-10)		✓	
Lou Correa (CA-46)		✓	
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)		✓	
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)		✓	
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)		✓	
Lucy McBath (GA-06)			
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)		✓	
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)		✓	
Debbie Mucarsel-Powell (FL-26)			
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)			
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Doug Collins (GA-27)		✓	
James F. Sensenbrenner (WI-05)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)		✓	
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)			
Jim Jordan (OH-04)		✓	
Ken Buck (CO-04)			
John Ratcliffe (TX-04)		✓	
Martha Roby (AL-02)			
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)		✓	
Mike Johnson (LA-04)		✓	
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)		✓	
Tom McClintock (CA-04)		✓	
Debbie Lesko (AZ-08)		✓	
Guy Reschenthaler (PA-14)			
Ben Cline (VA-06)		✓	
Kelly Armstrong (ND-AL)		✓	
Greg Steube (FL-17)		✓	
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	12	19	

Chair NADLER. The motion to adjourn is not adopted, and I will finish what I was saying.

I am very troubled that the White House counsel sitting behind you are preventing you from answering these very basic questions that go to the heart of the President's conduct we are investigating. Not only were you not a government employee, but these questions are about the President's efforts to interfere with a criminal investigation of himself and have nothing to do with official government business. This is clearly just part of the President's continued attempt to cover up his actions. He is obstructing our congressional investigations by preventing you from telling the American people the truth about his misconduct. He will not succeed, and we will not be deterred.

I now recognize the gentleman from Georgia for his questions.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This past few minutes was totally avoidable and also very frustrating in the sense it has also now raised, from our perspective, the question of the privilege of the rules of the House which could be discussed on the floor, and probably will be, and possibly just the blatant running over of House rules. My concern is ethics violation as well. This has got to be run in a different way.

So, at this point, Mr. Lewandowski, you have testified before Congress multiple times over the past couple years, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Correct me if I'm wrong. You've already testified twice before the House Intel Committee, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. How long were those sessions?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think the first session was about 7 hours, and the second session was maybe 4 hours.

Mr. COLLINS. You've also testified before Senate Intel, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. About how long was that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It was about 8 hours.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. You've also testified before the special counsel's office, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. How many times?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Two separate occasions.

Mr. COLLINS. For about how long?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Probably 15–16 hours.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. Those were voluntarily, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. So, there was really—and you agreed to come here voluntarily as well, correct, today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did.

Mr. COLLINS. There was no need for a basically flawed subpoena to be issued to you, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. I want you to know that our staff and many of our Members have read the full FBI summary of your testimony, because everyone on this Committee has access to your special counsel interview summary for months.

Have you had the opportunity to review the FBI summaries in preparation for today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. Which goes to the point about why he wouldn't be able to remember so many details outside what is specifically written in the Mueller report, and that's something that needs to be made aware of.

Were you given any guidelines by the Democrats on the topics or subjects of your questions today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. COLLINS. Yeah. Because, you know, that is a problem we seem to have here is basically what we want to say is overbroad subpoenas around here. There is—I mean, we could have talked today about your favorite football team.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The Patriots.

Mr. COLLINS. The Patriots. So, you're pretty happy right now, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Tom's a winner.

Mr. COLLINS. Again, the problem we have here is we don't follow procedures, because if it gets in the way of a good story, we don't like it around here, so we'll do whatever we want, including break House rules to do that as we go forward.

In any of the times that you've had today, and especially not being questioned, you have stated in your opening statement that you plan to answer as best you possibly can; is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. You also, at a certain point in time, realize that having testified so many times in these various issues that we have, that there are certain things—does that concern you having to keep coming back and back again without having proper reference if somebody wants to, as you early, I want to know the reference in which you're speaking to. Would that be a problem to you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, sir, I think my memory, obviously, to events which transpired more than 2 years ago was clearer the first time I testified to it, because it was a year and a half ago on many occasions or longer. So, if I can have a specific reference to something, I'd be happy to have that.

Mr. COLLINS. So, it's not dilatory from your opinion. You're just wanting to make sure that you give an accurate response, seeing how you've also already testified on these issues many times before, correct.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. So, to imply otherwise is basically, in many ways, taking a shot at your testimony here, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It is.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. When you worked on the Trump campaign, you said this earlier, I just want it to be stated again, because we've had these hearings here in the Judiciary Committee, it didn't seem to take, but we'll try again. Did you engage in collusion, coordination, or conspiracy with the Russians?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Never.

Mr. COLLINS. Did you observe anyone else doing that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. When we look at what's going on here today, I think the concern that we have, and many of us on this side, is we have a narrative that's failed. The failed narrative has continued. You're being asked to come in here and do something that you've done many times over, that this whole Committee has seen exactly what you're looking for.

If you're following the premise of what the Chair says the majority is looking for is that they're finding a reason to try and impeach the President. I've already said they have found—17 of them at least have publicly said they found a reason, which really don't have to go any further, but they can't get the more on the floor to do this. So, this is dragging this out.

So, Mr. Lewandowski, I'd encourage you to answer the questions fully, as you said you would do. You voluntarily come here, even though we decide to throw a flawed subpoena at you, and the others as well. I think as we go forward here, we'll see how this actually moves forward.

This is concerning to me, Mr. Chair. I'm going to take this for the moment. It's okay to try and get your stuff out. It's okay to be frustrated. It's also not okay to overrun House rules. The 5-minute rule is a House rule. It's not a Committee's rule and it's not up for interpretation by the Chair, whatever he feels like. It wouldn't be if I was the Chair or you're the Chair. That's not debatable.

You may not have got your last question in, but we've already discussed, and we're going to have a lot of more discussion here in a little while on staff questioning, but there's plenty of time to get that last little question that you didn't get asked to somebody else. Is it worth breaking the House rules? I know some in the audience don't care and some of the majority doesn't care, but at the end of the day, you're accusing a President of very high issues that we got to look at. You're accusing him and dragging it through in this Committee for 8 months we're doing this. So, I think following procedures is something that you actually have to look at because your idea is not really—

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of Order, Mr. Chair. The time has expired.

Chair NADLER. I mean, if he wishes. He doesn't wish.

The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Good morning, Mr. Lewandowski. I'm questioning you right now. Thank you.

The President asked you, who had no role at all in the White House, to deliver that message to Attorney General Sessions. The President could have just picked up the phone himself at any time and called the Attorney General. The President also had a full staff of Executive employees right down the hall.

So, this made me wonder. If the President thought what he was doing was legal, why didn't he just pick up the phone and call Attorney General Sessions, or why not ask any member of his staff who worked right down the hall to deliver a message. It is clear to me that the reason he went to you, Mr. Lewandowski, is because everyone said no.

So, I want to ask you about that. Two days before meeting you, the President had called White House Counsel McGahn at home on a Saturday to fire the special counsel saying, and you can see that

on the screen, Mueller has to go. Call me back when you do it, plain and simple. McGahn refused.

When the President asked you to deliver that message, did he, the President, tell you that 2 days before your meeting, his White House counsel had refused to fire the special counsel? Volume 1186 is where you'll find that language in volume II.

When the President asked you—did you hear the question?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question, Congresswoman?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When the President asked you to deliver that message, did he, the President, tell you that 2 days before your meeting, his White House counsel had refused to fire the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed me that I do not disclose the substance of any conversations with the President—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So, you are not allowed to answer whether the President told you he called his counsel at home on Saturday to remove, on a Saturday, remove the special counsel, and his counsel said no.

The President had also personally called Sessions at home and asked him to unrecuse himself and oversee the special counsel's investigation, and Sessions said no.

When the President asked you to deliver his message to Sessions, did the President tell you that Sessions had already said no? Volume II, page 107?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, Congresswoman, I recognize that the privilege is not mine. I've been asked by the White House to—Congresswoman, I'd be happy to answer your question, or you can just have a conversation by yourself. If you'd like to ask me a question, I'd be happy to answer.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. No. I'm going to continue. The reason is—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, then don't ask me a question if you don't want to hear my answer.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I'm reclaiming my time. This is a House Judiciary, not a house party.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. So, if you ask me a question, give me the opportunity to answer your question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. —the very campaign the special counsel's investigating—I'd like my time restored, please, of his interruption.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady controls the time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So, he was a Witness to the special counsel's investigation. For that reason, Sessions said publicly that Federal law prohibited his involvement in the special counsel's investigation. Here's a quote from the report from volume II, pages 49–50, which is on the screen. You can read that.

Yes or no. Did the President tell you that the Attorney General was legally not allowed to take any part in the special counsel's investigation when he asked you to deliver him a note about that very investigation? Did the President tell you that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What you've just read is not on the screen, Congresswoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. You need to look at the screen.

Yes or no? Read the screen.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You're welcome to read it, Congresswoman.
Ms. JACKSON LEE. You're welcome to be stalling. I'm not going to stall.

You either answer the question yes or no.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congresswoman, I'll take the same privileges that you've asked other Members.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Did the President tell you that nobody at the White House was supposed to even contact the Attorney General about the investigation? That you can answer yes or no.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I will do not disclose any conversation I've had with the President, Congresswoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, you are obviously here to block any reasonable inquiry into the truth or not of this Administration. The White House counsel, quote, "Shortly after Sessions announced his recusal, directed that Sessions should not be contacted about the special counsel's investigation." In fact, the White House counsel's internal note states, "no contact with Sessions and no communication serious about instruction."

Can you read that? I just said it. Can you read that? Did you hear me?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Is there a question?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Yes.

Did the President tell you his White House counsel told him about no contact with Sessions because of serious concerns of obstruction when he asked you to deliver a message to Sessions?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I am respecting the Executive branch privilege of confidentiality, and I will recognize that at this time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me just say that you know the President was putting you at risk when he asked you to deliver a message to the Attorney General.

I want to be very clear. The President knew what he was doing was wrong because everyone else had already said no. He called his White House counsel to fire the special counsel. McGahn said no. He called the Attorney General to ask him to unrecuse himself from the special counsel's investigation. Sessions said no. His White House counsel said there should be no contact with Sessions because of his recusal. So, what does a President do? He calls you in to do what everyone else wouldn't do. He called you in to do his dirty work in secret because he knew it was wrong.

Chair NADLER. The time—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Well, we will expose the truth. The President cannot hide behind you any longer. You should be here to be telling the truth.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentlelady's time—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Truth will set you free and the American people.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentlelady has expired. The Witness may answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe there was a question, Congressman.

Chair NADLER. Very well.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Yes, there was.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could you repeat the question? I didn't hear it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I'd be happy to repeat the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It's just a rant.

Chair NADLER. Repeat the question.

The gentlelady's time is expired.

The gentleman from—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Did you know the Attorney General recused—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Chabot, is recognized.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, thank you for appearing this afternoon to testify before this Committee. I understand that you've spent many hours testifying voluntarily before Congress over the last few years; isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It is.

Mr. CHABOT. Have you had to hire and retain counsel to represent you for all the investigations that you've had to endure, simply because you served as the President's campaign manager?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHABOT. That's unfortunate, because you didn't solicit or receive assistance from the Russians, did you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. CHABOT. Are you an agent working on behalf of the Russian Government?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. CHABOT. As a close friend and adviser of the President, you don't believe that the President is working on behalf of the Russians, do you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Absolutely not.

Mr. CHABOT. To your knowledge, there is no effort on the part of the President to intentionally obstruct justice, is there?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you.

Yet again, coming here to tell this Committee what we, Special Counsel Mueller, and the American public already know, that President Trump did not collude with the Russians, nor did he obstruct justice. That's not to say that the Russians weren't trying to interfere and influence our 2016 Presidential elections. It's clear that they were by sending fake texts and operating fake Facebook pages and holding fake rallies all in an effort to try to influence the outcome of the election. Democrats want to ignore all the real evidence of Russian interference and hold this fake impeachment because it happened under a different President's watch. This all happened under President Obama's watch; isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHABOT. It was the Obama Administration that failed to protect us from the Russian interference and influence in our election. Isn't that also true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. CHABOT. President Trump wasn't President. He wasn't the one that failed to protect the country. If anybody failed, it was the Obama Administration; is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, it is.

Mr. CHABOT. I've said it before, and I'll say it again: We're wasting valuable Committee time engaging in this impeachment investigation. The fact of the matter is one thing this Committee could be doing is to question Inspector General Horowitz concerning the bias against the President at the origins of the Russian investigation. We could be questioning Horowitz about his recent report how then-FBI director Comey mishandled department memos.

This Committee has such a rich history, has jurisdiction over a whole lot of very significant things. We're spending our time on this fake impeachment, but we could be focused on something that really matters, like immigration, asylum. We have hundreds and thousands of people that have entered our southern border. Generally, they're brought up either individually or in groups, caravans, usually oftentimes connected with cartels. Cartels make a lot of money when they come up here. They're told the magic words, come across the border. They say that they're in fear and come right into our country. We put them on a bus or on a plane, sent to communities all across the country. That's something this Committee should be working in a bipartisan manner to do something about.

Opioids. We have about 70,000 Americans who lost their lives to opioids last year. That's something in the jurisdiction of this Committee, yet we do virtually nothing about it in this Committee. A balanced budget amendment. That's something I've introduced in this Congress. We got a \$22 trillion debt hanging over our head; yet we do nothing in this Committee about attempting to actually pass something that would make us balance the budget every year, like all our States have to do.

So, finally, I just want to thank you again, Mr. Lewandowski, for appearing at today's hearing. Perhaps your testimony today will finally convince Democrats that there are much more important things that this Committee could be spending our time on rather than continuing to pursue this fake impeachment. A faux impeachment.

The bottom line is, they don't have the votes in the House to move forward for the House to vote for this Committee to open an impeachment inquiry. They don't have the votes. Some of the Democrats want to vote for it. Some of the Democrats would vote against it. They don't have the votes. So, what they do is they spend valuable Committee time that we could be spending on other important things on this fake, faux impeachment. It's a shame, because this Committee could be doing so much more on behalf of the American people.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NADLER. The gentleman will state his point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, the Witness just answered a long line of questions from the gentleman from Ohio about whether Donald Trump had colluded with the Russians and about the origins of the Mueller investigation and so on, but he never testified as to any of those things before Special Counsel Mueller. Can he now continue to invoke this White House rationale that he's confined to the

four corners of the Mueller report when he's gone way beyond it in his responses to the questioning from the gentleman from Ohio?

Chair NADLER. Regardless of whether he went beyond the four corners of the Mueller report in the answers that he gave to the last questioner, regardless of that, and I'm glad to hear he favors the Patriots even though that's not in the Mueller report, but regardless of the long series of answers that he gave irrelevant—that were to the Mueller report, the claim of privilege made by the Witness is improper for the reasons set forth in our letter today to the White House and to the Witness's counsel.

That said, I will take the claim of privilege under advisement.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS. Did you actually answer his Parliamentary inquiry? Because it was a statement, not a Parliamentary inquiry. You just sort of skipped on to Executive privilege here.

At least acknowledge that it was not a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman stated a Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS. He did not. It was a statement.

Chair NADLER. I answered his Parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, it's been made clear here you were not an employee, and you admitted that the White House, you had no W-2. You had no card. You had nothing. You were not an employee. You were a policeman at one time, so you know something about the law, and about following the law.

Didn't you think it was a little strange that the President would sit down with you one-on-one and ask you to do something that you knew was against the law? Did that strike you as strange?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I disagree with the premise of your question, Congressman.

Mr. COHEN. You weren't a policeman?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn't think the President asked me to do anything illegal.

Mr. COHEN. You didn't think it would have been illegal for you to ask Mr. Sessions to drop the investigation and to just go on to future Presidents and omit with everything with this President, and go Ollie Ollie in Free, we're going to start with the next one about colluding with Russia? You didn't think that was illegal to obstruct justice?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, the President didn't ask me to do anything illegal.

Mr. COHEN. Obviously, you never been a judge and won't be one.

All these people asked you, they gave you dictation. He dictated to you a message to give Sessions.

Had you ever been a secretary for the President before and taken dictation or shorthand?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Many times.

Mr. COHEN. Oh, so we got your qualifications now. You were a secretary.

He asked you, outside of White House channels, and that's what Mueller wrote, that this was outside of White House channels.

Could it have been he asked you to get the message to Sessions because he thought you would do whatever he asked, even if it was illegal or immoral. Just like your former boss Bob Ney, who said you were an implementer. News reports called you the President's, quote, "enforcer." *U.S. Today* said Lewandowski's background is largely as a Trump guy, and not so much as a strategist, not a campaign manager, but as a right-hand man, a body man, and an enforcer. *Esquire* went further and said the one-time campaign manager for Donald Trump has the traits of an enforcer, and the conflict resolution skills to match. You have even described yourself in your book, "Let Trump Be Trump," you said, "we were fine with whatever role the President wanted us to play." In Donald Trump's Army, there were only loyal soldiers. There is no more loyal soldiers.

Your previous boss, Bob Ney, was convicted of corruption and lying to authorities in the Jack Abramoff scandal. You were fired from Americans for Prosperity after being accused of fraud, voter fraud. You are now involved in this.

Either you were willing to break the law for politics and Mr. Trump or you're a Forrest Gump relating to corruption.

So, maybe let me ask you this: Did the President pick you his enforcer? He thought you would play whatever role he wanted because it was illegal? Is that possibly why he chose you to take this message to Sessions?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That would be a question for the President, Congressman.

Mr. COHEN. Well, Donald Trump was right, though. First the White House counsel, Don McGahn, refused to fire the special counsel. Mr. McGahn showed principle and character and refused to do what he knew would be an illegal act.

Then, Attorney General Sessions, who had recused himself, was asked to unrecuse himself. Attorney General Sessions also did the right thing and he said, "I'm not going to unrecuse myself because I have a conflict, because I did—was involved in the campaign and knew some things, can't do it."

Then, the White House counsel advised the President not even to contact. You, his loyal soldier, would do it. You were different that Sessions and McGahn. Trump could depend on you. You did not ask any questions; you were a loyal soldier. You just wrote down the message and agreed to deliver it. That's what he thought. You took the dictation; you gave it to Hope Hicks. You asked her to type it up for you—not that you couldn't have done it yourself, I'm sure—and then asked somebody else to deliver the message to Sessions when you decided not to.

Donald Trump talked to you outside normal channels so there'd be no record or anything that he asked you to do to obstruct justice. Nothing to do with that at all. The President knew what he was doing was wrong. Mr. Sessions knew what he was doing was wrong. Mr. McGahn knew what he was doing was wrong. You seem to be the only person who didn't think it was wrong.

Mr. Trump was wrong, because at the last minute you got cold feet, you chickened out. The President's trust was misplaced. You decided to do what you told the President you were going to do and you handed it off to somebody else.

Did you realize at some point that Mr. Ney, your former boss, got involved in criminal problems and went to prison and maybe you were going to be the next one? Did that cross your mind? Did you ever think about Bob Ney's situation going to prison?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman Ney, Congressman, so we are clear, went to jail many years after I left his employment. I'm sure you're going to clarify that for the record.

Mr. COHEN. You were his employee and you had great respect for him. You learned from that. I'm asking, did you learn from his experience and realize that what you were asked to do was illegal and you didn't want to follow the same trail as Bob Ney and end up in prison?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I wasn't asked to do anything illegal, Congressman.

Mr. COHEN. Well, the public will determine that.

This has been more obstruction of Congress by this Administration, and you followed their instructions, and you're doing just exactly they thought you'd do. You were a loyal soldier, except you didn't follow Trump's instructions, you chickened out at the last minute, you got cold feet.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, you ran President Trump's campaign between January 2015 and June 2016. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. You were at the helm of the campaign when President Trump's secured the Republican nomination?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Pretty good campaign you ran.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Thank you.

Mr. JORDAN. I mean you beat, what, 17–18 different opponents, senators, governors, and some good Senators. Of course, had you a pretty good candidate.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The best.

Mr. JORDAN. Pretty good candidate, who I think has done a great job as President of the United States.

After you left the campaign—I think you left in June of 2016—after you left the head of the campaign, were you still involved with the campaign throughout the rest of the election all the way up through November 8, 2016?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. That entire time.

So, you were part of the campaign operation at some level or another from January 2015–November 8, 2016.

During that entire time did you guys ever work with Russia to impact the election?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. JORDAN. You know what's interesting, Mr. Lewandowski? When Jim Comey was asked that same question, sitting at that same table, he gave the same answer. When Bob Mueller was asked that same question, sitting at that same table, he gave the same answer.

Falsely accused, the President is falsely accused of colluding with a foreign State to impact the election. Jim Comey, when we deposed him at that very table, said after 10 months of investigation we didn't have a thing. Bob Mueller gets named special counsel, he wastes \$30 million of taxpayer money, 22-months investigation, he sits at that table just a few weeks ago and gives the same darn answer.

These guys over here, they don't care. They don't care. They don't want to get to what Mr. Chabot said, they don't want to figure out how the false accusation happened. They just want to drag people in front of this Committee and keep trying to find some way they can go after the President.

Let's go back to the process that the Ranking Member raised.

Did you testify in front of the Senate Intel Committee in 2017?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Did you testify in front of the House Intelligence Committee in 2017?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. You went before the Special Counsel and answered his questions in 2018. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It is.

Mr. JORDAN. You did that all voluntarily?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. No subpoena?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Said, I'm willing to comply, give answers, answer all the questions you got.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. I think in your opening statement you said 20-some—how many hours did you sit in front of those various committees?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. More than 20.

Mr. JORDAN. More than 20 hours.

For this Committee, did you get a letter from this Committee back in March asking you to comply with certain document requests that Chair Nadler wanted to have.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe so, yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Your legal team complied with that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Then, on June 24 you got another letter. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. June 24 of this year you got another letter asking you to do an interview, a transcribed interview in front of the Committee. Your lawyer contacted Chair Nadler and said, we'd be happy to do that. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Said, give us some dates, we'll come in, we'll be happy to sit for an interview.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's right.

Mr. JORDAN. What happened next?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Next, about 5 weeks ago, the Committee issued a subpoena for my appearance.

Mr. JORDAN. So, you were willing to come voluntarily, just like you did with Senate Intel, House Intel, just like you did for Bob Mueller, for the special counsel, 20-some hours, you're willing to do that all. You complied with when they asked you for certain documents. Then, when they want you to come in for an interview said, all right, sure, we'll do it, they hit you with a subpoena.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct.

Mr. JORDAN. Then, they start calling you names, saying close up that book, answer the question, start treating you this way. Kind of interesting. They're the ones that started it. They're the ones that slapped you with a subpoena when you were willing to come here voluntarily.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I was.

Mr. JORDAN. Then, they questioned the demeanor you bring here today.

I mean, first they changed the rules last week, in the middle of the Congress, changed the rules of the Committee in the middle of the game. Then, today they're not even going to follow the rules because the rules they changed last week talk about staff asking questions after Members are done. We got this whole issue with consultants.

Maybe we would be better served if we did exactly what Mr. Chabot said. Maybe we would be better served as the House Judiciary Committee if we actually focused on how this whole false accusation started in the first place.

What do you think, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think it would be a great idea.

Mr. JORDAN. Great idea. Maybe the American people would be better served than spending more time investigating something that's already had 32 months of investigation, from both Jim Comey and the FBI, and Bob Mueller and the special counsel, maybe we would do that.

You know a great place to start, a great place to start, Mr. Chair? I asked you about this one week ago today. A great place to start would be the Inspector General's report that was issued just 3 weeks ago, the scathing report about Jim Comey. That would be a nice place to start.

When I asked the Chair when we might have an opportunity to question Mr. Horowitz, he said, "I don't know, I haven't thought about that."

Of course, you haven't thought about that. Too busy trying to impeach the President. Too busy slapping subpoenas on Corey Lewandowski. Of course, you haven't thought about that. That's what the Committee should be focused on.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Johnson of Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, you are about like a fish being cleaned with a spoon, it's very hard to get an answer out of you.

Let me ask you this, sir. Based on the President's past statements, everybody knows that the President does not like for any-

body to take notes when he's talking. In fact, he asks lawyers not to take official notes. You're aware of that, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm aware of the public accounts, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. All right. Fair enough. When the President met with you in the Oval Office one-on-one on June 19, 2017, to dictate a message to Attorney General Jeff Sessions, he told you to, quote, "Write this down." Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It was just you and the President in that meeting, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You knew that you needed to write down as fast as possible what the President was telling you so that you could make sure to capture the content of what he was telling you correctly, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know that speed of writing was a criterion, but I tried to capture it to the best of my ability, Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, sir.

He dictated to you exactly what he wanted you to put into the mouth of Attorney General Jeff Sessions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe he asked me to deliver a message for Jeff to consider delivering himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It was a message that he intended for Jeff, meaning Jeff Sessions, to deliver out loud and publicly. He wanted the public to know what he was saying, but he wanted Jeff to say it, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe the Mueller report accurately depicts that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Lewandowski, we've projected on the screen the message that the President dictated to you that he wanted you to deliver to the Attorney General. It's on the screen and I'd like for you to read the first two sentences, if you would entertain that.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Oh, as Director Mueller stated, when asked to read from the report, and I quote, "I would be happy to have you read it, Congressman."

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No. Look on the—well, would you prefer for me to read it instead of you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Please.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Okay. It says, "I know that I recused myself from certain things having to do with specific areas. Our POTUS is being treated very unfairly."

That's what he told you to write down and that's what you wrote down. I'll continue.

He said, "he shouldn't have a special prosecutor counsel because he hasn't done anything wrong."

Now, that's what he wanted you to deliver to Attorney General Jeff Sessions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's an accurate representation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. He wanted you to deliver it to Jeff so that Jeff could say it to the people, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You felt kind of squeamish, like that fish that you are trying to be right now being scaled, you felt a little squeamish about delivering that message, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Well, why didn't you—why did it take you so long and you never even delivered it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct, I never delivered the message.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Yeah, you chickened out.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I went on vacation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You went on vacation. So, you put the message in the safe, in your safe in your home for safekeeping, correct, before you went on vacation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I took my kids to the beach, Congressman. That was more of a priority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. President Trump was hounding you about when are you going to deliver that message, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Completely inaccurate, Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Well, he asked you about it a few times, didn't he?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, he did not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. He never asked you whether or not you had delivered that message?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not on multiple occasions, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. One occasion, okay. He did mention it on one occasion to you.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know if that's in the report, sir, or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You told him that, yeah, I'm going to get around it, I'm going to deliver it, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'd have to see the reference to the Mueller report where that is, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It's in the report.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Would you direct me to the book and page so I can review that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I don't need to waste any time with that.

Let me tell you something. The next three sentences, after those first two, would you read those, please.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You're welcome to, Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Okay. He said, "he shouldn't have a special prosecutor or counsel because he hasn't done anything wrong. I was on the campaign with him for 9 months. There were no Russians involved with him. I know it for a fact because I was there."

Now, the President wanted Attorney General to say that, but you didn't deliver the message. You knew that Attorney General Sessions had recused himself at that time. Since he had recused himself, you knew that it would have been against the law for him to comment in any way on that investigation. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did not know that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You did not know that? You did not know that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Thank you for being here. Thank you for putting up with the harassment that you're putting up with right now.

According to the Alliance for Securing Democracy, Russia interfered in the elections of Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, Ukraine, and the United States. They specifically targeted the Scottish independence vote, the Brexit vote, and Angela Merkel.

Despite knowledge of these kinds of election threats, the Obama Administration sat idly by. Instead of warning the Trump campaign, Loretta Lynch's DOJ and James Comey's FBI used secret surveillance to spy on Members of the Trump campaign, all while allowing election interference to occur.

Why isn't this hearing focused on holding DOJ and FBI leadership accountable for this kind of terrible malfeasance and lack of judgment?

What was Putin's ultimate goal? Clint Watts, a former FBI agent and counterterrorism specialist, said it is to attack and undermine democracy. He said the goal is to leave voters feeling as if, quote, "either the institutions are corrupt or you can't trust the vote," end of quote.

This is the kind of classic disinformation campaign that the KGB runs. As we all know, Vladimir Putin was a former leader of the KGB.

In 2016, Putin's goal could have been very simple: Divide the American electorate, sow seeds of distrust, make it impossible for whoever won our election to govern. With America weakened at home, we would be weakened on the international stage. Putin wins with a weakened America regardless of who won the election.

This is the kind of approach that has been used by the communists in Russia for nearly a century. After overthrowing Russian Czar Nicholas II in 1917, Vladimir Putin—Vladimir Lenin—I'm sorry, a different Vladimir—and the communists utilized Western journalists as propaganda tools to defend communism. The *New York Times* journalist John Reed, for example, defended the Bolsheviks, advocating against American intervention. Lenin used even the term "useful idiots" to describe how leftist-leaning, communist-sympathizing Americans could be easily tricked and used to help the Russians.

For the past 3 years, Democrats have focused on undermining America's President, instead of working with President Trump and Republicans in Congress to harden our election defenses. I think there would be broad bipartisan support that we need to prevent future election meddling. The Mueller report makes clear that President Trump wanted to focus on protecting our democracy from future attacks.

So, I have one question, Mr. Lewandowski. It's clear that Putin attacked America with the goal of dividing the American people and today's hearing is being held for the sole purpose of attacking America's President, which will weaken our country on the international stage. Do you believe that Vladimir Putin is sitting in his

office right now in the Kremlin laughing at what those on the other side of the aisle are doing and believing that those on the other side of the aisle are “useful idiots” helping—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Objection. I have a Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady will state her Point of Order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have a Point of Order. According to the rules, and the rules of this Committee and the House rules, we cannot attribute derogatory names to our colleagues or motives to our colleagues. I believe the gentleman said those on the other side of the aisle are idiots.

This is a very sacred and somber responsibility. I’ve taken an oath of office, my good friend, just like you did. I am concerned about the Constitution, just as you are. I would not engage in any behavior that could be described as idiot. Never in my life or my colleagues have we ever discussed behaving like idiots.

Mr. Chair, that is an inappropriate terminology and description of the Members of this House or Republicans or Democrats no matter what position they are.

Chair NADLER. I will overrule the Point of Order. The rules of decorum refer to motive. Calling someone an idiot is not flattering, but it does not go to motive.

I believe we should have the most robust debate. I believe we should respect each other. I don’t think we should—but I don’t think that goes to motive, and, accordingly, I’m going to overrule the Point of Order.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BUCK. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Actually, I didn’t call anybody an idiot, I said useful idiot. Secondly, I asked the Witness whether he believed that as part of Vladimir Putin’s strategy, Vladimir Putin was being aided by useful idiots in America.

Your answer, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I can’t be sure to the motives of Vladimir Putin or the Russians who wanted to interfere with our election process in 2016.

I can be certain of one thing: Donald Trump was a private citizen at the time and he had no more responsibility or authority to secure the integrity of the 2016 election cycle than I did. That responsibility fell to the intelligence community and the Obama-Biden Administration.

They clearly failed. Never did they contact, under my tenure, me to inform me or anyone at the campaign at the time of any potential hacking which may have been transpiring. Never did they contact us to alert us of any potential security violations as it related to the election.

So, I think Mr. Comey, Mr. Brennan, and Mr. Clapper ultimately own the responsibility as the head of intelligence community to understand why they did not do a better job of protecting the American electorate in 2016 to ensure we didn’t have foreign interference.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Lewandowski, had they contacted you, what would have been your response in terms of notifying others on the election in terms of their dealing with Russians?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. We would have worked with them. I would have recommended working through counsel to work with them to notify them of any potential contacts, which I don't ever recall having, but if we would have had any, I would have made sure we notified the appropriate authorities immediately.

Mr. BUCK. Thank you. I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, I just want to follow up on Mr. Johnson. The Mueller report, volume II, page 90, says: One month later—this is a month after your June 19 meeting, presumably after you returned from vacation—the President met again with Lewandowski, followed up on the request to have Sessions limit the scope of the Russia investigation just to clarify that he did do that.

I want to go back to that meeting on June 19. The President asked you to write down word for word a script that he wanted the Attorney General of the United States to deliver. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry, can you just give me the reference again, Congressman?

Mr. DEUTCH. Well, let me do this. Previously you testified, because it's reported in the Mueller report, that the President asked Lewandowski to deliver a message to Sessions and write this down. This is page 91. This was the first time the President asked him to take dictation. He wrote as fast as possible.

The notes that you took at that meeting are on the screen.

If you could—I don't know that the notes are—I'm going to read the section of the notes that you took that were—again, this is what you were asked to deliver to the Attorney General of the United States to announce in public:

I know I recused myself from certain things having to do with specific areas. But our POTUS ... is being treated very unfairly. He shouldn't have a special prosecutor counsel because he hasn't done anything wrong. I was on the campaign with him for 9 months. There were no Russians involved with him, I know for a fact, because I was there. He didn't do anything wrong except run the greatest campaign in American history.

That's from page 91. That's, again, that's what President Trump wanted the Attorney General to say in public about the special counsel's investigation. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's an accurate representation.

Mr. DEUTCH. So, this is in June of 2017. You said that you didn't know about the Attorney General being barred from participating, speaking out about the Russia investigation.

The public didn't know about all these attempts to influence the investigation at that time. What we did know, what everyone knew, Mr. Lewandowski, was that the President's campaign was under investigation, and they knew the Attorney General couldn't touch it because he was a major part of the campaign, he advised on national security matters, and back in March he had recused himself from anything having to do with the investigation.

You weren't aware of that at all, what he did in March and the fact that he had recused himself?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I was aware of the Attorney General's recusal.

Mr. DEUTCH. So, when the President asked you to deliver a speech that he wanted the Attorney General, who could not participate in the investigation, couldn't talk about anything having to do with the investigation, he recused himself, when the President asked you to deliver that word for word speech for him, that there was no inconsistency with that and the fact that the Attorney General had recused himself, you knew that he had, and you knew that he couldn't participate in any way?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not an attorney, Congressman.

Mr. DEUTCH. I'm not asking you as an attorney. I am, but that's not why I'm asking you. I'm just asking you, if you knew that he had recused himself—you did, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm the aware of the public reports that Jeff Sessions recused himself from the investigation.

Mr. DEUTCH. By recusing himself you're aware of the public reports and what was in his recusal statement on March 2, 2017, that he wasn't going to participate in any existing or future investigations of any matters relating to the campaign for President. You knew that was out there.

So, when the President asked you to specifically go in there and ask him to deliver a speech which was contrary to that, forget about being a lawyer, did it strike you as off in any way or were you concerned in any way?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. DEUTCH. Was it the right decision for Sessions to recuse himself?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, I can't comment on Jeff Sessions' decision-making process.

Mr. DEUTCH. So, here's what he did. The script says a group of people want to subvert the Constitution. I'm going to meet with the special prosecutor to explain this is very unfair and let the special prosecutor move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections so that nothing can happen in future elections.

The President, you'll agree, was trying to force the investigation to focus only on the future so it didn't focus on him. Isn't that right, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't agree to that.

Mr. DEUTCH. That's not, when you look only in the future and you're not allowed to look at the one investigation into the President, that's not how you interpret that? You interpret it differently?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that could be your interpretation.

Mr. DEUTCH. It is, I think it's an obvious interpretation. If we had more time, I'd ask what yours is.

I'll just close with this. A month—he asked you to do this, he brought you in to talk to the Attorney General because the President was terrified, Mr. Lewandowski. A month before your meeting the special counsel was appointed and the President said, oh, my God, this is terrible.

He wanted you to pressure the Attorney General, someone who wasn't even allowed to talk about the investigation, to block him from looking at his own conduct. Mr. Lewandowski, that's abuse of power.

As we go on through this investigation, I hope you'll be able to further elaborate on how you could have seen this in any other light than the obvious way the President attempted to abuse his power.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Witness may answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Thank you.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Ratcliffe.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, welcome to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have alternatively described and argued over the past week is an impeachment inquiry, an impeachment investigation, an impeachment probe, and an impeachment proceeding.

Now, if you're confused which one, I assure you, you're not alone. A lot of the folks that are watching today might be confused because they might be thinking that impeachment proceedings are supposed to be initiated after a vote by the full House of Representatives, and they'd be right. The Democrats, now the party of impeachment, tried three times and failed miserably three times, twice before the Mueller report and then once again after the Mueller report.

So, last week the party of impeachment, which is in charge of this Committee, changed our rules so that they could get to impeachment in a different way. Mr. Lewandowski, you're lucky you're the first Witness for the party of impeachment's new impeachment procedure.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I feel very lucky. Thank you.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. You should.

Now, I know that you've testified before the House, before the Senate, and before the special counsel. In fairness, Mr. Lewandowski, that's when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were promising the American people that there was going to be impeachment by collusion, or impeachment by conspiracy, which of course didn't exist, and the special counsel said it didn't exist.

So, then they had to shift and say, well, now it's going to be impeachment by obstruction of justice. Remember that they promised, they promised that Special Counsel Mueller was going to breathe life into impeachment by objection of justice, but instead he put it to death. I don't know if you remember, but I asked him, can you give me an example other than Donald Trump where the Justice Department determined that an investigated person was not exonerated because their innocence was not conclusively determined? His answer was, I cannot. Do you remember that?

So, as it turns out all 200, nearly 200 pages of the Mueller report and the analysis in volume II of obstruction of justice was done under a legal standard and legal burden of proof that is not recognized and ever been used before in American jurisprudence. The party of impeachment, they're going to gloss over that today.

They're also going to gloss over the fact that the inspector general criminally referred the FBI Director who leaked the information to get the special counsel in the first place and the same inspector general who found that facts establishing that that same FBI Director was, in fact, targeting Donald Trump at the same

time in an investigation where he said he wasn't investigating Donald Trump.

Now, you might think that this Committee would be interested in hearing from that Inspector General for the first time rather than hearing from you for the fourth time.

Maybe you can be helpful, because the party of impeachment, they don't care, Mr. Lewandowski, what kind of impeachment you can deliver for them. There are 135 Democrats and Socialists in the House of Representatives that that have publicly come out for impeachment. They're in agreement the President needs to be impeached.

The problem is they have come up with more than a dozen different reasons that they're arguing about are the basis for that impeachment. We've talked about impeachment by collusion. We've talked about impeachment by conspiracy. We've talked about impeachment by obstruction of justice. Let's cover a few more. Impeachment under the Emoluments Clause.

Did the first and only President rich enough to largely self-fund a successful Presidential campaign ever admit to you that he secretly ran for President to get rich?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Okay.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. He's already very rich.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Do you have any information or evidence, Mr. Lewandowski, about crimes the President committed for ignoring congressional subpoenas as a basis of impeachment?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do not.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. How about dangling pardons? Do you know if the President, did he ever admit or say to you that he would pardon anybody in law enforcement who was trying to enforce or protect our territorial borders?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. At the request of the White House, I can't discuss private conversations that may or may not occur with the President.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Okay. Well, how about this one? How about impeachment by using a Sharpie on a hurricane weather map? Did the President ever admit or say to you that he intentionally committed an impeachable high crime by magic marker as some of my Democratic colleagues are contending?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, Congressman, I can't discuss any private conversation I may have had with the President.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I'm sorry, you're, frankly, not being helpful at all, Mr. Lewandowski. Maybe you don't understand that the party of impeachment, they're not picky at all. They don't even care if you don't have impeachment—if you've got anything on Donald Trump.

How about on Justice Kavanaugh? Because this morning now they say they want to impeach Justice Kavanaugh. Have you got anything that supports impeachment of Justice Kavanaugh?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. He's a good man.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Well, listen, I know you're disappointed that you've only been here four times, but don't you think that there isn't going to be another opportunity, because this Committee has become the search party for impeachment, and they are going to

bring back anybody, as much as they have to find something, anything, to keep this impeachment hoax alive.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back 15 seconds over time. The gentlelady from California.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, I want to follow up from my colleague here, Mr. Deutch.

It's clear that the President was desperate for you to deliver the message to Sessions. Everyone else had said no, and he went to great lengths to make sure that you'd be effective in delivering it. After the President dictated the message, he told you to tell the Attorney General that he would be the most popular guy in the country if he delivered that message to limit the investigation to the future. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could you reference me to that in the report, please?

Ms. BASS. Yes, it's in volume II, page 92. So, is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'd like to reference that.

Ms. BASS. While you're looking, I'm going to move on.

So, the President is telling you how to convince Sessions to do it—it's page 92, first paragraph—to tell Sessions that he'd be the most popular guy in the country if he did what the President ordered. The President picked you for a reason, because he knew that you had the traits of an enforcer and described yourself as his, quote, "loyal soldier." This was no exception.

Did you find it now?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have it here, Congresswoman.

Ms. BASS. Ninty-two.

Okay, so the Attorney General, that he would be the most popular guy in the country if he delivered that message. Do you see that on page 92?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Ms. BASS. So, is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe it's accurate.

Ms. BASS. You told the President that you understood what he wanted Session to do. Is that what you told the special counsel? Same page. You did understand what the President wanted. He knew not to create a trail.

So, looking at the slide, "Lewandowski wanted to pass the message to Sessions in person rather than on the phone." Where is that? After you left the Oval Office, you didn't schedule an official meeting with Sessions. Instead, you called the Attorney General at home, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what's in the report?

Ms. BASS. You told Sessions you wanted to meet in person rather than on the phone. You could have just read the message from the President over the phone, but you knew that it would make it harder to persuade Sessions to do what you wanted. So, you wanted to meet with him in person, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what the report states, yes.

Ms. BASS. So, the Attorney General works at the Department of Justice, but you told the special counsel that you didn't want to meet in the Department of Justice because you knew that if you

went into a government building that there is a public log of the visit, and you specifically told the special counsel that you did not want to, quote, “a public log of your visit.” Isn’t that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s accurate.

Ms. BASS. So, why is that? Why didn’t you want to leave a paper trail for your visit?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, Jeff and I are friends socially, and I wanted to have the opportunity to have a meal with Jeff and relay the conversation which the President asked me to ask Jeff to consider giving.

Ms. BASS. So, if that was the case, then why was there a problem with you having to do it in secret, essentially? I mean, it was a very important message you were delivering from the President, and it was a message that could certainly be viewed as completely inappropriate considering that you were not even an employee of the White House.

You’re a private citizen. You’re delivering a message to the Attorney General to limit the investigation. So, if you didn’t think you were doing anything wrong, then why would it matter that there was a public log?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I wanted to have the opportunity to speak with Jeff in a more relaxed atmosphere and have a meal with him to have the conversation.

Ms. BASS. Well, you said that another reason for not meeting at the DOJ was because you, quote, “did not want Sessions to have an advantage over you by meeting on Sessions’ turf.” Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s right. I wanted to have a private conversation in a more relaxed atmosphere.

Ms. BASS. So, again, if this was an appropriate message to deliver and if it was just about that, why would it matter whose turf it was on? Why couldn’t you go to his office, you’re his friend, why couldn’t you go to his office and meet with him there?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I suppose I could have, but I chose to—I wanted to have a discussion with Jeff as we have had so many occasions before that.

Ms. BASS. Exactly. I mean, I believe—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Never inside the Department of Justice.

Ms. BASS. I believe that Sessions knew that it was wrong, and that Sessions canceled his meeting with you. If you guys were good friends, why would he have bothered to cancel it? Did he call you up to reschedule it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That would be a question for Jeff Sessions.

Ms. BASS. Well, after you testified—and you testified earlier that after the inauguration you didn’t communicate with the Attorney General often, your good friend that you have dinner with. So, when you said that you had a message to deliver, isn’t it fair to say that Sessions knew you were calling on behalf of the President and that message was from him?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no idea what was in Jeff Sessions’ mind.

Ms. BASS. Well, to be clear, the Attorney General knew it was a message from the President and he still refused to meet with you.

Mr. Lewandowski, it's clear to me that Sessions knew what we all know sitting here today, that what you were doing was wrong. He wanted nothing to do with your secret messages because he knew it was entirely improper for a private citizen to go behind the backs of the White House counsel and secretly meet with him somewhere, without any record of your meeting, on your turf, to try to persuade the Attorney General to protect the President from investigation into his own misconduct.

Well, you can't protect anymore. I'm glad that this misconduct can finally be brought to public attention so that the President can be held accountable.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady's time has expired.

The Witness has requested a short recess. The Committee will resume in 5 minutes. The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chair NADLER. The Committee will reconvene.

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Gaetz, is recognized.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, the Mueller report was supposed to be the end all, be all, the great groundswell of support for impeachment, ensuring that Americans would want to tar and feather the President, run him out of Washington on a rail, deprive the American people of the President that they duly elected.

Well, that didn't turn out to be the case. So, then it was all about bringing the Attorney General Bill Barr. He was certainly going to point out the inconsistencies and flaws in the analysis.

Well, that didn't happen, because the majority wanted to insist that their unelected staff ask questions of the Attorney General of the United States. No, they said, we'll go to court, we'll win, we'll force Bill Barr and Don McGahn to come and testify.

They're not winning in court. They're not here. It's a joke.

For the last 4 months, the path the majority has taken us on has rambled from disorganized to just downright dizzying. In June, Speaker Pelosi said the House Democratic Caucus was, and I'm quoting, "not even close to an impeachment inquiry." That was to CNN.

In July, House Judiciary Chair Jerry Nadler said, quote, "An impeachment inquiry is when you consider only impeachment. That's not what we're doing. We're investigating all of this."

Then, in August, in a CNN interview, Nadler said, "this is a formal impeachment proceeding."

Then, in September, when asked if the Democrats are engaged in an impeachment inquiry, the House Majority Leader, Steny Hoyer, answered, no.

It was the gentlelady from Washington who said just recently, Ms. Jayapal, we have been in the midst of an impeachment investigation. She said that to Politico. Then, in the very same story, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Himes, said, "no, we're not in an impeachment investigation."

Then, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Gregory Meeks said, when asked if the House was investigating impeachment, he said, "well, maybe there's—we don't know whether an impeachment investigation has begun."

It's just dizzying.

Last week, it was the Judiciary Committee Chair Jerry Nadler who said, “what we’re doing is very clear, it’s been very clear, it continues to be very clear. The Speaker has backed us at every point along the way.”

This process has been about as clear as Joe Biden’s last answer to race relations that involved turning on the record player. We don’t know where we are or what we’re doing.

Now, Mr. Lewandowski, I am not allowed by House rules to impugn the motives of my colleagues or to speculate as to what might be animating this bizarre circumstance. Those rules don’t apply to you.

So, Mr. Lewandowski, do you have a thought as to why we continue to engage in a charade that is overwhelmingly opposed by the American people and fundamentally misunderstood by my Democrat colleagues?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No Congressman, I think they hate this President more than they love their country.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Lewandowski, you were the campaign manager for the President’s campaign when the Obama-Biden Administration was notified that there might be efforts by the Russians to interfere with our election. Isn’t that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. GAETZ. Can you describe for us the briefing you got as the campaign manager to ensure that our system was resilient and American democracy was protected?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. There was no briefing provided by anybody from the Obama-Biden Administration, members of the intelligence community, or the FBI to our campaign when I was present or during my tenure as the campaign manager.

Mr. GAETZ. That’s just baffling to me. I mean, our democracy is so precious, we have to cherish it, we have to protect it. Yet, when the Obama-Biden Administration knew that there might be nefarious efforts to interfere or co-opt or in any way disturb or democracy they didn’t say anything to you.

Now, as you sit here today, having watched these facts unfold, do you have any rationale as to why maybe the Clapper, Brennan, Comey, Obama-Biden team didn’t want to give the Trump campaign a fair defensive briefing about the threats that we were facing?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It’s actually unfathomable to me that they didn’t contact a major political nominee for President of the United States and inform them of potential threats against the election process in 2016.

Mr. GAETZ. We could be finding that out now. I mean, we could have those people before our Committee to figure out what in the world happened that didn’t allow us to get those answers.

One final question for you, Mr. Lewandowski. Has an inspector general employed by the United States Government ever accused you of breaking the law?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. GAETZ. No. They have done that with James Comey. Yet, the leadership of this Committee will not bring James Comey before even though the inspector general said that his work impaired the

credibility and efforts of over 35,000 FBI agents and the brave people fighting for our country.

It's a shame that you're here, Mr. Lewandowski. Jim Comey should be sitting in that chair. He should be answering questions about why he did so much damage to the FBI and our country, including not giving you the briefing that you were entitled to.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Mr. Nadler.

Before I begin, let me remind you, Mr. Lewandowski, that this is not a Republican primary campaign. You are not on the campaign trail yet. This is the House Judiciary Committee. Act like you know the difference.

You've never worked for the Trump White House in any official capacity, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's right.

Mr. JEFFRIES. You do speak with President Trump with some regularity, true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that's a fair statement.

Mr. JEFFRIES. In fact, during the summer of 2017, according to testimony to the special counsel, you were summoned to the White House by President Trump on at least two occasions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe the report says that, Congressman.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. Well, you meet with the President one-on-one on June 19, 2017, and then again on July 19, 2017, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I believe that's accurate.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. Let's try to get some clarity on what exactly you do for Donald Trump since you're not a government employee.

You stated during the 2016 Republican National Convention that, I got the reputation as a tough guy, that's my reputation. Do you recall making that statement, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. It's in the public record.

Your job is to be Donald Trump's political enforcer, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Let me ask the question another way. Are you the hit man, the bag man, the lookout, or all the above?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think, I'm the good-looking man, actually.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay.

President Trump told you on June 19, 2017, to personally deliver a message to Attorney General Sessions that would have ended the criminal investigation into the Trump campaign, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe that's what the Mueller report states, no.

Mr. JEFFRIES. President Trump wanted Attorney General Sessions to limit the special counsel's investigation to future incidents of election foreign interference, true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Which page is that on, Congressman?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That's in the public record. It's in this hearing. It's in the Mueller report.

Now, the White House has a legal protocol for Presidential statements. Under the Presidential Records Act they must preserve all memos, letters, emails, papers, like the note he dictated to you.

So, you wrote down the President's message, which you then stored in a safe in your home. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, it is.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. You told the special counsel that was your standard procedure with sensitive items, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Where is that referenced in the report—

Mr. JEFFRIES. Volume II, page 92, a matter of public record.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Let me just reference that. One second, Congressman.

Mr. JEFFRIES. You don't have to reference it.

The President asked you—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You said page 90, Congressman?

Mr. JEFFRIES. The President asked you to—reclaiming my time—the President asked you to record a message from him on June 19, because he wanted to hide his message from eventual disclosure. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. You never delivered the message to Jeff Sessions after that June 19 meeting, true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's accurate.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Instead, you testified that you went on vacation, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did.

Mr. JEFFRIES. How long pass your vacation, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Oh, it was lengthy. I think at least 2 weeks.

Mr. JEFFRIES. At least 2 weeks. You were summoned again to the White House on July 19, 30 days after the original June 19 meeting, true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. So, you weren't on vacation the entire time, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Oh, I didn't say I was on vacation the entire time. I was on vacation for 2 weeks, Congressman.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Right. You still failed to deliver the message and it had nothing do, at least in part, to your so-called vacation.

Now, the July 19 meeting occurred just a few days after new information came to light about Russian operatives meeting with high-level Trump campaign officials.

When you're summoned to the White House after that July 19 meeting, by that time you still hadn't delivered the message to Jeff Sessions. You said to the President you would you do it soon, according to volume II, page 93, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what the report says, that's accurate.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. President Trump also asked you to deliver a message to Attorney General Sessions that if he didn't do what was requested, he would be fired, correct? Volume II, page 93.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that's what was reported, yes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. President Trump wanted you to intimidate Attorney General Sessions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You'd have to President Trump that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. You stated earlier today that President Trump asked you to take down dictation, quote, “many times.” Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It is.

Mr. JEFFRIES. On page 91, volume II of the Mueller report it states, quote, “The President then asked Lewandowski to deliver a message to Sessions,” and said, quote, “write this down,” close quote. This was the first time the President had asked Lewandowski to take direct dictation.” The first time.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Those are not my words, Congressman. Those are the investigators’ words.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Right. Did you lie to Bob Mueller or are you lying to us?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn’t lie.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Okay. You’re not really here to tell the truth. You are here to participate in a continuing coverup. Russia interfered with this election in sweeping and systematic fashion. The Trump campaign welcomed that assistance at the highest level. There were subsequent acts of obstruction of justice with respect to the investigation.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. The American people deserve to know the truth.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman’s time has expired, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman—

Mr. COLLINS. I think that was 19 seconds over, to help you, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, my colleague Mr. Jeffries just started that last lining of question with sort of an admonition to you. He said this is the House Judiciary Committee and not a political forum and it would be nice if you recognized that.

I think it would be nice if all the Members of this Committee would recognize that, because that’s the reason that this has turned into such a farce.

It’s been said so many times today this Committee is so important to the country. It has one of the broadest jurisdictions over so many critical issues that are facing the country. You referenced some of this in your opening statement. I, among many of my colleagues, are ready to get to that work for the American people.

We’re here today. There haven’t been any fireworks. Oh, there’s a lot of disappointed people around, operatives around the country who were really hoping that there’d be fireworks. We’re not surprised at all.

I have a couple of questions just for clarification for the record. First, is there anything that’s been said here, any question that you’ve been asked about or something that you would like to provide further comment on, just to clarify the record?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. All right. In questioning today, is the majority investigating any new allegation or issue or fact not already investigated by the House and Senate Intel Committees or the special counsel’s office?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Do you have any more information on any other matter related to either collusion or obstruction that you can offer to this Committee that you have not already shared with Congress or the special counsel's office?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe I have any new information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. In your prior testimony to the special counsel, is it true that you answered every question asked of you truthfully and to the best of your ability and your recollection?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To the best of my recollection, I did answer truthfully, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. A couple of things just for further clarification. We're afraid that some of this record will be obscured today, so let me just—these will be just quick, rapid fire.

Do you agree there is no evidence the President intended to obstruct justice?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Do you agree that the President has been harassed politically since the day he took office?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Do you agree that the President's supporters have received vastly different treatment than the supporters of Hillary Clinton?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Unequivocally.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. You've called this a witch hunt, and I wonder if you'd like to elaborate on that any further.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that this fake Russia collusion narrative is the greatest crime committed against the American people in our generation, if not ever.

This is a President who was duly elected by the American people, and Members of certain bodies refuse to accept those election results. If this were done by a different President, to a different party, the same way it was done to Donald Trump, that person would already be thrown out of office and people would be in jail.

When you support Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama there is a different set of rules. I think the American people find it very unfair. There's been no accountability at the highest levels of the government for the FISA abuse applications which transpired, the spying on Americans clearly in violation of the Fourth Amendment, or the lives that were ruined because they simply wanted to support a candidate for President of the United States, and I think it's shameful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. We do as well, and that's a pretty good recitation of some of the issues that are keeping us up at night.

Part of thing that we're greatly concerned about is the American people's distrust now of our institutions. When people begin to doubt that the rule of law actually applies equally, that justice really is blind in this country, then we reach somewhat of a tipping point. It's very difficult to put that genie back in the bottle.

We're concerned, I know the Republicans and the conservatives on this Committee are deeply concerned about the eroding faith in our institutions.

I'm thankful that you've come to take the hostile fire today. I commend you for that. I commend you for your story, being self-made. One of the things I'm also concerned about is young people who are watching this who may have a disincentive to get into politics and to serve their country in this way because of this abuse that they've suffered.

I yield to Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Real quick, Mr. Lewandowski. Do you know why you didn't get a defensive briefing from the FBI?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do not.

Mr. JORDAN. I got a good idea. I think they were trying to trap the President.

Page 17 of the inspector general's report points this out. January 6, 2017, they go up to the Trump Tower when it's President-elect Trump and they're trying to set him up about a pending investigation. All the while Mr. Comey's been telling the President, you're not under investigation.

Of course, they didn't give you a defensive briefing during the campaign or even up until that date because they were trying to set him up. We can't ask about that, because Mr. Nadler hasn't even thought about when he's going to bring Mr. Horowitz in to answer our questions. He'd rather subpoena you even though you're willing to come voluntarily. That's the problem.

I thank the gentleman for his good line of questions. I thank him for yielding. I yield back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, and I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, in between your first meeting on June 19 and your second meeting with the President on July 19 you went on vacation. Also, during that time there was public reporting about the Trump Tower meeting, correct? This is on page 92.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If it's in the report, I believe it to be accurate.

Mr. CICILLINE. On July 19 when the President, for a second time, asked you to deliver the message to Sessions you said, and I quote, "The message would be delivered soon." Page 93. Correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Page 93?

Mr. CICILLINE. You didn't. You didn't call Jeff Sessions, you didn't try to meet with him.

So, the President asked you twice in the Oval Office to deliver a secret message to the Attorney General of the United States, a message that you quickly wrote down word for word at the President's direction, correct? Sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe I wrote it down.

Mr. CICILLINE. When you worked for the President during his campaign, did you ever ignore or disobey directions from candidate Trump?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn't believe it to be an order.

Mr. CICILLINE. Just to be clear, although you were not working for the President in any capacity, you wanted to give the President the impression that you were going to follow his orders, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, you said, "I'm going to take care of it."

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Is that referenced in the report?

Mr. CICILLINE. Did you tell the President you were going to deliver the message?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't comment on private conversations with the President—

Mr. CICILLINE. Okay. Sir, it's on page—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. —to preserve Executive privilege.

Mr. CICILLINE. I'm sorry?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I could read you the exact statement again, if you'd like me to.

Mr. CICILLINE. So, you're in the Oval Office—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I said, the White House has directed that I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch confidentiality.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Lewandowski, reclaiming my time. You're not going to stonewall me in my questioning.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Would you like me to answer your question?

Mr. CICILLINE. Your head must have been spinning. You're here with the President of the United States in the Oval Office, he's directing you to deliver a message to the chief law enforcement officer in the United States which you understood would effectively end the ongoing investigation into this President and his campaign.

So, you told the President that the message would be delivered soon. This is on page 93—you immediately following the meeting with the President, you gave Dearborn the message the President had dictated to be delivered to Sessions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's what the report says.

Mr. CICILLINE. You didn't tell the President that you'd already asked Dearborn to deliver the message. You just said it would be delivered soon. This is on page 92, correct? It's on page 92.

You didn't want to tell the President that you were passing off his message to someone else, did you? You knew he wanted you, someone he had described as his enforcer, a loyal soldier, to do it, because the President trusted you. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's a question for the President, sir.

Mr. CICILLINE. Then, why didn't you then deliver this message to Mr. Dearborn—to Jeff Sessions directly? Why did you give it to Mr. Dearborn to do?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think I have testified I was out of town.

Mr. CICILLINE. For 2 weeks?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't live in town, Congressman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Okay. Did you, Mr. Lewandowski—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Unlike you, sir, I don't live in town.

Mr. CICILLINE. During your second meeting in the Oval Office, the President told you that if Sessions wouldn't meet with you, to tell him he was fired.

Did you, Mr. Lewandowski, ever threaten the Attorney General that if he didn't meet with you, he would be fired?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. CICILLINE. Did you tell Mr. Dearborn to tell Sessions that he would be fired if he didn't take this meeting as the President directed?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, the White House has directed I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch confidentiality.

Mr. CICILLINE. You reason you didn't tell the President that was because you know that it was wrong. The President—isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, the President wasn't aware that you ignored his directive to tell Jeff Sessions he was fired if he didn't meet with you, was he?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry, what was the question?

Mr. CICILLINE. I'll move on.

In fact, to prove to the Attorney General that the threat was real, 4 days later, on July 22, the President directed Priebus, his chief of staff, to obtain Sessions' resignation. That's on the slide in front of you. The President told Priebus that he had to get Sessions to resign immediately. Did you know that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. CICILLINE. This evidence as a whole strongly suggests that the President was reinforcing to Sessions that his job was on the line, at the same time as the President believed you were delivering the message to end the investigation into the 2016 campaign.

All of this made everyone very uncomfortable, including Mr. Dearborn, which is on page 93, and he told you that he was uncomfortable being a messenger to Sessions, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, were you aware when you asked Rick Dearborn to deliver this message to the Attorney General on behalf of the President of the United States it created the same legal culpability for you as had you delivered the message yourself? Are you aware of that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, the President didn't ask me to do anything illegal and he never asked me to keep anything a secret.

Mr. CICILLINE. Are you aware that when you asked Mr. Dearborn to deliver this message to end the investigation and just focus on future investigations, you thought you were protecting yourself, but you were, in fact, committing a crime?

Rick Dearborn knew delivering the message was wrong, you knew it was wrong. That's why even after being asked to deliver it and saying you'd handle it soon you passed it off to him and you never followed up.

Guess what, I'd also think it's very, very wrong. In fact, I think the President asking a private citizen to try to scare his Attorney General into ending the investigation into the President's conduct is obstruction of justice, plain and simple.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentleman is expired. The Witness may answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe there was a question.

Chair NADLER. Very well.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, thank you for being here today. You've come voluntarily. You've heard slanderous attacks on you. You had people refer to you as a gutted fish. You've had people refer to you as a chicken. You've had people imply that you're here to lie. That's unfortunate, and it's beneath this Committee, quite frankly. We're here—ostensibly, they tell me they want to hear the truth.

You're here to tell the truth today, right, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. In fact, you've given lots of testimony. You've told the truth repeatedly. I see a list of 302s when you were talking to the FBI, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. Those 302s, they didn't record that. Those are afterward, after notes, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's right.

Mr. BIGGS. You gave testimony to the Intelligence Committees of both Houses, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did, yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Yeah. So, here you sit here today. You gave testimony to—and you gave interviews, I think, roughly 20 hours worth of interviews to the Mueller team, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. If we look at this Mueller report, we see your name in various places throughout the Mueller report, right? Fair enough?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've never read the report, but I think that's accurate, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. You're not unwise to not have read the report.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Nobody's actually read the report, but that's okay.

Mr. BIGGS. Yeah, I've read the report.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You are the one. We've been looking for you.

Mr. BIGGS. Yeah, I'm the one. Your name is all over this report. Oddly enough, when you were asked by a Member of the other side to look at volume II, page 86, and they wanted you to testify to it, you might be surprised, your name's not even mentioned on that page. Did you know that? You're not even mentioned there. They were asking you questions to comment about things where your name is not even there. Did you know that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. That same person then asked you to talk about pages 49–50 of volume II. Guess what? Guess whose names don't appear there? Yours. Did you know that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, I did not.

Mr. BIGGS. Yeah, it's odd, isn't it? Odd, isn't it, that they would be asking you to comment on pages that you weren't even there.

So, let's talk a little bit more about some of what Members of Congress have done. They've spent 2 years claiming, without evidence, that then-candidate Trump and the Trump campaign colluded with Russia.

As a member of the campaign, you've responded today. How do you respond? Would you like to expand on that again today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. During my tenure at the campaign, Congressman, as I said in my opening statement, never do I believe I had any interaction with any foreign agents, foreign agencies, or foreign governments who were attempting to impact the outcome of the election.

I've said very publicly, if anybody did attempt to impact the outcome of the election in an illegal manner, I hope they spend the rest of their lives in jail.

Mr. BIGGS. Yeah. So, we know that on January 2019 on The Chris Matthews Show, a Member of this Committee was asked: Do you believe the President right now has been an agent of the Russians?

Mr. SWALWELL. That was me.

Mr. BIGGS. That Member said, yes. Chris Matthews followed up and said, an agent like in the 1940s working for a foreign power? That individual responded, he's working on behalf of the Russians, yes.

Mr. SWALWELL. Still believe that.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will—the gentleman from—

Mr. BIGGS. Arizona's got the time.

Chair NADLER. —Arizona has the time.

Mr. BIGGS. I'd like 10 seconds added back on if he's going to interrupt.

Chair NADLER. You can have 10 seconds, in any event.

Mr. BIGGS. So, as a close friend, personal, and adviser of the President and member of the Trump campaign, how do you respond to that accusation by a Member of this Committee made months and months ago even before the Mueller report came out and said there was no collusion or coordination?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I find it beneath the dignity of the President of the United States to accuse somebody of that. While I didn't support President Obama when he was the President, didn't vote for him, I still wanted my country to be successful, so I wanted him to be successful. I think those faceless, baseless accusations against our President are unfounded and unwarranted.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I want to just cover the last little bit of this. We hear today lots of questions about a meeting you had with the President regarding Jeff Sessions and some note that was dictated to you. That was after Special Counsel Mueller was appointed, wasn't it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe it was, yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Did the President ask you to stop Mr. Mueller or to encourage Mr. Sessions to stop the Mueller investigation at any point?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I can't speak to or disclose the substance of discussions with the President or his advisers, to protect the Executive branch confidentiality.

Mr. BIGGS. I appreciate that, but I will tell you, in going through this report, there is no evidence, no indicia that the President ever asked that you or Mr. Sessions stop the Mueller investigation. In fact, the Mueller investigation went on unimpeded. Thousands of interviews, millions of documents.

With that, my time is expired, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.
The gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, I'm going to put a slide up, and it's the words that President Trump dictated to you on July 19. Can you read what you wrote down?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm happy to have you read it, Congressman.

Mr. SWALWELL. Well, why don't you want to read it, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think you should afford me the same privilege you afforded Director Mueller.

Mr. SWALWELL. Would you like to read it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No. You're welcome to read it.

Mr. SWALWELL. Are you ashamed of the words that you wrote down?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. President Swalwell, I'm very happy of what I've written, but you're to read it if you'd like.

Mr. SWALWELL. Are you ashamed to read it out loud?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not ashamed of anything in my life, Congressman. Are you?

Mr. SWALWELL. Then, why don't you read the words?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I've asked and answered your question.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, why won't you read the words aloud?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've asked and answered your question, Congressman. If you'd like to read the words, you're welcome to.

Mr. SWALWELL. Well, you were ashamed to read them out loud and you didn't deliver those words to the person the President asked you to. Did you have a consciousness of guilt?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have nothing to be guilty of, Congressman. Thank you.

Mr. SWALWELL. Do you still feel guilty today and that's why you can't read it out loud?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, you're welcome to read the words if you'd like.

Mr. SWALWELL. I just wonder why you can't.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have the capacity to, Congressman. I'll give you the privilege.

Mr. SWALWELL. You said the President did nothing wrong. Why can't you read those words right now? Why can't you read them aloud?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, tell me why you hold me to a different standard than previous Witnesses who sat here.

Mr. SWALWELL. I want to give you one more opportunity to clear up something you said earlier. You've said a number of times if it was in the Mueller report, it was accurate, except as it relates to you stating that this was the only time the President ever asked you to write something down. Are you saying that part is not accurate?

[Witness confers with counsel.]

Mr. SWALWELL. I'd ask to stop the clock while he confers with his lawyer.

Chair NADLER. The clock will be stopped for 5 seconds.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could I ask you the page and reference number on that, Congressman?

Mr. SWALWELL. Sure. It's page 91, lines 7 and 8. I will read it to you, "This was the first time the President had asked Lewandowski to take dictation."

Are you saying that is not accurate?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm saying those aren't my words, Congressman.

Mr. SWALWELL. I'm asking you, was that the first time the President asked you to take dictation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've testified it's not the first time.

Mr. SWALWELL. So, this part would be inaccurate?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm saying I've taken dictation by the candidate and the President in the past.

Mr. SWALWELL. Have you ever put any words that the President asked to you write down before in a safe or was this the first time you had done that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe it's my standard operating procedure when taking notes, Congressman.

Mr. SWALWELL. So, every note that you take of the President you put in a safe? How big is the safe?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It's a big safe, Congressman. There are a lot of guns in there.

Mr. SWALWELL. Is this the first time you've ever put a secret message from the President that he wanted you to deliver to someone else in the safe?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe there's anything secret about the message. I was never told to keep the message secret.

Mr. SWALWELL. Is this the first time you ever put a message that the President asked you to deliver to someone else in the safe?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. SWALWELL. I want to go back to that day. Later, after the President asked you to deliver this message, he was interviewed by the *New York Times*. The next slide shows that he said: "Sessions should have never recused himself, and if he was going to recuse himself, he should have told me before he took the job; I would have picked someone else."

That's not what the President said to you during that meeting one-on-one in the Oval Office. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed that I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers, to protect Executive branch confidentiality.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Chair, I'd like to stop the clock for a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry. The clock will be stopped.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Chair, I would like to request a ruling on the Witness' refusal to answer.

Chair NADLER. Mr. Lewandowski, when you refuse to answer these questions, you are obstructing the work of our Committee. You are also proving our point for the American people to see. The President is intent on obstructing our legitimate oversight. You are aiding him in that obstruction. I will remind you that article III of

the impeachment against President Nixon was based on obstruction of Congress. You are instructed to answer the question.

The clock will start again.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The clock will stop again. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS. Is it correct—and I can repeat or you can let me see your little sheet there—that reference you made to Nixon was after a formal inquiry was put to the House and then brought back to the Judiciary Committee? Your statement is a little bit different than this. Just wanted to point out truth for the record.

I yield back.

Mr. GAETZ. I have a Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. First, that was not a Parliamentary inquiry. You didn't even ask anything.

The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, did you just threaten to impeach Mr. Lewandowski, a private citizen?

Chair NADLER. No. The plain import of what I said was that he is violating the law by refusing to answer these questions. The President is violating the law by instructing him and others not to answer these questions. Article III of the Nixon impeachment was based on this kind of obstruction of Congress by President Nixon.

Mr. GAETZ. One further inquiry, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, does that mean then, pursuant to your statement, that this is an official impeachment that we're in?

Chair NADLER. I have stated repeatedly that this Committee is—and we amended our rules to empower the Chair to designate specific hearings, which I did for this hearing—is pursuant to finding out—to determining whether we should vote Articles of Impeachment against the President. That's exactly what this is.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from California will continue.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, I'll ask you again. This, what's displayed on the slide is not what the President told you in that one-on-one meeting. Is that correct?

Are you refusing to answer, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, Congressman. As I've explained in a letter from the White House dated September 16, 2019, to my attorney—

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, that letter—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. —Mr. Lewandowski's conversations with the President and with senior advisers to the President are protected from disclosure—

Mr. SWALWELL. Can we stop the clock again for this obstructive behavior?

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, Point of Order, and I would ask the clock be stopped.

Chair NADLER. The clock will be stopped, and the gentleman will state his Point of Order.

Mr. CICILLINE. My Point of Order, Mr. Chair, this Witness continues to obstruct the work of this Committee by refusing to answer questions. He's been ordered to do so by you. I ask that you adjudge him in contempt in these proceedings.

Mr. GAETZ. Point of Order. That's not a proper Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. It was a Point of Order. It wasn't a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. I will take that under advisement.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will continue.

Mr. SWALWELL. Are you refusing to answer, yes or no?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I'm happy to answer your question, so let me have the privilege to do so.

As explained below, Mr. Lewandowski's conversations with the President and with senior advisers to the President are protected from disclosure by long-settled principles protecting Executive branch confidentiality.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, that's not an answer.

Mr. Chair—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. As a result, the White House is directing Mr. Lewandowski not to provide information about such communications beyond the information provided in the portions of the report that have already been disclosed to the Committee.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman has the time, not the Witness.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, I'm just asking, if you're not going to answer, just say it's a refusal to answer. We don't need to be read the instructions from the White House. So, I'm going to move on.

In that *New York Times* interview hours after the President spoke to you, he never said, in fact, I just enlisted Mr. Lewandowski to deliver a secret message to the Attorney General for him to direct the special counsel to limit the investigation. He said to you something that he did not say just hours publicly. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no idea what he said to the *New York Times*.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Lewandowski, would you agree that delivering a secret message in the way that this President did, as a former law enforcement officer who's probably investigated gangs and mob-like behavior, that this is consistent with that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I take exception to your premise of the question it was a secret message.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, Mr. Lewandowski, welcome to the Judiciary Committee. You and the President are accused by the majority of a coverup of foreign collusion, but the Mueller team of partisans, try though they did, couldn't find any evidence of collusion. So, since you stand accused of this crime, I'm just kind of curious, how do you cover up a crime that never happened?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's a great question, Congressman. I don't know the answer.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. You've been watching the crux of the majority's case; is that the President asked you to suggest to the Attorney General that he should say the President is being treated unfairly and had done nothing wrong. Is that essentially the accusation against you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It seems to be, yes, sir.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Well, I think the record is pretty clear. The President was being treated unfairly and he had done nothing wrong, yet it's upon this pretext the Democrats feel justified to invoke impeachment, the solemn power reserved to the Congress for treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. It is the power to nullify the constitutional election of the President of the United States, a decision made by the American people.

Does that sound like an abuse of power in this case to you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It does.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Certainly, does to me too. For more than 3 years now, our Nation has been torn apart by this monstrous lie that the President of the United States was a willing agent of a hostile foreign power.

I'd like to ask you, where do you think this whole lie of Russian collusion started?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I don't have the facts on it, but I think when Inspector General Horowitz has the privilege of coming here and testifying, he'll testify that this began at the highest levels of the government and was perpetrated through the intelligence community to come up with a narrative of why Hillary Clinton lost the campaign as opposed to the real narrative of why Donald Trump won the campaign.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Well, this actually began before the election. Do you believe the U.S. Government, through its Justice and intelligence agencies, deliberately interfered with the 2016 Presidential election?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe there are Members of the Intelligence Community who have been referred for criminal referral for perjury and other crimes should be held accountable for using their badges and their guns to try and influence the election, spy on American citizens, in a clear violation of the Fourth Amendment, and falsifying FISA applications for the explicit purpose of trying to prevent an individual from being elected President of the United States.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. If we're serious about protecting the American political process from unwarranted interference, either by foreign governments or by our own government, where should we be looking?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I would recommend Inspector General Horowitz, U.S. Attorney Durham, who's in the middle of an investigation. I would also, if it were me and I were Chair or maybe someday in the upper chamber, would bring before us James Comey, Clapper, and Brennan and have them answer the questions under oath that seems to elude them so many times when they sit before these committees.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. By the way, we have suggested to the majority that we need to do precisely that, and so far, all those requests have fallen on deaf ears.

Here's the picture that seems to be slowly taking shape as more and more information comes to light: We have a phony dossier produced by the Clinton campaign and we have disinformation channeled to George Papadopoulos through Joseph Mifsud, who it turns out has a long history of involvement with Western intelligence agencies, including the CIA. That was then used to justify a sham investigation. That investigation was then leaked to the press to give credence to this false narrative.

Is that what you see taking shape here with the evidence that's slowly coming out?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that's exactly right. You look at the role that Bruce Ohr and his wife Nellie Ohr played at Fusion GPS, the culpability they have. The fact that they at least notified the FBI of the lack of credibility of Christopher Steele and the information that he was providing, should give us great pause that such a small group of individuals at the FBI, who comprised Crossfire Hurricane, had the opportunity to set in motion a plan to try and prevent a person from being elected President of the United States with no evidence whatsoever.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I think the importance of this cannot be overstated. We entrust the most terrifying powers that the government possesses to these agencies, literally the power to ruin lives, to spy on you, to incarcerate you, to launch predawn raids on your home.

The abuse of these powers for political purposes would be a direct threat to the most fundamental freedoms that we have as Americans and the most fundamental institutions of our democracy. I should think that would be of some passing interest to every Member of this Committee.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, earlier in your testimony, you questioned the love that Democrats have for our country. I served on Active Duty in the United States military. Do not question my love of our country. I'm not going to question yours. We're all Americans.

Now, earlier in your testimony, you had made a pretty stunning concession, which is that you had not read the Mueller report. That explains a lot about your testimony. I'm thinking maybe you don't know what the special counsel actually found, so I'm going to tell you.

Volume I of the Mueller report, found that the Russians attacked American elections in a sweeping and systematic manner. It also found that the Trump campaign knew about the attack, that they gave internal polling data to the Russians, that they planned their campaign strategy around this attack. It's not just in the Mueller report; it's also in Robert Mueller's testimony under oath in front of the Intel Committee as well as this Committee.

The reason we are here today is because volume II finds that the President tried to obstruct that investigation into the Russian attack on at least 10 instances, 5 of which Robert Mueller found

there was substantial evidence. So, I'm going to put up a slide about what the special counsel found about this particular incident in which you're involved.

He found substantial evidence that the President's effort to have Sessions limit the scope of the special counsel's investigation to future election interference was intended to prevent further investigative scrutiny of the President's and his campaign's conduct.

So, that's why we are all here today, and I think it's important to look at the timeline to understand how this all unfolded. You previously testified that in March 2017—that you were aware that Attorney General Sessions recused himself. He did that in March 2017.

I'm going to put up a slide about what the White House Counsel's Office had directed about communications with Sessions. It said that Sessions should not be contacted, no contact with Sessions and no comms/serious concerns about that instruction.

Did you ever get that instruction from anyone not to contact Sessions at all?

[Witness confers with counsel.]

Chair NADLER. The clock is stopped.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. LIEU. Okay. Thank you.

A few months later, on June 14, 2017, the media reports that the obstruction investigation—well, actually, that the Russia investigation turns into an obstruction investigation into the President himself. Then, when Donald Trump learns about this, he goes nuts. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know that to be accurate.

Mr. LIEU. The President launched over 10 tweets very shortly thereafter, calling the investigation a witch hunt. That's correct, isn't it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know that to be accurate.

Mr. LIEU. He did. All right. So, then he calls Don McGahn at home and says that, Mueller has to go, call me back when you do it. Were you aware of that, that he called Don McGahn at home to tell him to fire Mueller?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. LIEU. Okay. Two days after that phone call, the President calls you into his office. You admitted that he dictated a message for you to carry to Jeff Sessions. You said that you didn't give it to Jeff Sessions because you went on vacation. The Mueller report actually says that the Attorney General canceled that meeting. That's correct, isn't it? The Attorney General, in fact, canceled the meeting that you tried to give the note to?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't—where is that referenced in the report, Congressman?

Mr. LIEU. Sure. It's on page 92. I'm going to give you the courtesy, I'm just going to read it for you. It says, "Lewandowski called Sessions and arranged a meeting for the following evening at Lewandowski's office, but Sessions had to cancel due to a last-minute conflict."

Do you remember that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate.

Mr. LIEU. Okay, all right. Then, a little bit later on July 8, the media writes additional negative information about the President and his campaign, including that his senior advisers and his son met with Russian operatives who had dirt on Hillary Clinton as part of Russia and its government's support for Mr. Trump.

Donald Trump then calls you back into his office again, alone, for a meeting, and this time he tells you that Sessions is going to be fired if he doesn't meet with you. Do you recall that conversation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I took that as a joke.

Mr. LIEU. Okay, you took that as a joke. After that, the President goes on TV and he says: "Sessions should have never recused himself, and if he was going to recuse himself, he should have told me before he took the job, and I would have picked somebody else."

Do you think the President was joking when he said that on TV?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know whether the President was joking or not.

Mr. LIEU. Okay. When the President met with you alone to ask if you delivered the note to Sessions, do you believe any of that was a joke?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't discuss a private conversation with the President. It's in the report, sir.

Mr. LIEU. Okay, I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Arizona.

Ms. LESKO. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Lewandowski, for being here today voluntarily.

First, we had the Steele dossier, which turned out to be a false opposition report funded by the Clinton campaign and the Democrat National Committee and apparently was used to spy on the Trump campaign and initiate the special counsel investigation. Then, for 2 years, we've heard from Democrats on TV, I heard it over and over again from some on this Committee, that they had proof, proof that the President had colluded with Russia. Then, guess what? The Mueller report comes out, and they lied. It was totally false. There was no collusion, no conspiracy.

So, then my Democratic colleagues had to switch gears because they knew that one failed. So, they said, oh, now it's obstruction of justice. So, they brought in Robert Mueller, and they tried to question him. They did everything they could. That one flopped, too.

So, now here we are today. They're hauling you in, and who knows who they're going to haul in next. They're trying everything and anything. I just don't know when it's going to end.

I want to read a quote from—on April 19, 2019, shortly after the release of the Mueller report, Emmet Flood, special counsel to the President, wrote about the abuses by Executive branch employees. He said, "In the partisan commotion surrounding the released report, it would be well to remember that what can be done to the President can be done to any one of us."

Do you agree with this statement?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Ms. LESKO. Mr. Lewandowski, I have to tell you, I'm scared for our country. I'm scared when I read this Mueller report, when I read what's been going on with a false dossier that was apparently

used to spy on Americans. If that can be done to the President of the United States, this can be done to anyone.

So, I ask you, Mr. Lewandowski, do you think that the Democrats will go to any length to undermine the President of the United States and influence the 2020 election?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congresswoman, I believe in this democracy of the United States, and I love this country. I think while partisan politics is so important, I think the fact that we're the greatest, freest country in the world is paramount to everything that we do.

While we may disagree in this Committee, and I believe that this President has been treated exceptionally unfairly, I think at the end of the day, we all believe that a free and fair election is the best way and the best method for ensuring the safety and security of our democracy.

Do I have concerns, based on the 2016 election, seeing the abuses of a small minority that have impacted so many? You bet I do. I'm concerned that as our children and grandchildren grow up, we look back on this time in our Nation's history and we say, that never should have been allowed, not to a Republican and never to a Democrat? You bet I do.

I think at the end of the day, partisan politics aside, and to Mr. Lieu's point, we all love our country. We may have disagreements, but I don't think anybody wants to see someone not elected properly or the interference of foreign agents or individuals in this country to negatively impact the outcome of an election, because we are better than that.

This country is the greatest country in the history of our planet, and we should never forget that. Sometimes, maybe just sometimes, partisan politics can take a backseat to doing what's right for our country.

Ms. LESKO. Thank you, Mr. Lewandowski.

I yield the balance of my time to Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and thank the gentleman for his well-stated answer to the last question.

So, Mr. Lewandowski, the Obama Administration spied on two American citizens associated with the campaign that you ran and were involved with: George Papadopoulos and Carter Page. We've heard from Mr. McClintock and Ms. Lesko about Carter Page and the dossier and how they did that. With Mr. Papadopoulos, it was done overseas with foreigners.

FBI spies on a major party's nominee for the highest office in the land spies on two American citizens. Just for the record, were you, as the campaign manager, ever notified or was anyone at the campaign ever notified that was going on when it was happening?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. I yield back. Thank you.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, some of our GOP colleagues have suggested that our time would be better spent today working on protecting the 2020 election, so we must charitably assume that they've just completely forgotten about the House of Representatives passing, on June 27, 2019, the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, which authorizes \$600 million to modernize and se-

cure our election infrastructure, mandates the use of voter-verified paper ballots and postelection risk-limiting audit, and bans internet accessibility and connectivity for devices on which ballots are marked or counted.

Now, perhaps they forgot about it because all them voted against it, except for one Republican, and the entire Democratic Caucus voted to support it. We are still hoping that Mitch McConnell decides to take up that legislation.

So, who are the useful idiots? I suppose we can have an interesting conversation about that later.

Mr. Lewandowski, you told Mr. McClintock some of the things you might want to investigate about the deep state when you become a U.S. Senator. Let me ask you something else about your upcoming service as a Senator. Will you accept this view of the so-called confidentiality interest Executive privilege, which you have been invoking today, on behalf of the President's ability to prevent Congress from collecting testimony from private citizens? Will you accept that in your service if you're elected to the Senate?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I appreciate your confidence in my ability to win in New Hampshire, and I'm sure many people in New Hampshire have that same confidence in me. That being said—

Mr. RASKIN. I wasn't concerning on your representation to the—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, I appreciate that, thank you. That being said, it's not my privilege to waive, Congressman. It's the Executive office's privilege. I'm not an attorney, and so I can't speak to—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I am one, so let me ask you a question: Are you representing that the White House has told you that they are invoking the Executive privilege on your behalf today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe it's an Executive privilege, sir. Again, I think we've submitted the letter for your clarification of what the White House has said.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, let me ask you—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It's not my privilege to waive.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I don't think it's anyone's privilege to waive, because I don't think it exists, Mr. Lewandowski. I think the whole thing is imaginary. It's like the tooth fairy.

You didn't work for the President in the White House?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. My children are watching. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. RASKIN. I'm sorry?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. My children were watching, so thank you for that.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I hope the President's not on then.

Mr. Lewandowski, you didn't work for President Trump, did you? You never worked in the White House?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I never worked in the White House, sir.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. So, you were a private citizen when you met with the President in the circumstances we're discussing today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I am.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. The White House says you shouldn't have to answer any questions today because the President's communications seeking advice or information in connection with the dis-

charge of his duties are highly confidential. This pushes White House obstructionism to a surreal new extreme—let's make this clear—because I see no evidence at all that the President was seeking your advice or that you were helping him discharge his official duties.

First, I just want to make sure we have this on the record. When you went to the White House in June and July of 2017 to meet with the President, you were not a White House employee, were you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I was not a White House employee.

Mr. RASKIN. You have never been a White House employee?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's correct.

Mr. RASKIN. There were no other White House employees present for that meeting, no secretary, no staff assistant, no other Executive branch employee. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate.

Mr. RASKIN. Okay. While you claim that you were advising him during those meetings, the President didn't seem to be seeking your advice at all. In fact, you never testified to the special counsel that President Trump once asked for your advice.

Here's what you told the special counsel about your meeting on page 91, volume II. Please put it up on the slide, if you would.

During the June 19 meeting, Lewandowski recalled that after some small talk, the President brought up Sessions and criticized his recusal from the Russia investigation. The President told Lewandowski that Sessions was weak and that if the President had known about the likelihood of recusal in advance, he would not have appointed Sessions. The President then asked Lewandowski to deliver a message to Sessions and said, write this down.

So, I'm assuming you told the truth and the whole truth about your discussion when you testified to the special counsel. There's nothing in there about him asking your advice on anything, is there?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. There's nothing in the report that says that, correct.

Mr. RASKIN. You were not helping him perform his official duties in office, were you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't discuss my private conversations with the President.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I'm just going based on what's up on the screen. Did you help him implement any of his duties of office at that point?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I can't discuss the substance of the discussion outside what's in the report.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, no one has told us what duty you were performing, if you were performing one, or what public policy you were advising on. All of America is reading the same text. We don't see him asking you for your advice about anything.

Did he ask your advice about anything? Did he ask your advice about national security, for example, which is the only context I know about an Executive privilege, but now it seems as if that's not even being waved around?

Look, one can only regard with amazement the logic of this argument. The President tweets out that various *FOX News* anchors advise him. Are they covered by this privilege too?

Chair NADLER. The gentleman's time is expired. The Witness may answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That'd be a question that you should direct to the White House, sir.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman's time is expired.

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Cline.

Mr. CLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Mr. Lewandowski for being here today, after testifying three other times willingly, for you to be here, again, voluntarily. I doubt the others had as much political theater as this one has had, but I appreciate you being here today.

This hearing is yet another grand display of political theater that we have seen from this Committee over the last several months. The majority should be focused on sound congressional oversight, in particular, the IG report about abuse in the FBI, and we should be having a hearing here soon with the inspector general in front of us to question, but all we've seen for months is desperate attempts to keep this impeach at all costs narrative alive.

I don't know what they're calling it today. Is it an inquiry? Is it an investigation? Is it a proceeding? Whatever word that Google Thesaurus throws back at them when they type it in, that's what we're at. It's embarrassing, as a Member of the Judiciary Committee, to have you here to have to go through this.

The majority is propping up this Mueller report like a bad remake of *Weekend at Bernie's*. Impeachment based on the Mueller report is dead, and everybody seems to know it except the Chair and several Members of the party conference, the majority. We should be hearing from the IG report about the FBI abuse. We are now hearing about the President's mood when he's talking to you in the Oval Office. There was collusion with Russia, but not by President Trump.

I want to go back to questions by the gentleman from Florida, not the gentleman from Florida who's still standing by the belief, proven false by volume I of the Mueller report, that President Trump is a Russian agent, but the gentleman from Florida—or the gentleman from California who was asking you about the Steele dossier.

You've heard of the Steele dossier, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLINE. It was an opposition research document created by a man named Christopher Steele and paid for by the Clinton campaign and the DNC.

Have you ever met Christopher Steele?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have not.

Mr. CLINE. You're familiar with who he is?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I am.

Mr. CLINE. Christopher Steele was hired by a firm called Fusion GPS to produce the Steele dossier.

Have you heard of Fusion GPS?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I have.

Mr. CLINE. Well, that's one more than we had from Mr. Mueller during his testimony, because he didn't know what Fusion GPS was.

Do you know who hired Fusion GPS to produce the Steele dossier?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe it was a law firm, Perkins Coie.

Mr. CLINE. Do you know who Christopher Steele's sources were for the information he put in the dossier?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't have—I couldn't speak to it directly, sir.

Mr. CLINE. They were Russian sources, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's the public reports, yes.

Mr. CLINE. The FBI and intelligence leaders did not verify the truthfulness of the allegations in the Steele dossier about Donald Trump, did they?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's my understanding, sir.

Mr. CLINE. Even though the information was never verified, and most of it has been proven to be false, the intelligence community relied on it to get a FISA application to spy on the Trump campaign, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's correct, yes.

Mr. CLINE. All of this was laid bare in volume I—or should have been laid bare, but volume I clearly indicated that there was no collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government.

That Mueller report that we are still propping up and hashing over week after week after week, you wrote an op-ed about back on March 29, when you clarified that you thought the report was comprehensive. You clarified that it found no wrongdoing by the President or his advisers, but that it is being used—it was being used back in March and it is still being used by conspiracy-minded Democrats and a hostile media for their own political purposes, thwarting the President's reelection and pursuing further investigations.

Do you stand by that op-ed and do you still believe that it is being misused in that way today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do believe it, sir.

Mr. CLINE. Is there anything else you'd like to add to the questions that have been answered or asked?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. CLINE. All right. With that, I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you.

Mr. Lewandowski, what we're seeing here is a pattern of the President doing anything and everything to hide his misconduct from Congress and from the American people. The President tried to get you to deliver a secret message to the Attorney General, all in an attempt to prevent the special counsel from exposing the President's own misconduct. As soon as the special counsel published his report and the President's misconduct was exposed, the President tried to cover that up, too.

Isn't it true that the President has repeatedly tried to discredit your and other Witnesses' testimony to the special counsel in the published report?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to my knowledge.

Ms. JAYAPAL. You follow the President on Twitter, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's a good question.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Okay.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have to check, but I think it's—I may be the only one who doesn't, but I'll fix that immediately. I'm sorry.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Excellent. You've probably seen his tweets, I imagine. Didn't the President say—and I'll put up the slide for you—statements are made about me by certain people in the crazy Mueller report, in itself written by 18 angry Democrat Trump haters, which are fabricated and totally untrue.

That is a Trump tweet from April 19, 2019. That's the President saying that all the statements given by Witnesses in the investigation, all those statements are untrue.

Mr. Lewandowski, you were a Witness in the investigation. You sat for interviews with the special counsel as part of the Federal investigation. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did sit, yes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. The special counsel's report includes statements that you made to the special counsel during the Federal investigation. Did you lie at any point to the special counsel during those interviews?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection, no.

Ms. JAYAPAL. So, your statements to the special counsel in the Mueller report, those are not, quote, "fabricated and totally untrue." You didn't lie to the special counsel, did you, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection, no.

Ms. JAYAPAL. So, the President is wrong that the report is fabricated and totally untrue. That's just the President trying to discredit all the Witnesses who said that he obstructed justice. Isn't that correct, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's a question for the President.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Well, which is it? I mean, did you lie, Mr. Lewandowski, or is the President wrong when he says that all the statements in the report are fabricated?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe it says certain people. Statements made about me by certain people. It doesn't say all, unless I'm misreading it.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Lewandowski, did you lie to the President, and is the President correct that everything in the report is fabricated?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I won't comment on private conversations, but I don't appreciate the insinuation that I lied about anything. I've answered it multiple times. I've answered your question multiple times about my truthfulness to the Committee and the Special Counsel's Office.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I appreciate that, Mr. Lewandowski, but—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have not, to the best of my knowledge, lied to the special counsel.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Lewandowski, this is my time. You are not yet in the Senate. You are a Witness before the Judiciary Committee. Please act like it. This is my time; I control it.

The President also said—and please put up the slide, “watch out for the people that take so-called notes when the notes never existed until needed,” referring to the Mueller report referencing people taking notes of meetings with the President, notes that documented the President’s obstruction.

Mr. Lewandowski, you have notes from your meeting with the President. You’ve testified to that before us, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. You were dictated those notes by the President, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that’s in the report.

Ms. JAYAPAL. You told the special counsel the President dictated a message to you and you said, “write this down.” This is volume II, page 91. You gave those notes to the special counsel, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can’t speak to the way the special counsel’s conducted their investigation or what information they have.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Did you give the notes to the special counsel? This is not about how the special counsel conducted its investigation; it’s about whether you gave the notes to the special counsel.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s a question for Special Counsel Mueller.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Those were your notes, Mr. Lewandowski. They were in your safe. They were dictated to you and written down by you. Did you give them to the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I complied with all legal and lawful requests of the special counsel.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Well, obviously, you are once again obstructing our investigation by refusing to answer questions that—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I’ve just answered your question. I said, I complied with all requests by the special counsel.

Ms. JAYAPAL. So, you gave the notes to the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I’ve asked and answered your question.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Did you make up that the President told you to write down that note, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can’t speak to private conversation I might or might not have had with the President of the United States.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Did you lie about the President telling you to write down the note?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe—

Ms. JAYAPAL. That’s not a private conversation.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe what is in the report is an accurate description.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Okay. So, to be clear, you also gave the special counsel notes from your meeting with the President that are not fabricated and totally untrue, as per the President’s tweet.

So, when the President said all those notes never existed until needed—that was his quote—that’s just another instance of the President trying to discredit anyone who actually tried to document his misconduct.

Now, the President is going further, isn't he? You have said previously that you have nothing to hide and that you would answer all questions. Here's what you said. Can I play that clip?

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/v7ro7ud2g67b0vc/Video%201%20-%20Jayapal.mp4?dl=0>]

Ms. JAYAPAL. It's interesting, Mr. Lewandowski, because, obviously, the President does have something to hide, because the White House is directing you not to answer the questions in front of the Judiciary Committee. That is a tremendously shameful thing, Mr. Lewandowski. The American people deserve to know the truth, and I think they deserve to have you answer our questions.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentlelady is expired.

The gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEUBE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The American people know the truth, if they've read the Mueller report, and have come to their own conclusions.

Sir, you and the Trump campaign fully cooperated with the Mueller investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe so, yes.

Mr. STEUBE. Multiple times that you have been asked to testify, voluntarily, before numerous different congressional committees, you've complied in that request, even voluntarily, not even needing to be subpoenaed.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's right. To the best of my recollection, yes.

Mr. STEUBE. After 22 months, 18 lawyers, 500 subpoenas, 500 search warrants, the Mueller report concluded that there was no evidence that the Trump campaign colluded with Russia. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I haven't read the report, but I believe that's the final conclusion.

Mr. STEUBE. So, now that we have established that the Mueller report itself doesn't find that there's any collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia, this whole contention about the President firing or not firing or directing people to fire, is it your understanding—and you may not be able to answer this because it's outside the scope—but is it your understanding, in article II of the Constitution, that the President could fire the Attorney General, without cause, for any reason whatsoever?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Let me preface it by saying I'm not an attorney, but it's my understanding that the President has broad authority over Members who serve in the Executive branch and has broad latitude to hire and fire at his discretion.

Mr. STEUBE. Also, under that constitutional authority obligated to him under article II, he could fire the FBI Director, without reason, for any reason whatsoever at any time?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I'm not an attorney, but that could be a very realistic interpretation of the article II powers provided to the President in the Constitution, yes.

Mr. STEUBE. He could have also had Mr. Mueller fired during the course of the investigation if he wanted to, under his powers under article II?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I think that would be a question for the Attorney General or White House Counsel, but I believe that would be his prerogative if he so chose, yes.

Mr. STEUBE. So, given all that, he did not choose to exercise any of that authority. In fact, he allowed for the campaign and the Members like yourselves to coordinate with them, cooperate with them, and until now that we have gone through a 22-month investigation where the American people have been sold a lie of Russian collusion, now we're going to just try to rehash this narrative amongst the American people, despite the fact that it has been investigated by investigators, lawyers, FBI agents for 22 months.

I would be happy to yield to any other Members of my caucus that would like to yield. If not, I'll yield back to the Chair. Thank you for your time.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. DEMINGS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, just for the record, I do love this country. I spent 27 years enforcing the law, and now I have the honor of writing of the law.

When special counsel visited us and in his testimony, he talked about a spectrum of Witnesses who were either telling half-truths up to those who were outright liars, today, I do have to wonder how many untruths, how many Members of Congress neglecting their duties and their oath, and how many White House attorneys does it take to protect one innocent President.

Mr. Lewandowski, you started off your testimony—or during your opening statement, you talked about being a certified police officer in New Hampshire. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Ms. DEMINGS. Do you believe that police officers have a very tough job?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Ms. DEMINGS. Even with all the stuff that law enforcement officers have to put up with, not only enforcing the law and patrolling their communities, but just working horrible hours, I'm sure you know about that, with all that stuff, do you believe that law enforcement officers, when they engage in wrongdoing, that they should be held accountable?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Ms. DEMINGS. Mr. Lewandowski, you said that if anyone were trying to coordinate with Russia, they should be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe, Congresswoman, I said if anybody attempted to impact the outcome of the election illegally, they should spend the rest of their lives in jail.

Ms. DEMINGS. So, do you believe that a person coordinating with Russia should not be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think anybody who's attempting to impact the outcome of an election illegally, whether it's with Russia or any other foreign entity, should spend the rest of their life in jail.

Ms. DEMINGS. Mr. Lewandowski, I know you know, and I believe—I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt—that you care

about the special counsel's report concluding that Russia Government interfered in the 2016 Presidential election in a sweeping and systematic fashion. Do you agree with that conclusion?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe Russia attempted to influence the election, yes.

Ms. DEMINGS. In fact, the report documents over 100 contacts between Russian nationals or those acting on their behalf and the Trump campaign or those advising then-candidate Trump. The report focused that those contacts with Russia included offers of assistance to the campaign, invitations for candidate Trump and Putin to meet in person.

Mr. Lewandowski, you said you knew nothing about this. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe I had any conversation with any Russian or Russian contact.

Ms. DEMINGS. You knew nothing about them offering assistance to the campaign at all?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe I have ever spoken to a Russian.

Ms. DEMINGS. Okay. You said that: I never spoke to a Russian, I never contacted a Russian, I never coordinated with a Russian. I don't know anything about Russia, okay? I never spoke to them, and I was the campaign manager.

Do you remember saying something similar to that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think it's an accurate statement.

Ms. DEMINGS. You also said, and I quote, "you had sole control over the campaign, other than the candidate himself. I sat next to candidate Trump for thousands of hours during the period of time."

Would that be pretty close to what you remember saying?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It would depend on the timeframe of the campaign we're speaking about.

Ms. DEMINGS. When you served as campaign manager to the Trump campaign.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Right. There were multiple periods of time from—

Ms. DEMINGS. Would you say that you had sole control over the campaign other than the candidate himself? Would that be an—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not on the day I was fired, I didn't have sole control.

Ms. DEMINGS. Prior to that day.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, not leading up to—

Ms. DEMINGS. There is nothing funny about—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not leading up to that day. Congresswoman—

Ms. DEMINGS. There is absolutely nothing funny about this whole thing.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If you ask me a question, I'm happy to give you an answer.

If you don't like my answer, I could rephrase it.

Ms. DEMINGS. Excuse me?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I said if you don't like my answer, I could rephrase it. No, I don't think I had sole control of the campaign the day preceding my firing or the day I was fired or multiple days leading up to that. So, if you have a specific timeframe—

Ms. DEMINGS. Let's forget the firing. The first month that you were the campaign manager, would you say that you had sole control over the campaign, other than the candidate himself?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Are you talking about in June of 2015?

Ms. DEMINGS. So, you talked to then-candidate Trump pretty much on a regular basis, right? You have established that you talked to him on a regular basis. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Ms. DEMINGS. Out of being the campaign manager, being very close to the candidate, the campaign has over 100 contacts with Russia, and you didn't know anything about that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's correct to the best of my knowledge.

Ms. DEMINGS. Did you ever ask the President if he knew about his campaign's contacts with Russia after the reports came out that there were over 100 contacts? Did you ever ask him after that report, those reports came out?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry. Did I ask who, Congresswoman? I missed that.

Ms. DEMINGS. Did you ask Trump if he had ever had—did he know that the campaign had regular contact with Russians after the report came out? After you heard that report, those reports, did you ever ask him?

Ms. SCANLON. [Presiding.] The gentlewoman's time has expired, but the Witness may answer.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congresswoman, I couldn't disclose a private conversation I may or may not have had with the President.

Ms. DEMINGS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. SCANLON. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California—I'm sorry. I'm sorry, the gentleman from Texas. California, okay.

Mr. CORREA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, Mr. Lewandowski, I'm glad to hear that both of us share a deep love for this country and that both of us have a tremendous distaste for any foreign agents that may want to interfere with our democracy in this country.

I'm going to ask you if you're familiar with George Papadopoulos?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I am.

Mr. CORREA. You agree that he was a foreign policy adviser for the Trump Administration as of April 27, 2016?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To the campaign, Congressman.

Mr. CORREA. To the campaign, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To the campaign.

Mr. CORREA. Yes. As you know, George pled guilty to felony crimes, including lying to Federal investigators. We've got his indictment up on the screen. One of those things he pled guilty to was lying about how often he was communicating with Russians, with Russia, when he was an adviser to the campaign, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know if that's what he pled guilty to, Your Honor—sir.

Mr. CORREA. It's on the slide. In fact, I'm quoting the Mueller report now: "Throughout April 2016, Papadopoulos continued to correspond and meet with Russians and seek Russian contacts." Of course, that's up on volume I, page 87, the slide.

The report also documents Papadopoulos trying to schedule then-candidate Trump to travel to Russia to meet with Putin. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know what's in the report, sir.

Mr. CORREA. The report also documents emails discussing this potential Russian trip—and I'll show them to you in case you have not read them—correct?

If you can put those up, please.

On April 27, the Trump campaign foreign policy adviser Papadopoulos again sent you, sir, an email telling you that he had, quote, "been receiving a lot of calls over the last months about Putin wanting to host Trump and the team when the time was right."

Do you know about that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what is in the report.

Mr. CORREA. Volume I, page 89.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. That's the first I've seen it.

Mr. CORREA. On June 1, Papadopoulos forwarded you another email from a Russian official raising the possibility of meeting in Moscow, asking you if that was something that you wanted to move forward with. Is that accurate or not?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know.

Mr. CORREA. Volume I, page 89. Slide, please.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I see the report, sir.

Mr. CORREA. Okay. So, I would say that this just was not about you receiving information about coordinating potential meetings with Russia, but actually, you responded to Papadopoulos, telling him to connect with Sam Clovis, because he was going to be the running point man. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that to be accurate.

Mr. CORREA. Okay. Did you tell Papadopoulos to stop communication with Russians?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe I did.

Mr. CORREA. Okay. You actually encouraged that communication, correct, by referring him to a running point man, which is Mr. Clovis, Yes?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, Congressman, what I was attempting to do with contact from Mr. Papadopoulos, who I had very limited interaction with, was to put him in touch with a staff person who could have a more articulate and thorough conversation. It wasn't—while I ran the day-to-day responsibility of the campaign, a thousand emails a day didn't allow me the privilege of responding in detail to each of them.

Mr. CORREA. Candidate Trump has said that you and he were communicating 10–14 hours a day. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not sure if that's what the President said, sir.

Mr. CORREA. He did.

Did you at all mention to candidate Trump these communications that Russians were having with the campaign?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. CORREA. Did you communicate with the family about these communications that were going on?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. CORREA. You and I both have a distaste for foreign agents affecting our democratic process. Did you report these incidences to the FBI?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did not.

Mr. CORREA. Did you bring it up to anybody's attention?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think just Mr. Clovis, because I did not see that outreach to me as an offer to interfere with the outcome of the election.

Mr. CORREA. What did you see it as?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I saw an outreach from a potential foreign agent to a senior—to a policy adviser, and that's why I asked him to get in touch with Mr. Clovis.

Mr. CORREA. For the safety—just to be on the safe side, wouldn't you call the FBI and say, hey, these guys are calling us, please check it out?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think, in hindsight, it's something that Mr. Clovis probably should have done.

Mr. CORREA. So, you got Russians hacking our elections. Your campaign adviser is talking to another campaign adviser about Russians interested in communicating with the campaign.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congressman, I don't believe I ever had a communication of any Russians trying to offer to interfere in the outcome of the election.

Mr. CORREA. You did have knowledge, sir, of people in your campaign communicating with Russians.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Witness may answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. CORREA. Thank you.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

One of the things that has always caught my attention was the fact that Campaign Chair Paul Manafort shared with a Russian operative, Mr. Kilimnik, the campaign's—and this is a quote from the report, "strategy for winning Democratic votes in Midwestern States,"—that's in volume I, pages 6–7, and that he shared with the Russian operative internal polling data on the campaign.

Now, did you have a knowledge that Mr. Manafort was sharing internal polling data or the campaign's Midwest strategy with these Russian operatives? Did you know about that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did not.

Ms. LOFGREN. So, although it's been reported that you continued to advise the campaign even after you left and had an enduring presence, that's not something you were aware of?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Correct. I was not aware.

Ms. LOFGREN. Well, I'm just interested—all of us here, both Republicans and Democrats, have something in common: We run for office, and we know a little bit how to do that. One of the things that we all know is that internal polling data is generally something that you don't share broadly. You use it to base your campaign. Wouldn't you say that's correct, as a general rule?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think it's a good general rule, yes, ma'am.

Ms. LOFGREN. So, I'm mystified why the manager of the Trump campaign would choose the one thing that would allow the Rus-

sians—who were, we already know from other evidence, trying to influence this campaign—information that would allow them to guide their efforts, this internal polling data.

Do you have any insight into that, why that would happen?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know why Mr. Manafort would share that information.

Ms. LOFGREN. It seems to me that—do you know whether the Russians asked for it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know.

Ms. LOFGREN. Don't know.

It seems to me that of all the things in the report, and there are many troubling things, that the Russians, and it's clear that they were trying to elect Donald Trump President—actually Putin has said that publicly since then—they received from the Trump campaign manager the internal polling data and the strategy to win in the Midwest with Democratic votes not once, but repeatedly. At the same time there were over 100 contacts between Russians and the campaign.

Can't you understand that would raise some anxiety, those facts?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Just a point of clarification. Mr. Manafort was never the campaign manager.

Ms. LOFGREN. Are you saying he was not involved in the campaign?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No. I'm saying he was not the campaign manager. Just as a point of clarification.

Ms. LOFGREN. Chair, manager, a person in charge of the campaign for a period of time.

I just think that when you add it up—who would know about this other than Mr. Manafort? Can you tell us who else we need to call who would have the facts of this information?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, we know where Mr. Manafort is, and he's currently available for questioning, I think, if you're looking for him.

Ms. LOFGREN. In addition to him, who—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Gates, potentially.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Gates might know about who initiated, whether the Russians were asking for the polling data or whether it was the idea of the Trump campaign itself to provide the polling data, that would be Mr. Gates would know that, in addition to Mr. Manafort?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Do you think that the President was advised of the day-to-day details of his campaign?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't think the President was advised of the minutia of the day-to-day details of the campaign, as probably most candidates are not advised of the day-to-day minutia.

Ms. LOFGREN. What level of information was the President generally provided? Would it be, you know, we've got a strategy to win the Midwest, or we're just hoping for the best? What would be the level of information generally that the President as a candidate would receive?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can only speak to my tenure there and my conversation with the candidate at the time about the information I would have shared. I would have basically shared his travel cal-

endar for the next day or week, so he'd understand where were we traveling to. I would share with him media opportunities if he wanted to be on a—or have the opportunity to be on a specific television show. Then, messaging points of what we may want to be discussing during that tenure or time of the campaign, particularly if we're going to be in a primary State.

Ms. LOFGREN. I would assume, like all other campaigns, that the messaging was informed by the polling data that you had.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Just as a point of clarification, Congresswoman, we didn't do any polling data for the first approximately 15 months of the campaign.

Ms. LOFGREN. My time has expired, Mr. Chair. I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The time of the gentlelady has expired.

The gentlelady from Pennsylvania.

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you.

Mr. Lewandowski, one of the major concerns raised by the special counsel's report is that the President has had a pattern of witness tampering conduct.

So, let's look at some facts. We know that Attorney General Sessions was a Witness in the special counsel's investigation because of his role on Trump's campaign, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's in the report. I don't know that to be accurate.

Ms. SCANLON. Well, that's why Sessions recused himself.

So, you've confirmed today that the President dictated a message for you to give to Attorney General Sessions about what he should say about Russian contacts with the Trump campaign, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. In general, that's accurate, yes.

Ms. SCANLON. So, you told the special counsel that the President scripted what he wants Sessions to say in a public speech as if it were Sessions' own words about his knowledge of the Russian contacts with the campaign, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That seems to be an accurate representation.

Ms. SCANLON. Okay. Now, that isn't the only time that the President tried to influence witness testimony, according to the special counsel's report.

White House counsel Don McGahn told the special counsel—and I think we have a slide on this. I see you've found your copy of the Mueller report, so if you want to follow along. It's volume II, page 123.

The President discussed with aides whether and in what way former campaign chair, or manager, whatever he is, Manafort might be cooperating with the special counsel's investigation and whether Manafort knew any information that could be harmful to the President. The special counsel concluded that, and we have another quote—and, again, if you want to follow along, it's volume II, page 132, "evidence concerning the President's conduct toward Manafort indicates that the President intended to encourage Manafort to not cooperate with the government."

Did the President ever try to discourage you from cooperating with the special counsel, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't speak to any private conversation I may or may not have had with the President, other than to say I've always been told to tell the truth.

Ms. SCANLON. Okay. So, you're not going to tell us today whether or not he encouraged you not to cooperate with the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've never been instructed to do anything but tell the truth.

Ms. SCANLON. Okay. Now, Congressman Ratcliffe asked what you knew about the President dangling pardons to some of his employees, and you mentioned Manafort, you mentioned Gates. There's also Flynn and Cohen. The President and his counsel have suggested that pardons might be forthcoming for those folks.

One of the reasons you're here today is that the Mueller report identified you as a participant in the President's attempts to limit or shut down the Department of Justice's investigation of Russia's sweeping interference in our 2016 election. Has the President ever offered you a pardon?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, the White House has directed not to close the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch confidentiality.

Ms. SCANLON. Okay. We've seen the letter. So, you're not going to answer whether or not the President has offered you a pardon?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Ma'am, it's not my privilege. I'm respecting the White House's direction.

Ms. SCANLON. Reclaiming my time. Thank you.

On the same day that you were subpoenaed to appear before this Committee, August 15, the President did indicate that he's going to support your Senate campaign, didn't he?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not sure.

Ms. SCANLON. Okay. Well, I just want to note for the record that when Mr. Lewandowski asked for the Committee to give him a little break about an hour and a half, 2 hours ago, he took the time during that recess to launch his Senate campaign website with a tweet. I think that fact says an awful lot about the Witness' motivation to appear here today, and I've heard enough.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I, too, want to clarify for the record that I think earlier you said that Democrats and this Committee perhaps, that Democrats hate this President more than they love their country. That simply is not true. You're looking at someone that loves her country. More importantly, as a judge, I've taken an oath of office more than once to uphold the constitutional laws of this country.

I take this work of this Committee very seriously. I would hope that you, as a former peace officer, would do the same and show more respect to this Committee and the work that we're undertaking.

Having said that, Mr. Lewandowski, you agree that if anyone does try to meddle with U.S. elections they should go to jail, right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do.

Ms. GARCIA. I know there's a clip of you saying that. We can run the clip.

[Audio recording played.]

Now if other people who were operating outside the realm of what their responsibilities were, were trying to coordinate to materially impact the out-

come of an election and if they did that, I hope they go to jail for the rest of their lives because our democracy is too important to play with.

Ms. GARCIA. I agree with that statement. I know that on July 27, 2016, when you were still regularly communicating with Trump, candidate Trump publicly called for Russia to find missing Clinton emails by stating on July 27.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/t77kg803q26c7rc/Garcia%20Video.mp4?dl=0>]

Ms. GARCIA. So, Mr. Lewandowski, let's be very clear. In that speech, the President was suggesting publicly to the whole world that Russia should hack Hillary Clinton's emails.

It got even worse. After his statement, Russia did hack his opponent's emails, as he asked them to. When WikiLeaks released those emails, Mr. Trump tweeted how great it was. He said at campaign appearances in October and November of 2016, "This just came out. WikiLeaks, I love WikiLeaks." He said that in Pennsylvania in 2016, October. "This WikiLeaks is like a treasure trove," he said that in Minnesota in October of 2016. He had said in Ohio, "boy, I love reading those WikiLeaks."

I believe all those quotes were also there for the whole—for you to see.

So, again, let's be clear, this is then candidate Trump tweeting congratulations to Russia and WikiLeaks for stealing documents from U.S. citizens.

I think, if it could get worse, it did. Multiple individuals have testified under oath that Mr. Trump, in fact, knew about the release of these stolen emails prior to the release.

I'm going to read you these quotes. Witnesses testified under oath that, quote, "Trump privately sought information about future leak releases." That's in the Mueller report, volume II, page 77. The slide's up there for you to see.

Deputy campaign manager Rick Gates told the special counsel that he, quote, "was with Trump on a trip to an airport"—and you can't read too much of it because it's redacted. It said, and shortly after the call ended, "Trump told Gates that more releases of damaging information would be coming." He knew it. He said it'll be coming. Which turned out to be true. That's in volume II, page 18. The screen is up, the shot is up there.

So, in fact, the White House redacted some of the information in the report, and you saw those redactions on the screen, so there could actually be more in those redactions.

The President's personal attorney, Michael Cohen, testified to Congress this past February under oath that, quote, "Mr. Trump knew from Roger Stone in advance about the WikiLeaks." You've got the slide there showing us exactly what the testimony reflects.

Roger Stone has been charged with serious Federal crimes for his conduct during the campaign. His indictment also says that, quote, "Stone was contacted by senior Trump campaign officials to inquire about future releases by WikiLeaks." Stone, thereafter, told Trump campaign about potential future releases.

That's in the indictment, and I have a copy here if you wish to see it.

So, again, to be clear, Roger Stone has known the President for years. They have been long-time friends. Didn't you say, quote, and here's the screen shot from CNN, "Roger Stone's history with Donald Trump goes back 20 years. He's been someone who has known then Mr. Trump and worked with him through business dealings long before we ever started a political campaign."

So, the fact is that he stole materials, he encouraged the hacking. Don't you think that's doing what you said no one should do, and if they do, that they should go to jail for the rest of their lives?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I stand by my statement that anybody who attempted to materially impact the outcome of an election should go to jail for the rest of their lives.

Ms. GARCIA. Do you agree the President should go to jail for doing what I just reiterated in a line in my statement?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn't say that, ma'am.

Ms. GARCIA. Well, it seems to me that even this President needs to be held accountable, because no one is above the law. I agree with you that if someone does interfere with our elections they should go to jail, including this President, if necessary.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady yields back.

Ms. GARCIA. Yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Lewandowski, I'd like to get back to something that—an exchange that you had with Mr. Cicilline and Mr. Jeffries.

We've talked a great deal today about the message that the President asked you to deliver to then Attorney General Jeff Sessions. As you've testified today, and you've informed the special counsel as well during the special prosecutor's investigation, you, quote, "stored the notes in a safe," right, as you'll see on the slide there quoting directly from the special counsel's report, which you described to the special counsel as the standard procedure for sensitive items.

That was your standard procedure. That is not normal protocol for official White House documents. My colleague mentioned this earlier, but since you're not a White House employee, and have not been, as you've testified, I'll remind you again that the White House has a legal protocol to follow for official documents.

As you'll see on this next slide, this screen is a memo from this White House, Donald Trump's White House, about the Presidential Records Act. So, the President is well-informed about the record requirements for our Commander in Chief.

As you'll see on this slide, under the PRA the White House must preserve and maintain all memos, letters, notes, emails, and written communications from the President, just like the note that he dictated to you. Of course, those notes are not supposed to be kept in a secret safe in his former campaign manager's house.

So, it's clear, I think, to folks who read the special counsel's report that is why the President asked you, he wanted this message to be hidden, and he knew you wouldn't keep a record. In fact, you took it out of the White House after Ms. Hicks typed it up and stored it in your personal safe.

Now, I want to give you an opportunity to just confirm this. In your exchange with Mr. Swalwell, you talked a bit about the notes that you dictated from the President. In the special counsel's report

it makes clear, on page 91, the last sentence of the second paragraph, that when you met with the President, this was, quote, "The first time the President had asked Lewandowski to take dictation, and Lewandowski wrote as fast as possible to make sure he captured the content correctly." That sentence cites your interview with the special counsel.

In your exchange with Mr. Swalwell, you contradicted that, and so I'm trying to figure out that discrepancy. Was this, in fact, the first time that you had been asked by the President to take dictation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To be clear, the words that are written in this report are not my words. That's the representation of the summary of my conversation with the special counsel. I can say that I have on numerous occasions been directed by the President to write specific information down and deliver that.

Mr. NEGUSE. So, to that end, Mr. Lewandowski, have you turned over those notes? Were those notes turned over to the special prosecutor?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've complied with all requirements of the special counsel.

Mr. NEGUSE. I appreciate you saying that. I'll ask the question again. Did you turn over any other notes that have been dictated to you by the President to the special prosecutor outside of this note that's referenced in the report?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've complied with all requirements of the special counsel.

Mr. NEGUSE. So, the record will reflect that you won't answer that particular question. I think it's important one for this Committee to get to the bottom to, because ultimately what you are saying is that the special counsel's statement in this report is incorrect. If that is the case, this Committee has an obligation to ascertain the contents of those other notes that you've described.

I just want to go back to the message that was delivered to you by the President to tell the Attorney General that if he did not meet with you, you should tell him that he was fired. That's in volume II, page 93.

You're aware—I believe there's a slide that will pop up here, you can see it in front of you—I know that you're aware that the Attorney General is a Cabinet-level position, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, I'm aware of that.

Mr. NEGUSE. He is, in fact, the head of the Department of Justice. He's the chief law enforcement officer in the United States. You knew that you couldn't fire the Attorney General, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yeah. I can't fire anybody.

Mr. NEGUSE. Yeah. As you told Mr. Priebus, as the next slide attests, you told the Chief of Staff at that time, what can I do? I'm not an employee of the Administration. I'm a nobody.

So, if that's the case, it again is pretty clear to anyone who reads the special counsel's report that the reason the President was delivering this message to you was so that you could scare the Attorney General into complying with the directive that he had given you. He enlisted you to dictate a secret message, which you stored in your personal safe at home, for the Attorney General, and then he tells you to tell the Chief Law Enforcement Officer of the United

States that if he won't meet with you, a private citizen, that he would be fired.

At the end of the day, we know it's because the President didn't want anyone investigating him. The special counsel's report certainly supports that. I will leave the last slide as I see my time has expired. The special counsel's words speak for themselves with respect to his conclusion in this exchange.

With that, I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentlelady from Georgia.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, I want to just pause here for just a moment. We just heard facts about a foreign government attacking our elections. We've heard that quite a bit this afternoon. We know that's a serious crime. You even said so, and I definitely agree with you.

In fact, the special counsel's investigation resulted in criminal indictments of more than a dozen defendants. That included guilty pleas and indictments of top Trump official—campaign officials. These guilty pleas include multiple charges of conspiracy against the United States and lying and misrepresenting statements to the Department of Justice officials. It also included indictments of criminal charges against 13 individual Russian nationals and 3 Russian entities, primarily for conspiracy to defraud the United States. Is that correct, Mr. Lewandowski?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's what that says, yes.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you.

You agree, and you've actually said so today, that anyone, whether it's a Trump campaign official or Russian individuals and entities, anyone who attacks our elections should be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do agree with that.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you. I agree, too.

So, to be very clear, the special counsel uncovered serious crimes by over a dozen individuals, including Russian nationals, for conspiracy against the United States.

I'm a representative of Georgia, and I'm very concerned with protecting our elections. Georgia has actually actively been targeted for election interference by the Russians. Unsealed indictments from the Mueller investigation show that Russian operatives visited websites for Cobb and Fulton Counties, both of those reside within my own district, looking for vulnerabilities that they might be able to exploit.

You have said, not once but several times, and I quote, "trying to coordinate to materially impact the outcome of the election, that if they did that, I hope they go to jail for the rest of their lives, because our democracy is too important to play with."

Mr. Lewandowski, those are your words. You've continued to stand by that. As I've said today earlier, I agree. Our democracy is simply too important to play with. So, I'm glad that we're investigating. I'm glad that we are holding accountable anyone who will attack our elections.

That's why Special Counsel Mueller's investigation was so vitally important. It exposed people attacking our elections in Georgia and

throughout the country. That is an issue that should never divide us among partisan lines.

So, we have to make sure that we are protecting our 2020 elections at all costs. Every American deserves the right to vote, and we must protect that right at all costs, because democracy is, as you have said today, too important to play with.

I will yield back the balance of my time to Mr. Stanton.

Mr. STANTON. Thank you very much, Congresswoman.

I want to thank Mr. Lewandowski for being here today and answering these questions for many hours.

With respect to Mr. Michael Cohen, he communicated regularly with Mr. Trump during the campaign. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. There was regular communication, yes.

Mr. STANTON. I want to read from paragraph 7B of Mr. Cohen's Federal indictment which states: "Cohen asked individual 1 about the possibility of individual 1 traveling to Russia in connection with the Moscow project and to ask a senior campaign official about potential business travel to Russia."

The senior campaign official Mr. Cohen references are yourself. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could be.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Cohen testified before the House Oversight Committee on February 27, it's on the screen in front of you, he testified specifically that that senior adviser was yourself. I'll skip to the end. Congressman DeSaulnier asked, who was the campaign official? Mr. Cohen responded, quote, "Corey Lewandowski."

Now, more importantly, Mr. Cohen said to the special counsel that he discussed with candidate Trump the subject of traveling to Russia during the campaign and that Trump, quote, "indicated a willingness to travel to Russia," unquote. That's volume I, page 78.

Mr. Cohen then testified before Congress that Trump was individual 1. It's on the screen in front of you. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's what Mr. Cohen testified to.

Mr. STANTON. Looking at the indictment again, we can now fill in the blanks. Mr. Cohen asked individual 1, candidate Trump, and a senior campaign official, you, about traveling to Russia.

Mr. Chair, can I take my regular 5 minutes at this time?

Chair NADLER. Yeah. The gentleman is recognized—the gentlelady yields back. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. STANTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

During your time as campaign manager, you communicated regularly with the President. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. With then candidate Trump, yes, sir.

Mr. STANTON. Yeah. In fact, you said you sat next to him for, quote, "thousands of hours while you were campaign chairman."

During your time as campaign manager, did you ever have a conversation with candidate Trump about his campaign team having contact with Russians?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection, no.

Mr. STANTON. The special counsel's report includes emails from George Papadopoulos he sent to you asking about Mr. Trump traveling to Russia. Mr. Cohen also asked you about traveling to Russia per his indictment. Carter Page emailed you about Trump speaking at an event in Russia. In your thousands of hours speak-

ing with the President, you never mentioned any of these people emailing you, asking you about Trump traveling to Russia? Is that your testimony here today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't recall ever having a conversation with Mr. Trump about traveling to Russia.

Mr. STANTON. What about after the time that Trump was elected, did you ever discuss with the President his knowledge of his campaign's interactions with Russians?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, at the advice of White House counsel, I can't answer questions. That would be privileged, and I respect that privilege.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Lewandowski, of course, was never a White House employee. I know it's been asked before, but I'm going to ask again, Mr. Chair. I have a Parliamentary inquiry. Is this an appropriate assertion of privilege?

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STANTON. Is this an appropriate assertion of privilege?

Chair NADLER. This is most certainly not an appropriate assertion of privilege for the reasons I stated before. Certainly, there's no conceivable privilege for any time period before the President was President.

Mr. STANTON. To be clear, the White House apparently is directing you not to answer whether the President knew about his campaign communicating with Russia just after Russia had attacked our elections. I think the American people want to know and are frustrated today what, in fact, are you hiding?

In Mr. Cohen's Federal indictment, it named Mr. Trump as knowing about campaign communications with Russia. Again, did you ever discuss this fact with Mr. Trump?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, to the best of my knowledge, during our campaign, I never had a conversation with Mr. Trump about any contacts with Russia.

Mr. STANTON. The President is named as individual 1 in a criminal case by his former personal attorney. You're asking us to believe that you never discussed with the President this fact in all your thousands of hours of conversations?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, Congressman, to the best of my knowledge, I don't recall ever having a conversation with candidate Trump about any interaction with Russia.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Cohen's indictment also states that candidate Trump directed Mr. Cohen to make payments to certain individuals beginning in October of 2016, to prevent those individuals from telling negative stories about candidate Trump. During the fall of 2016, at the time of these payments, did you ever discuss with candidate Trump these payments?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To the best of my knowledge, I never had a conversation about those payments.

Mr. STANTON. What about after the time that Mr. Trump was elected? Did you ever have a conversation with him about those payments?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The White House has directed that I do not disclose any conversations or the substance of those discussions

with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch privilege.

Mr. STANTON. To be clear, you're being told that you're not allowed to answer whether the President told you that he directed his personal lawyer to make illegal payments?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm simply going at the direction of the White House. It's not my privilege to waive, Congressman.

Mr. STANTON. To be clear, the White House is telling you not to answer whether you discussed potential crimes with the President of the United States?

Mr. Lewandowski, it's clear to me that the President—

Chair NADLER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. STANTON. Please.

Chair NADLER. I believe the Nixon case established the very iron-clad principle that discussions regarding criminal acts are not privileged, so there's no possibility of a privilege with respect to the question of whether you were asked about criminal activities.

I yield.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Lewandowski, it's clear to me that the President, the campaign, and yourself did not want the American people to know about any campaign contact with Russia. You lied to cover it up. You lied when you publicly said you knew, quote, "nothing about Russia."

Multiple senior campaign Members were regularly communicating with you about traveling to Russia, meeting with Russians, and even Mr. Trump possibly going to Russia. There's documentation that contradicts your denials, including emails with you personally.

This Committee, our Committee, will not let anyone, not the President of the United States, not anyone, to hide the truth to the American people any longer. No one is above the law.

I yield back.

Mr. DEUTCH. Point of Order, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman yields back.

The gentleman will state his Point of Order.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, the refusal by Mr. Lewandowski to answer the questions about whether he had discussions with the President about payments from personal lawyer to—those payments from the personal lawyer or whether he had discussions with the President about knowledge of the campaign's interactions with Russia are not protected.

I would ask, as the Chair reconsiders whether to hold Mr. Lewandowski in contempt as he goes forward from this hearing, it's important to note that the White House directed Mr. Lewandowski not to discuss the substance of conversations about official government matters.

The White House counsel is here. If the Chair would like to ask them whether they assert that those discussions about Russia or personal payments are official government business, they can be asked. Otherwise, certainly as you consider and you weigh whether to hold Mr. Lewandowski in contempt, you should consider those.

Chair NADLER. Yeah. It is certainly the case—I'm not going to ask White House counsel—it is certainly the case that conversations about criminal actions are not official White House business,

without question. I will give Mr. Lewandowski, in light of this ruling, the opportunity to answer that question again.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, while he's doing that, I have a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, I'm not an attorney, and I have to continue, at the advice of White House counsel, and you're welcome to take this matter up with them, but I've drawn the line of having private conversations with the President of the United States during the transition or his time as President.

I've been very candid and open about answering all questions about the campaign, and I will continue to do so. At the direction of the counsel, they have exerted Executive privilege of which is not mine to waive.

Chair NADLER. I will then simply observe on the record that the White House has claimed privilege for—with respect to the question of possible criminal activity or instructions for criminal activity by the President of the United States.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS. In light of the discussion just now, and the gentleman from Florida's long question, was there ever a doubt in this Committee that we were not trying to find a way hold him in contempt?

Chair NADLER. Was there what?

Mr. COLLINS. Was there ever a doubt today from the start of this that we were ever trying not to hold him in contempt?

Chair NADLER. That's not a proper Parliamentary inquiry. It's not a Parliamentary inquiry.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Witness has requested a brief recess. Accordingly, the Committee will take a 5-minute recess.

The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chair NADLER. The Committee will come to order. We'll reconvene. When we left, we were about to have the gentlelady from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, America learned today that no one else would do what the President asked of you. Not McGahn, not Sessions, and not Dearborn. To the President's disappointment, not even you. Yet, it was very important that you maintain a good relationship with the President, because after you left Trump campaign in December of 2016, you co-founded Avenue Strategies. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, it is.

Ms. DEAN. I'm reading from their website. Avenue Strategies describes itself as having, quote, "a core focus on government affairs, public affairs, strategic consulting, public relations, and crisis management to engage policymakers in our clients' behalf."

That's what Avenue's website said. Am I right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know. I haven't worked there in 2 years.

Ms. DEAN. Okay. That was the pitch when you did work there?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yeah, I couldn't speak to that.

Ms. DEAN. You were pitching clients on your ability to engage policymakers. That means government access was important to you. Yes or no?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Ms. DEAN. Okay. You couldn't engage policymakers without having access.

You did have access to the President. You acknowledged, and, in fact, I would say you boasted you were very close with the President. Isn't that so?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think it's a fair assessment that I'm close to the President, yes, Congresswoman.

Ms. DEAN. You visited him many times in the Oval Office. You called him on the phone. You had access that others didn't. It was important to you, wasn't it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What was important to me? Speaking to the President?

Ms. DEAN. Your access.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Ms. DEAN. Okay. Yet, you did use that access to pitch clients. As I said, in December of 2016, you co-founded Avenue Strategies. On December 17 of that same year, you took a business trip to Mexico to meet with Mexican billionaire Carlos Slim. Is that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It is.

Ms. DEAN. Politico reported you traveled to Mexico on a business development trip with Slim. When you met with Slim, you pitched consulting services with him, yes?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, that's fake news.

Ms. DEAN. Oh, you met with Slim. You didn't pitch your brand-new endeavor, your new enterprise.

Did you tell him you could get a meeting at that time with then President-elect Trump?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not that I recall, no.

Ms. DEAN. I'm showing you a slide.

Isn't it a fact that just 3 days later, on December 20, Trump tweeted a Presidential statement, a quote, "yes, it's true, Carlos Slim, the great businessman from Mexico, called me about getting together for a meeting." We met, all caps. He's a great guy, exclamation point.

Slim did actually meet with the President-elect, Trump, a few days later. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not certain.

Ms. DEAN. This is all a coincidence, I suppose.

In fact, his spokesperson explained that Slim's quote, "sit-down at Trump Mar-a-Lago resort came days after Lewandowski had traveled to Mexico on a business development trip and met with Slim."

You also proposed to do work for a payday lender, Community Choice Financial. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think the previous company I was working with did that work.

Ms. DEAN. Okay. You met or had some engagement with that client. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm not sure.

Ms. DEAN. Well, I'll try to refresh your recollection.

A source from that meeting said you pledged that you, quote, "would get Trump to fire that company's arch nemesis, the Consumer National Protection Bureau head, Richard Cordray," I think you'll see the slide reveals that, if they hired you and your firm, Avenue. Is that source accurate?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Ms. DEAN. Oh, they're lying, too?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No. It's called fake news, Congresswoman. I'm sure you've never been misquoted.

Ms. DEAN. Well, isn't it true, Mr. Lewandowski, that a few months later, in a live *Meet the Press* interview, you called for President Trump to oust CFPB Director Richard Cordray?

Let me play you that clip now.

[Video shown.]

It's my recommendation to the President of the United States to fire Richard Cordray.

Ms. DEAN. Another coincidence that you are pitching what your client wants you to pitch. Coincidence?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Congresswoman, how is this relevant to the hearing?

Ms. DEAN. I'll ask the questions.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Lewandowski, you met with representatives from Facebook and Blackstone to pitch them on Avenue services as well. Am I correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, I don't recall that.

Ms. DEAN. You don't recall that?

Do you recall actually saying that you had access to the President's Twitter account?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Those words never came out of my mouth, Congresswoman.

Ms. DEAN. Did you ever claim to have access?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my knowledge, Congresswoman.

Ms. DEAN. Did you ever have access to the President's Twitter account?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't recall.

Ms. DEAN. You don't recall if you had access to the President's Twitter account?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe I've ever had access.

Ms. DEAN. Unbelievable to me.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, his Twitter followers are large, but I don't believe I've ever had access to his Twitter account.

Ms. DEAN. Okay. I have just a few seconds left.

Mr. Lewandowski, your role as the President's enforcer has evaporated. You can protect him no longer.

Mr. Chair, on this 223rd Constitution Day we could not be in a more important place in this Judiciary Committee proving to the American people that their Constitution, our Constitution, is stronger than a President in search of corruption and coverup.

I yield back.

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, my colleagues have gone through some unbelievable acts by the President attempting to obstruct an investigation into his conduct and then to cover it up. That coverup has extended to preventing Witnesses from coming to talk to this Committee without any lawful basis of doing so.

Let me just be very clear. We are right now in the United States of America, and we have a President who is obstructing our congressional investigation into his misconduct. We know why he's doing this. The President wants to prevent Witnesses from testifying to Congress and the American people because he wants to hide his misconduct.

We've heard the name Rick Dearborn a lot today, the former deputy chief of staff.

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order, Mr. Chair.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. On August—

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady will suspend.

The gentleman will state his Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just ask, without follow-up, is the gentlelady accusing the President of a crime?

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. I can—

Mr. COLLINS. If she can reword, I'll be happy to withdraw.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. I am not accusing anyone of anything.

Can I continue? Can I reclaim my time?

Mr. COLLINS. Not if you continue in the vein, you're continuing with the question saying that he committed a crime.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Collins, this is not a reality TV show.

Mr. COLLINS. Not for you either.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. This is a serious Judiciary Committee hearing.

Mr. COLLINS. Then, ask—

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. We are trying to investigate misconduct by the President.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman has—

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. May I continue, Mr. Chair?

Chair NADLER. The gentleman has stated his Point of Order.

The gentlelady may continue with her time.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you.

On August 26, the Committee served a subpoena on Rick Dearborn to appear here today. You testified that you gave Dearborn the message dictated to him by the President. We went over that message today. It asked the Attorney General to direct the special counsel not to investigate the President.

That's not all. Mr. Dearborn was also Jeff Sessions' chief of staff during the Trump campaign. In that role, Dearborn coordinated meetings for candidate Trump and the Trump campaign, meetings that were organized by Russian organizations. Dearborn himself communicated with Russian officials. Once again the President is trying to prevent us from learning the truth about his conduct.

Let's be honest here. Mr. Dearborn is not here today because the President is afraid of what he would tell us and the American people. The President directed him not to appear based on a fake

claim of absolute immunity. Even though we can't hear from this important Witness about the President's potential obstruction of justice, I will share some of the subjects that I would have asked Mr. Dearborn if he were here today.

Mr. Lewandowski, we heard that the President directed you to deliver a message to the Attorney General. You asked Dearborn to deliver the message dictated to you by the President, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Can you remind me what page that's in the Mueller report?

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Volume II, page 92, right in the middle of the page.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Right under point 2.

Following his June meeting with the President—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate, yes, ma'am.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you, and you gave Dearborn that message and asked him to deliver it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate, yes.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you.

Well, what we know is that Dearborn did not deliver your secret message. In fact, he told the special counsel, quote, and you can see it on the screen, "being asked to serve as a messenger to Sessions made Dearborn uncomfortable." It definitely raised an eyebrow. Dearborn recalled not wanting to ask where it came from or think further about doing anything with it. As soon as the President learned that Dearborn knew and told the special counsel how bad it was, he's directed him now not to come in front of this Committee to testify.

So, it's no wonder the President wants to prevent Dearborn from testifying because we would be able to ask him why he wanted nothing further to do with the President's conduct, why he was so uncomfortable he didn't deliver that message.

In fact, Dearborn, as an actual government employee, was familiar with the Presidential Records Act. He knew that any official business must be documented. He did not keep the notes. The President doesn't want us to know why Dearborn didn't even want to keep that message.

Dearborn also knew the White House policy that any messages to the Attorney General were supposed to go through the White House counsel. The President doesn't want us to ask Dearborn why it was so wrong for the President to call in his private enforcer instead of the White House counsel.

So, again, let's make something very clear here today. Presidents of the United States cannot ignore congressional subpoenas. Richard Nixon learned this. His impeachment proceedings had an article of impeachment based on doing exactly that.

No President can be allowed to violate his or her constitutional duties, nor can any President be allowed to obstruct a congressional investigation or hide crimes. We will not sit back and let this President continue to obstruct justice any longer. Let me remind everyone that in this country no one is above the law.

Mr. COLLINS. Point of Order, Mr. Chair. I move to take down the gentlelady's words.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you. I yield back my time.

Mr. COLLINS. I still wanted to take down her words.

Chair NADLER. Which words do you want taken down?

Mr. COLLINS. That she can no longer allow this President to obstruct justice. She cannot do that.

Chair NADLER. I will rule that she can do that.

Mr. COLLINS. I will appeal the ruling of the Chair, then.

Chair NADLER. Fine. The ruling of the—the gentleman—we will suspend for a moment.

In the interest of time, I would ask the gentlelady if she would withdraw that characterization?

Mr. COLLINS. It is against the House rules.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Can I say no President can be allowed to obstruct?

Chair NADLER. You certainly can.

Mr. COLLINS. That, you can.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. We won't allow any President to continue to obstruct justice. Is that okay?

Chair NADLER. Yes.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Thank you, Representative Collins.

Chair NADLER. You want to say that?

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Let's say that.

Chair NADLER. Okay. Does she have any time left?

The gentlelady's time is expired.

The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Today's hearing and those we've held previously have outlined serious evidence of obstruction of justice. The President didn't just attempt to obstruct the special counsel's investigation, but he is also obstructing our congressional investigation into his conduct. The President has instructed a number of Witnesses to ignore our subpoenas to hide his wrongdoing from the American people.

One of those Witnesses is Rob Porter, the former White House staff secretary who was served with a subpoena by this Committee on August 26. Rob Porter was prominently featured in Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report with a detailed description of efforts to obstruct justice. The report describes the President directing then White House Counsel Don McGahn to fire the special counsel and then ordering him to lie about it.

The Committee has many questions for Mr. Porter, but the President doesn't want us asking those questions. So, the President directed Mr. Porter not to appear based on a bogus claim of absolute immunity, a pattern by this President to cover up his obstruction efforts.

Let me be clear. Mr. Dearborn is not here today either for the same reason, the President's fear of what we and the American people could learn from their testimony. Their absence won't stop our oversight, and I will still go through items I would have covered with Mr. Porter.

On January 25, 2018, the *New York Times* reported, and it's up on the slide, quote, "the President had ordered McGahn to have the Department of Justice fire the special counsel." After the news broke, the President went on TV and denied the story. This is all public.

Following the article, the President pressured McGahn to put out a statement denying he had been asked to fire the special counsel, but McGahn refused. McGahn's attorney told the President's attorney that, quote, "the *Times* story was accurate in reporting that the President wanted the special counsel removed."

The President didn't drop the issue. He then used Rob Porter to convince McGahn to make a false denial. The President told Porter that the article was, quote, "bullshit, that he never tried to terminate the special counsel." The President said that McGahn leaked to the media to make himself look good.

We know from the special counsel's report that what the President told Porter was not true. In fact, the report proves that the President did ask McGahn to fire the special counsel over and over again, and McGahn refused.

That's pretty bad, but it gets worse. According to the special counsel's report, quote, "the President then directed Porter to tell McGahn to create a record to make clear that the President never directed McGahn to fire the special counsel."

To be clear, the President asked Porter to tell McGahn to create a false record to hide the President's conduct. The President was so desperate to hide his misconduct that he even told Porter to threaten McGahn if he did not create the written denial. In fact, the President said, quote, "if he doesn't write a letter, then maybe I'll have to get rid of him."

Porter delivered that threat, but McGahn stood firm and refused to assist the President's misconduct. This should ring a bell. It's like the threat the President asked you, Mr. Lewandowski, to deliver to Jeff Sessions. Now, the President is attempting to bully his Witnesses and directed you, Mr. Lewandowski, not to answer our questions under our subpoena.

We will not let this coverup stand. That is why we are pursuing this impeachment investigation. Obstruction of Congress, ignoring congressional subpoenas is a serious offense. Nixon learned this. The third article of impeachment against Nixon explained that he was, quote, "violating his Constitution duty by blocking evidence under duly authorized subpoenas issued by this Committee."

Today, the President is doing just that, willfully disobeying subpoenas to cover up his conduct.

I will now yield the remainder of my time to our Chair.

Chair NADLER. Thank you.

Mr. Lewandowski, your behavior in this hearing room has been completely unacceptable, and it is part of a pattern by a White House desperate for the American people not to hear the truth.

I've been asked several times today whether the Committee will hold you in contempt. That is certainly under consideration. There is a far more troubling level of contempt on display here today, and that is President Trump's role in your refusal to answer questions.

The pattern of obstruction laid out in the Mueller report has not stopped. You showed the American public in real time that the Trump Administration will do anything and everything in its power to obstruct the work of the Congress. The President's lawyers are sitting behind you right now to make sure that you do not answer us.

Well, this Committee is focused on the evidence of potential corruption, obstruction and abuse of power, and exposing that misconduct is our top priority. Make no mistake, we will hold President Trump accountable.

Mr. GAETZ. Point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, did you have that little speech prepared before this hearing went downhill—

Chair NADLER. That is not a proper Parliamentary inquiry. The answer is no.

Pursuant to the resolution for investigative procedures adopted by this Committee last year—last week rather—and pursuant to notice, we will now proceed to staff questioning.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. The majority has designated Barry Berke to conduct its questioning.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, Point of Order. Clause, Clause 2(j)—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. Clause 2(j)(2)(C) of Rule XI permits up to 1 hour of questioning by staff of this Committee. This gentleman is a private consultant—

Chair NADLER. You're talking too fast. I can't understand you. I'm sorry.

Mr. COLLINS. This gentleman is a private consultant whose very consultant contract explicitly states that he is not an employee of this Committee, not a government employee. The Congressional Handbook states in explicit terms consultants' contracts, consultants contracted to work for standing committees, 2 U.S.C. 4301, are explicitly not employees of the Committee.

House Admin Committee will not even approve a contract for a consultant that will be performing regular or normal duties of the Committee staff. Any attempt to suggest that someone can simultaneously be an employee of the Committee and not be an employee of the Committee and the Committee staff defies even the most attenuated logic.

The majority's use of private sector consultants to question Witnesses constitutes an egregious violation of House rules under any circumstances. Under the circumstances of the current so-called impeachment inquiry, it would constitute an unprecedented privatization of impeachment.

I have the employment contract here of the gentleman, Mr. Barry Berke, and I also have the letter in which you are asking a question. Also, have the staff roll, which he is not listed as a staff member. He is a private consultant.

The Point of Order is he should not be able to allow questioning of this Witness. I have no problem because you have already run through and bullied through last week a staff questioning. Since you have fine staff, if your staff asks questions, I will withdraw the Point of Order. Mr. Berke or Mr. Norman is neither one allowed to ask questions under this rule.

Ms. Lofgren's Committee is here, and we do have the Committee staff from House Admin who agrees with this interpretation.

Chair NADLER. I am prepared to rule on the Point of Order.

For the purposes of staff questioning under the resolution adopted by the Committee on September 12, 2019, there is no distinction between staff and consultants.

First, the Chair has significant discretion to determine who qualifies as staff for the purposes of the resolution. Committee consultants in effect function as staff for all intents and purposes. They are paid out of the Committee's budget, they work at the Chair's discretion, and they are subject to all the same ethical and legal responsibilities as any other House employee.

Second, the Committee's retention of consultants is consistent with prior Committee practice. Committee consultants have been retained to question Witnesses at hearings and other proceedings. They've assisted with investigations, including impeachment investigations.

For example, David Shippers was the consultant to the majority and Abbe Lowell to the minority during the Clinton impeachment investigation. Committee consultants have questioned Witnesses without objection from Members.

In fact, just last Congress, the Republican majority of this Committee hired consultants to assist with their investigation into former Secretary of State Clinton's emails, and they regularly asked questions during transcribed interviews and other matters connected with that investigation.

Our consultants were retained specifically to assist the Committee perform its oversight and investigative functions, which is the purpose of today's hearing.

Accordingly, I overrule the Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, let's continue this for a second, because this is an important point. Before I ask—

Chair NADLER. Do you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair—

Chair NADLER. I'm sorry. You can be heard on the Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. Thank you.

Because, Mr. Chair, you're going down a very interesting road here, and this is an interesting road that we've already discussed and undoubtedly you've had a very big misunderstanding of just a few minutes ago.

We are not in an impeachment inquiry. We're not. You may want to it be. You may think it is. If you want to go to the floor right now, I'm sure they'll clear floor time for us and you can bring your privileged resolution for an impeachment inquiry. You can, but you don't have the votes.

You can't just make it up on the fly. The Chair of the Administration Committee is here, that we have talked to our Committee staff on that part. They would not ever agree that a contract employee is a staff member. The folks that you just named were after an impeachment inquiry was formed. They were hired for that specific purpose.

Now, if you want to continue this, this is a violation of the House rules. There is a privileged resolution for the House rules.

We've already had today the problematic issue of overstepping time. This one, Mr. Chair, is one that cannot go forward. This is one that you have great staff members, they are legally staff. They

fit every definition. No contract approved by the House Admin Committee, including the Chair who is on this Committee, can actually contract services to be provided by a consultant that are regular, normal business of the Committee staff.

This is regular, normal Committee oversight, if you want to have it. Even how you dress it up, it doesn't matter. This is not anything different. To continue down this path puts your entire line, already in question by millions of people, but a question in Committee to this House puts us in jeopardy, because if it's win at all costs, Mr. Chair, then we've got a problem.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair—

Mr. COLLINS. If it's win at all costs, we've got a problem.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I just have a question for the Chair.

Chair NADLER. Who seeks—

Mr. JORDAN. I just have a question.

Chair NADLER. No. Questions are not in order. We're discussing a Point of Order.

Mr. JORDAN. I have a question on the Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. Then, you're recognized.

Mr. JORDAN. If they're staff, why were they called consultants in their employment contract?

Chair NADLER. That's not a Point of Order.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, then let me ask, Mr. Chair, let me ask about this. Did the rule change last week, 1 week ago today that we voted on, that you voted for, we voted against, did it mention the word consultants in the rule changes that were adopted by the Committee?

Chair NADLER. I can't hear he's saying because you're talking.

VOICE. Chair, regular order.

Chair NADLER. Yes. I cannot hear what Mr. Jordan is saying because Mr. Collins is talking too.

Mr. JORDAN. The resolution that the majority adopted last week, was the word consultant mentioned in there when it came, relative to the ability of staff to ask questions?

Chair NADLER. It was not.

Mr. JORDAN. It was not.

So, let me get this straight. You changed the rules last week, and now this week you're not going to follow the rules you changed?

Chair NADLER. We are—all right. I am going to rule—

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. No, I'm going to rule on the Point of Order.

Mr. BIGGS. I'd like to speak towards the Point of Order.

Chair NADLER. It is not to have a debate on a Point of Order. The gentleman made his Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. They're not an employee of the Committee, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. You've made that point. That's your Point of Order. I am prepared to rule on it.

Ms. LOFGREN. May I be heard on a point of personal privilege?

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady.

Ms. LOFGREN. Since my name has been invoked.

I have ascertained that, in fact, the staff director for the House Administration Committee has not been solicited for his information.

Mr. COLLINS. I did not ask your staff director. I asked ours.

Chair NADLER. Okay.

Ms. LOFGREN. Fine.

Mr. COLLINS. Because you're—at this point—

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Mr. COLLINS. The issue here, though—

Chair NADLER. The issue here was stated already by you. You don't have to repeat it.

Mr. COLLINS. No. Be careful going down this road, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. You made your point, and I'm going to rule on it.

Mr. COLLINS. Be careful, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. I'm going to be very careful.

Number one, we are in an impeachment investigation, but that is—whether or not we are—is not relevant to this question, so we're not going to debate whether—

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, it is.

Chair NADLER. It is not relevant to that question.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, you [inaudible] investigation inquiry. I mean, which is it?

Chair NADLER. That is not relevant to this question. The Committee's retention of consultants is consistent with prior Committee practice. Consultants have been retained to question Witnesses at hearings and at other proceedings, not only in an impeachment hearing. This is consistent with past practice. I so rule. I overrule the Point of Order.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The Point of Order is overruled, unless someone wants to ask for a vote on the Point of Order.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, Mr. Chair—

Chair NADLER. Do you wish to ask—do you wish to vote—

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. No, I want to talk. I want to ask you a question here, because—

Chair NADLER. No. The Point of Order—

VOICE. Regular order. Regular order, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. The Point of Order—you raised a point of—you were recognized for the purpose of raising a Point of Order.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have a question.

Chair NADLER. You raised it. I ruled on it. Do you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair, yes or no?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Ms. LOFGREN. I move to table, Mr. Chair.

Chair NADLER. What?

Ms. LOFGREN. I move to table the appeal of the ruling.

Mr. COLLINS. This is a sad day. This is a sad day for the Committee.

Chair NADLER. The ruling of the Chair is appealed. The gentlelady moves to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The clerk will call the roll. The clerk will call the roll on the question of approving the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler.

Chair NADLER. Aye.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler votes aye.

Ms. Lofgren?

Ms. LOFGREN. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Lofgren, aye.
Ms. Jackson Lee?
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee votes aye.
Mr. Cohen?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Georgia?
Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Georgia votes aye.
Mr. Deutch?
Mr. DEUTCH. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Deutch votes aye.
Ms. Bass?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Richmond?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline?
Mr. CICILLINE. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline votes aye.
Mr. Swalwell?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu?
Mr. LIEU. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu votes aye.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Jayapal?
Ms. JAYAPAL. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jayapal votes aye.
Ms. Demings?
Ms. DEMINGS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Demings votes aye.
Mr. Correa?
Mr. CORREA. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Correa votes aye.
Ms. Scanlon?
Ms. SCANLON. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Scanlon votes aye.
Ms. Garcia?
Ms. GARCIA. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Garcia votes aye.
Mr. Neguse?
Mr. NEGUSE. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Neguse votes aye.
Ms. McBath?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton?
Mr. STANTON. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton votes aye.
Ms. Dean?

Ms. DEAN. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Dean votes aye.
 Ms. Mucarsel-Powell?
 Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Mucarsel-Powell votes aye.
 Ms. Escobar.
 Ms. ESCOBAR. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Escobar votes aye.
 Mr. Collins?
 Mr. COLLINS. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Collins votes no.
 Mr. Sensenbrenner?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gohmert?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan?
 Mr. JORDAN. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan votes no.
 Mr. Buck?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Roby?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz?
 Mr. GAETZ. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz votes no.
 Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
 Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Louisiana votes no.
 Mr. Biggs?
 Mr. BIGGS. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Biggs votes no.
 Mr. McClintock?
 Mr. McCLINTOCK. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. McClintock votes no.
 Ms. Lesko?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Reschenthaler?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline?
 Mr. CLINE. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline votes no.
 Mr. Armstrong?
 Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Armstrong votes no.
 Mr. Steube?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cohen votes aye.
 Chair NADLER. Has everyone voted who wishes to vote?
 The clerk will report—no, no, wait, wait. We're still waiting for
 someone.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman from Arizona? How many—has the gentleman from Arizona been recorded?

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton, you voted aye.

Chair NADLER. Is everyone in agreement? Anybody else? The clerk will report.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chair, there are 19 ayes and 8 noes.
[The vote was as follows:]

Roll Call No. 3

Date: 9/17/19

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
House of Representatives
116th Congress

Subject: Approving the Motion to Table
the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair

PASSED

FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)	✓		
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)	✓		
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)	✓		
Steve Cohen (TN-09)	✓		
Hank Johnson (GA-04)	✓		
Ted Deutch (FL-02)	✓		
Karen Bass (CA-37)			
Cedric Richmond (LA-02)			
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)			
David Cicilline (RI-01)	✓		
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)			
Ted Lieu (CA-33)	✓		
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)	✓		
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)	✓		
Val Demings (FL-10)	✓		
Lou Correa (CA-46)	✓		
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)	✓		
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)	✓		
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)	✓		
Lucy McBath (GA-06)			
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)	✓		
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)	✓		
Debbie Mucarsel-Powell (FL-26)	✓		
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)	✓		
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Doug Collins (GA-27)		✓	
James F. Sensenbrenner (WI-05)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)			
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)			
Jim Jordan (OH-04)		✓	
Ken Buck (CO-04)			
John Ratcliffe (TX-04)			
Martha Roby (AL-02)			
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)		✓	
Mike Johnson (LA-04)		✓	
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)		✓	
Tom McClintock (CA-04)		✓	
Debbie Lesko (AZ-08)			
Guy Reschenthaler (PA-14)			
Ben Cline (VA-06)		✓	
Kelly Armstrong (ND-AL)		✓	
Greg Steube (FL-17)			
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	19	8	

Chair NADLER. The motion to—the Point of Order—the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair is agreed to. The majority has designated Barry Berke to conduct his questioning.

Mr. Berke, you are now recognized.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, I have a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, you mentioned earlier that there were consultants who had been used to question Witnesses. So, I'm just going to ask as a Parliamentary inquiry, what were the parliamentary occurrences where a—

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of Order, Mr. Chair. That's not a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman is correct. That is not a Parliamentary inquiry.

Who else has a Parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, was today's Witness, Mr. Lewandowski, when he was subpoenaed, was he notified that consultants would be questioning him?

Chair NADLER. That is not a Parliamentary inquiry. That is not a Parliamentary inquiry either.

Mr. JORDAN. That's a procedural—it's an important procedural question.

Chair NADLER. Mr. Berke is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I move to adjourn.

Chair NADLER. A motion to adjourn is in order and is not debatable. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler?

Chair NADLER. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Nadler votes no.

Ms. LOFGREN?

Ms. LOFGREN. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Lofgren votes no.

Ms. JACKSON LEE?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jackson Lee votes no.

Mr. COHEN?

Mr. COHEN. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cohen votes no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Georgia votes no.

Mr. DEUTCH?

Mr. DEUTCH. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Deutch votes no.

Ms. BASS?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Richmond?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jeffries?

[No response.]

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline?

Mr. CICILLINE. No.

Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cicilline votes no.
Mr. Swalwell?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu?
Mr. LIEU. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Lieu votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Jayapal?
Ms. JAYAPAL. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Jayapal votes no.
Ms. Demings?
Ms. DEMINGS. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Demings votes no.
Mr. Correa?
Mr. CORREA. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Correa votes no.
Ms. Scanlon?
Ms. SCANLON. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Scanlon votes no.
Ms. Garcia?
Ms. GARCIA. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Garcia votes no.
Mr. Neguse?
Mr. NEGUSE. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Neguse votes no.
Ms. McBath?
Ms. MCBATH. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. McBath votes no.
Mr. Stanton?
Mr. STANTON. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Stanton votes no.
Ms. Dean?
Ms. DEAN. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Dean votes no.
Ms. Mucarsel-Powell?
Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Mucarsel-Powell votes no.
Ms. Escobar?
Ms. ESCOBAR. No.
Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Escobar votes no.
Mr. Collins?
Chair NADLER. To adjourn.
Ms. STRASSER. Motion to adjourn.
Mr. COLLINS. Aye.
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Collins votes aye.
Mr. Sensenbrenner?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chabot?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gohmert?
[No response.]
Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Jordan votes yes.
 Mr. Buck?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Ratcliffe?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Ms. Roby?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Louisiana?
 Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Yes.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Johnson of Louisiana votes yes.
 Mr. Biggs?
 Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
 Mr. McClintock?
 Mr. McCLINTOCK. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. McClintock votes aye.
 Ms. Lesko?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Reschenthaler?
 [No response.]
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline?
 Mr. CLINE. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Cline votes aye.
 Mr. Armstrong?
 Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
 Mr. Steube?
 [No response.]
 Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair?
 Chair NADLER. Are there any Members who wish to—the gentleman from Florida.
 Mr. GAETZ. Am I recorded?
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz, you are not recorded.
 Mr. GAETZ. Aye.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Gaetz votes aye.
 Chair NADLER. Are there any other Members who wish to be recorded?
 The clerk will report.
 Ms. STRASSER. Mr. Chair, there are 8 ayes and 20 noes.
 [The vote was as follows:]

Roll Call No. 4

Date: 9/17/19

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
House of Representatives
116th Congress

Subject: Motion to Adjourn

PASSED

FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)		✓	
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)		✓	
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)		✓	
Steve Cohen (TN-09)		✓	
Hank Johnson (GA-04)		✓	
Ted Deutch (FL-02)		✓	
Karen Bass (CA-37)			
Cedric Richmond (LA-02)			
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)			
David Cicilline (RI-01)		✓	
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)			
Ted Lieu (CA-33)		✓	
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)		✓	
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)		✓	
Val Demings (FL-10)		✓	
Lou Correa (CA-46)		✓	
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)		✓	
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)		✓	
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)		✓	
Lucy McBath (GA-06)		✓	
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)		✓	
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)		✓	
Debbie Mucarsel-Powell (FL-26)		✓	
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)		✓	
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Doug Collins (GA-27)	✓		
James F. Sensenbrenner (WI-05)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)			
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)			
Jim Jordan (OH-04)	✓		
Ken Buck (CO-04)			
John Ratcliffe (TX-04)			
Martha Roby (AL-02)			
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)	✓		
Mike Johnson (LA-04)	✓		
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)	✓		
Tom McClintock (CA-04)	✓		
Debbie Lesko (AZ-08)			
Guy Reschenthaler (PA-14)			
Ben Cline (VA-06)	✓		
Kelly Armstrong (ND-AL)	✓		
Greg Steube (FL-17)			
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	8	20	

Chair NADLER. The motion to adjourn is not agreed to.

Mr. Berke is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. Who has the point of Parliamentary inquiry?

The gentleman will state his point of parliamentary—

Mr. BIGGS. My Parliamentary inquiry—

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his point of Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My inquiry is this, it relates to the rule that we changed last week where we mention staff would conduct questioning, and it has been expanded to include consultants today. My question is, did we contemplate that—the distinction between independent contractor such as a consultant?

Chair NADLER. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. Did we contemplate what?

Mr. BIGGS. Did we contemplate independent contractors, such as a consultant, would be vis-à-vis employees, which is what the staff would be, as being part of the distinction when that rule was changed last?

Chair NADLER. The gentlelady from—

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, the advice I have received from the top staff person at the House Administration Committee is that staff can be comprised of employees, interns, detailees, fellows, contractors, et cetera. Staff and employee are not equivalent terms.

I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. So, would the gentlelady yield to a question?

Ms. LOFGREN. Certainly.

Mr. BIGGS. So, my question would be, as the Committee on House Administration has indicated, to me anyway, that it will not approve a contract if the services to be provided by the consultant are the regular and normal duties of Committee staff. Are you saying that this—I mean, I was under the impression that this was not extraordinary—

Ms. LOFGREN. That's not pertinent to this proceeding. I'd be happy, after the meeting, to go through it. This was signed off by the Committee itself. It met all our requirements.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman has not stated a Parliamentary inquiry. The time is Mr. Berke's. Mr. Berke has 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAVKIN. Mr. Chair, as you know, I'm counsel for Mr. Lewandowski. I need about 30 seconds to register a formal protest.

Chair NADLER. You are not a Witness, and you should not be seated at that table.

Mr. CHAVKIN. I understand that. I'm going to leave as soon as I can register this formal protest based upon the debate that I've just heard. These seem to be unauthorized questions. I know you choose your words carefully.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will—

Mr. CHAVKIN. I will leave it to Mr. Lewandowski to decide, but it is my view that he should not answer unauthorized questions.

Mr. CÍCILLINE. Point of Order, Mr. Chair.

We're not interested in your views. We have a hearing to conduct.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. CHAVKIN. As his legal counsel—

Chair NADLER. We are having a hearing to conduct—

Mr. GAETZ. Point of Order. I don't believe Mr. Cicilline stated a rule.

Chair NADLER. Mr. Lewandowski will answer all questions. If he has a legitimate privilege to assert, you may of course assert the legitimate privilege. Other than that, he's under subpoena, he will answer all questions.

This is being done pursuant to the Committee's rules. If his counsel doesn't like it, you don't interpret our rules, with all due respect.

Mr. CHAVKIN. Right. What my point is, Mr. Chair, these are unauthorized questions.

Chair NADLER. Mr. Berke is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BERKE. Mr. Lewandowski, did you ever become concerned that the President had asked you to do something that could expose you to criminal liability?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry, what was the question?

Mr. BERKE. Did you ever become concerned that the President of the United States had asked you to do something that could expose you to criminal liability?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Was I concerned that the President asked me to do something? Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. BERKE. Were you ever concerned that the President had asked you to do something that put you in harm's way, made you feel that you were in trouble?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think I've asked and answered that question.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, I'd like to show you a video of an interview you did on *FOX News*. This was on January 16, 2018.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/0aojgaln6w49cjj/Video%20%20-%20Berke.mp4?dl=0>]

Mr. BERKE. Sir, you were answering that with regard to your appearance before the House Intelligence Committee. You say you take the Fifth when you are in trouble. You didn't do anything, so you were going to testify. You weren't going to take the Fifth before that Committee with regard to questions about the campaign.

Were you concerned, sir, that you had done something with regard to delivering or agreeing to deliver the President's message and, therefore, you could get in trouble based on what you agreed to do and attempted to do?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no concerns.

Mr. BERKE. Isn't it a fact, sir, that contrary to your testimony that you voluntarily appeared in front of the special counsel, when you were called to provide answers to the special counsel, you indicated your intent to assert your rights under the Fifth amendment not to self-incriminate? Is that true?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection. Is that in the report, sir?

Mr. BERKE. Isn't it true, sir, that you refused to testify without receiving immunity?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe that's accurate. I'd be happy if you could show me that. If it's in the report, I'll be happy to answer if.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, is it your testimony under oath that you never received immunity prior to answering questions of the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That's a question for Special Counsel Mueller, and I won't be answering mechanics of the investigation.

Mr. BERKE. My question to you, sir, is did you refuse to answer the special counsel's questions without getting a grant of immunity protecting you from having your words used against you in a criminal prosecution?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've asked and answered your question.

Mr. BERKE. Are you denying, sir, that you refused to answer questions and asserted your rights under the Fifth amendment not to self-incriminate unless the special counsel gave you immunity?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've asked and answered your question, sir.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, do you agree with your statement that you would, "assert the Fifth amendment if you believed you were in trouble," to quote your words, to *FOX News*?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't think I was under any obligation when speaking to *FOX News* to not engage in hyperbole if I so chose. I was not under oath at any time during that discussion. I have been very forthright today.

Mr. BERKE. Is it still your testimony, sir, that you made under oath earlier, that you appeared voluntarily before the special counsel and not under a grant of immunity?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. To the best of my recollection, I appeared in front of the special counsel voluntarily.

Mr. BERKE. Did you receive immunity, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. As Director Mueller stated when asked about Don Jr.'s communication to special counsel, his intent to invoke the Fifth amendment right, Director Mueller said, and I quote, "I'm not going to answer that." So, if you want to direct that question to Director Mueller, it's on page 77 of the report, you're welcome to do so.

Mr. BERKE. Did you receive immunity, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've asked and answered your question.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me ask you, have you ever been untruthful about being asked to give—answer questions of the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've already testified I've been honest to the best of my ability.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me show you another clip. This one was from March 25, 2018, from *Meet the Press*, March 25, 2018.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/f0uego0d8lb9lir/Video%203%20-%20Berke.mp4?dl=0>]

Mr. BERKE. Sir, was that truthful what you said on national television on March 25, 2018, that the special counsel had not asked to speak to you at that date?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know if they asked to speak to me by that date.

Mr. BERKE. So, you know your interview that's reported in the special counsel report was on April 6, 2018?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Is that accurate?

Mr. BERKE. Yes.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Is that the date of the interview?

Mr. BERKE. Yes.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what the report says, I'll take it to be accurate.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, you made public statements denying that you had been asked to give answers to the special counsel when you actually had. You had been untruthful about that. Isn't that true, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Are we talking about a discussion with the media or in front of a Committee of jurisdiction where I'd been sworn to testify?

Mr. BERKE. I'm talking about your public statements to the American public—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Oh, I'm sorry, nobody in front of Congress has ever lied to the public before. I'm sorry.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, is that an admission that you did lie?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Absolutely not.

Mr. BERKE. Did you lie, sir, in television interviews denying that you had been asked to give answers to the special counsel?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't believe so.

Mr. BERKE. So, you deny that you ever lied in public statements about whether you—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What I'm saying is, when under oath, I've always told the truth, whether it was before special counsel, whether it was before the House Judiciary Committee, whether it was before the House Intelligence Committee on two separate occasions, or before the Senate Intelligence Committee. Every time I've raised my right hand to God, I've sworn and told the truth.

Mr. BERKE. That's not my question to you, sir. We'll get to that. My question to you, sir, is, on national television, did you lie about your relationship with the special counsel and whether they sought your interview?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, did you lie about it because you didn't want the world to find out that you were afraid you could be exposed to criminal liability and you were only going to appear as to certain issues with a grant of immunity protecting your words from being used against you in a criminal prosecution?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm going to go back to what Director Mueller stated, "he's not going to answer that question." I'm not going to allow you to use me as a back door into his methods. If you'd like to question Director Mueller about the way of the investigation techniques of the Justice Department, you've had that opportunity to do so, but clearly you didn't. So, take him back here, bring him before the Committee so he can answer those questions. Those questions are not for me.

Mr. BERKE. Let me ask you this, sir, prior to the Mueller report being published in redacted form, did you ever misrepresent what you did on behalf of the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't think of an instance where that would have occurred.

Mr. BERKE. Let me show you an interview that you did on May 14, 2019. Excuse me, I'm going to show it to you from February 22, 2019. Let me show it to you. Excuse me, May 14, 2019.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/wue98tbmdydn/nhn/Video%204%20-%20Berke.mp4?dl=0>]

Mr. BERKE. Did you hear that, sir? That was you saying on MSNBC you don't ever remember the President ever asking you to get involved with Jeff Sessions or the Department of Justice in any way, shape or form. That wasn't true, was it, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I heard that.

Mr. BERKE. That was not true, was it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no obligation to be honest with the media because they're just as dishonest as anybody else.

Mr. BERKE. So, you're admitting, sir, you were not being truthful in that clip, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. My interview with Ari Melber can be interpreted any way you like.

Mr. BERKE. Yes. Would you like me to play it again?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You're welcome to, please.

Mr. BERKE. Play it one more time.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/wue98tbmdydn/nhn/Video%204%20-%20Berke.mp4?dl=0>]

Mr. BERKE. Sir, it is true in May 2019, you absolutely remember when the President asked you to deliver a message to the Attorney General of a speech for him to give related to the special counsel investigation. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'd have to think about it.

Mr. BERKE. Are you claiming, sir, that—and you had been interviewed by the special counsel about those very events in which you discussed and you said it was accurately reported in the report a year earlier? Are you saying, sir, you may have forgotten it by the time you were interviewed just before the report was publicly released?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm saying my memory was clearly much fresher when I actually gave the interview with the special counsel's report.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, is it your testimony before this Committee that when you said you did not remember the President ever asking you to get involved with Jeff Sessions of the Department of Justice, you were saying you were being truthful?

Sir, I don't believe there's any reason to consult with your counsel. The question is are you a truth teller in that interview?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm a truth teller every time I stand before Congress or a Committee of jurisdiction and raise my hand and swear to God under oath.

Mr. BERKE. My question, sir, is when you said the President never asked you to get involved with Mr. Sessions—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no obligation to have a candid conversation with the media whatsoever, just like they have no obligation to cover me honestly. They do it inaccurately all the time.

Mr. BERKE. So, you're admitting that on national television you were lying there?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What I'm saying is they have been inaccurate on many occasions, and perhaps I was inaccurate that time.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, I want to remind you you're under oath. Am I right, sir, that the reason why you didn't admit that the President had asked you to deliver a message to the Attorney General about investigations is because you knew it was wrong and you were concerned about your own exposure, and you didn't have immunity in that interview. Isn't that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Which interview?

Mr. BERKE. The one we just watched where you lied about the President asking you to deliver a message.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn't know I could get immunity from a media outlet.

Mr. BERKE. I want to clarify, the date of that interview was February 22, 2019, just to be clear. The date is February 22, as I originally stated, 2019.

Sir, let me ask you a question—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. So, what was the inaccuracy earlier, because I missed that?

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me ask you, did you say that because you wanted to protect the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, did you deny it because you wanted to protect yourself?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection, Mr. Berke.

Mr. BERKE. Then, why did you lie on national television, sir, about the President giving you a message to the Attorney General about the special counsel's investigation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't recall that particular day and my mind-set at the time, so I couldn't answer that.

Mr. BERKE. Can you offer any explanation for why you would lie on national TV other than concern about protecting yourself and the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Well, I know previously the Chair asked Witnesses not to guess, so I'd prefer not to guess, unless the Chair has changed his tune on that.

Mr. BERKE. So, you can't give me any other explanation except your concern that you or the President could be criminally exposed based on what you attempted to do on his behalf. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I didn't say that.

Mr. BERKE. Can you give me any explanation other than that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If you'd like me to take a guess, which the Chair has asked previous Witnesses that he didn't want guessing—if we're changing the rules of the Committee once again, I'll be happy to try and take a guess, with the caveat that I don't recall that particular interview. I'm not exactly sure where I was the time it transpired. I don't exactly remember that particular day and what was transpiring in my life. I'd be happy to take that caveat. With that said, I don't recall it.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me ask you about your earlier testimony a few minutes ago that you're truthful when you take an oath, as you did earlier today before this Committee. I'd like to put up a slide that you were asked about earlier, if I may. This is the actual statement that you made to the special counsel that you said was

accurate. I'm quoting, "that's a direct quote." It's right in front of you, sir, on the screen. That's a direct quote from the report on page 92. It said: "Lewandowski did not want to meet at the Department of Justice because he did not want a public log of his visit."

You were asked about that. Now, sir, do you deny that you told the special counsel you did not want to public log of your visit with the Attorney General?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe I've answered that question, but I don't deny that is an accurate representation of what I told the special counsel.

Mr. BERKE. Okay. Is it an accurate representation of what you said before, which I didn't quite follow, that you did not want a public log of your visit because you wanted to have a casual dinner with the special counsel, and that's why you didn't want there to be a record of your visit? Was that your testimony earlier today, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I had no interest in having a casual dinner with the special counsel, no, sir.

Mr. BERKE. I'm sorry. With the Attorney General, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Are you clarifying the question?

Mr. BERKE. I am, sir.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. Could you repeat it, please?

Mr. BERKE. Yes, sir. Your earlier testimony was that the reason you didn't want a public log is because you wanted to have the casual dinner with the Attorney General. Was that your earlier testimony?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That seems to be accurate.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, having a casual dinner with the Attorney General has nothing to do with why you wouldn't want a public log of your visit with the Attorney General, does it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It does.

Mr. BERKE. So, isn't it a fact you didn't want a public log because you knew what you were doing was wrong? So just as the President went to an unofficial nongovernment employee, you wanted to make sure there was not a record of it. Isn't that right, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No.

Mr. BERKE. So, do you agree that a log creates a record of your visiting with the Attorney General?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I would think a log would create a record, yes.

Mr. BERKE. Do you agree, sir, that you admitted to the special counsel you didn't want to have a record of your visit, and that's one of the reasons why you didn't go to the Department of Justice, because you did not want a public log of your visit, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I've never been to the Department of Justice. I don't know what goes on in the Department of Justice. I don't really want to find out what happens in the Department of Justice based on what's happened to other people involving the Department of Justice, to be honest with you.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, my question to you is, you say you didn't go because you didn't want a public log of your visit?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Are you asking me the same question I've just answered? Yeah, I have stipulated to the fact that what is in the Mueller report about a public log is accurate to the best of my

recollection. I'll be happy to answer it again, but it's still accurate to the best of my recollection.

Mr. BERKE. That's because you didn't want a public record of it, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe I've said, my quote is, "did not want to meet at the Department of Justice because he did not want a public log." That is a quote that somebody in the special counsel's team clearly referenced as something I've said, although, I don't think I would have spoken about myself in the third party.

Mr. BERKE. You also said, sir, that you didn't want the Attorney General to have an advantage over you. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I think that's also an accurate representation of the report, but I'd have to be made aware of where that is again.

Mr. BERKE. It's on page 92. It's quoted right in front of you. So, I ask you, sir, again, if you didn't think you were doing anything wrong and you weren't being brought in to pressure and bully the Attorney General, why did you not want him to have an advantage over you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Jeff and I were friends and have been friends. Seeing him in a social environment where we could sit down and have a meal, whether at his house, my house, or a Washington, DC restaurant to have a conversation was something I thought was better for the both of us.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, isn't it true that has nothing to do with the question whether you wanted a public—that you didn't want him to have an advantage over you? That was because you were trying to assert leverage as the President wanted you to give him a message about what he should say about the special counsel's investigation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, Mr. Berke.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me show you another statement that you made in a *FOX News* interview on April 19, 2019.

[Video available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/yd4im0o3gr2n6aq/Video%205%20-%20Berke.mp4?dl=0>]

Mr. BERKE. Now, sir, that was April 19. I'll represent to you that was the day after the redacted Mueller report came out on April 18. Sir, you said, you never delivered a message to Jeff Sessions, that's what you said in there, right? You were asked to deliver that message. Isn't that correct, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's accurate. Compared—as comprised in the report, yes, but the meeting never transpired.

Mr. BERKE. You said, sir, you never did anything other than what was completely legal. You said that, sir, because you knew if you delivered that message that told the Attorney General to instruct the special counsel to limit the investigation to exclude the President, that would not be legal. Isn't that correct, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Berke, I didn't have the privilege of going to Harvard Law School and I'm not an attorney. So, what I know is I didn't think at the time that the President asked me to deliver a message that anything was illegal about it. I didn't have the privilege to go to Harvard Law. So, if you're telling me that, in your opinion, that would have been illegal, then that's your opinion to it. I never assumed that, never thought about it at the time, and haven't thought about it now.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, you did think about it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What else have I thought about, Mr. Berke?

Mr. BERKE. So, let me ask you this question, sir.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Berke, what else have I thought about if you just told me that?

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of Order, Mr. Chair. The Witness doesn't get to ask questions; he gets to answer them.

Mr. BERKE. Let me ask you, sir, you were asked about why you didn't deliver the message, you said you went on vacation for 2 weeks. Over a month after the President directed you to deliver that message to Attorney General Sessions, you didn't deliver it, right, because you met with the President a month later on July 17. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that's what the report says.

Mr. BERKE. Okay. So, you've been back from vacation for 2 weeks. You even went to Washington to meet with the President. Why didn't you deliver the message that the President asked you to deliver, unless you didn't deliver it because you knew it was improper to deliver?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Berke, it wasn't a priority.

Mr. BERKE. For who?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. For me.

Mr. BERKE. It was a priority for the President. Isn't that right?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You'd have to ask the President that question.

Mr. BERKE. Didn't the President tell you it was a priority? Didn't he ask you at your second meeting in July, did you deliver the message yet to the Attorney General? Didn't he ask you that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Berke, I can't disclose any conversations that aren't in the Mueller report.

Mr. BERKE. That is in the Mueller report.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. Where is that, please?

Mr. BERKE. You recall you testified—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What page is that on, sir, to refresh my memory?

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me ask you a question, do you remember the President asking you that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Could you please reference me the page number so I can review it?

Mr. BERKE. Sir, did the President ask you—do you remember testifying earlier that you said the President said if Mr. Sessions will not meet with you for you to deliver that message, you should tell him he's fired? Correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, if there's a reference to the report, I'd like to refresh my memory. It's been a long day. I'm sure you can appreciate that.

Mr. BERKE. How about if I reference you to your testimony. Do you recall testifying to that earlier today?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, it's been a long day. I believe to the best of my knowledge that's what I've said. If there's a reference to the Mueller report, I ask you to point it to me.

Mr. BERKE. So, let me ask you, sir, if it wasn't a priority for you to deliver the message, why did you enlist Mr. Dearborn to deliver the message for the President?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I can't speak to a private conversation I would have had with Mr. Dearborn at the advice of counsel.

Mr. BERKE. I'm not asking private conversations. The fact that you did it is already disclosed in the report. I'm asking you why did do you it. Why? What's going on—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I knew Mr. Dearborn—

Mr. BERKE. Why did do you it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Can I answer now?

Mr. BERKE. Please.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. I've known Mr. Dearborn since his tenure as a Chief of Staff to Senator Sessions. He was my primary point of contact for Jeff Sessions during the Trump campaign. I also knew that Mr. Dearborn had continued, like I did, to have a long-standing relationship with Jeff. If I wasn't going to be seeing Jeff, I figured Rick would be able to deliver that message.

Mr. BERKE. Well, sir, did you try to see Mr. Sessions again? Did you call him after the President told you to do it and see if he would meet with you this time?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to—

Mr. BERKE. Did you call once? Please answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, is the reason you personally didn't call on someone who you said you were friendly with was because you knew what the President asked you to do was wrong and you, sir, didn't want to get in trouble, that's why you didn't do it?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Mr. Berke, I've asked and answered that question. I'm not a lawyer, but I didn't think that he was asking me to do something that was unlawful at the time, and I don't think that was the case now.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, didn't Mr. Dearborn tell you that he actually had handled the situation and had delivered the message?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't recall that conversation. It's possible.

Mr. BERKE. Let me show you what Mr. Dearborn told the special counsel. He said that he had told you that he had handled the situation, but he had not actually followed through. Do you recall that, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know if I recall that conversation with Mr. Dearborn.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me now ask you why the President thought you might be prepared to deliver a message that everyone in his Administration that he asked refused to deliver. Sir, am I correct that a few weeks before you met with the President in June of 2017, you had a conversation with his senior staff about joining the Administration in a very senior role?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm sorry, the question was in which time-frame?

Mr. BERKE. A few weeks before you met with the President the first time in June of 2017, and he asked you to deliver a message to the Attorney General.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The question is what, sir?

Mr. BERKE. That you had discussions with the President's senior staff about joining the Administration in a senior role.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't speak to conversations I may or may not have with senior staff members of the Administration to preserve the privilege which they've invoked.

Mr. BERKE. So, it's such a sacred privilege you would do not disclose private communications because that would be wrong. Is that your testimony, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No. My testimony is that the White House has directed that I do not disclose the substance of any discussions with the President or his advisers to protect Executive branch confidentiality. I recognize that's not my privilege, but I am respecting the decision of the White House.

Mr. BERKE. Well, sir, didn't you publish a book in which you disclose these very conversations you had with senior White House officials?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Which book do you reference? I've written two New York Times best sellers in a year, so could you refresh my memory which one?

Mr. BERKE. I'm asking you about the best seller "Let Trump Be Trump."

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That was a hell of a book, by the way. Yes, I did write that book.

Mr. BERKE. You disclosed—

Mr. CICILLINE. Point of Order, Mr. Chair. I request that the Chair order the Witness to answer the question.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did answer the question. I wrote "Let Trump Be Trump," available at fine bookstores everywhere, is my guess.

Mr. BERKE. Let me ask you about—and do you recall, sir—let me show you some things you wrote in your book. Do you recall you met at the White House, right, in late May 2017? Do you recall that?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do recall meeting then with Mr. Trump in the Oval Office in late May of 2017. Yes, I do.

Mr. BERKE. Let me show you, sir, here's what you wrote. You wrote—and that was before—that was just after his first trip abroad as President, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don't know his travel schedule as well as you do, but it's possible.

Mr. BERKE. Let me show you what you wrote, sir.

Multiple times during his trip abroad and even during the plane ride home, the boss talked about bringing us in to restore order to the west wing.

Is that what you wrote, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I mean, it looks like I wrote it.

Mr. BERKE. Okay. You recall, sir, that before you met with the President, his Chief of Staff Reince Priebus and his Senior Advisor Steve Bannon described what kind of role you were being considered for. Do you remember that, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I can't discuss private conversations with the senior staff. Mr. Berke, I've answered that many times.

Mr. BERKE. I know you can't discuss it, but you can write about it. So, let's look at what you wrote about it, sir.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You should buy the book; it's very good.

Mr. BERKE. Let's look at it. So, Corey Lewandowski, per their plans, you wrote—and this was the plans Mr. Priebus and Bannon

shared with you—is going to oversee political operations, Presidential appointments, and the RNC, as well as the campaign’s handling of Russian meddling in the 2016 election. You would be on the same level as Jared, a senior advisor.

Was that true, sir, what you wrote there that they were talking about you in late May joining the position and playing that role?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The book is accurate.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, if you keep going on, if we could go with—you met with the President and the President said he didn’t want to do it right now, meaning when you met with him, because if the place isn’t working better in the next 4 or 5 weeks, I’m firing everyone. Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I believe the book is accurate.

Mr. BERKE. Now, and you thought this was an incredible opportunity, as you wrote, right? Like a little kid in Little League getting to play in the World Series. Correct? That’s what you wrote?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Yes, having the privilege to be inside the Oval Office speaking to the President of the United States, after growing up poor in Lowell, Massachusetts, not attending Harvard or graduating Phi Beta Kappa from Duke, yeah, it’s pretty amazing opportunity.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, and you knew for Donald Trump as Presidential candidate, that, as you wrote next, “loyalty is the currency of the realm, and nothing hurts him deeper than when someone he trusts is disloyal.” Is that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I believe that’s in the book.

Mr. BERKE. Okay. So, when he asked you a few weeks after this meeting to deliver this message as a nongovernment employ to the Attorney General, you knew that you were being considered for a senior position on the same level as Jared Kushner, and you also knew how the President values loyalty. Isn’t that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. BERKE. You deny that those conversations happened that you just talked about?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. BERKE. That was weeks before you met with the President, correct, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I met with the President in late May, as the book detailed accurately.

Mr. BERKE. Sir—

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. You also read the rest of the paragraph, which said, “we don’t want you to come in at this time because if it doesn’t work out, I’m going to fire everybody.”

Mr. BERKE. He said now, but he was dangling the position of the most senior level for you. Isn’t that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s a question for the President of the United States, sir.

Mr. BERKE. He would know that he dangled it. Therefore, you would do his bidding in delivering a secret message to the Attorney General that everyone in his government who he asked to deliver wouldn’t do it. Isn’t that correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, sir.

Mr. BERKE. All right, sir. Well, let me ask you—let me ask you about this role you were going to have, because—if we could show

you another quote that you wrote of how this role was described, part of your duties—if we could go to the next slide, please—part of the duties, as Reince Priebus said, “Corey is going to come in and run the Russia investigation.”

So, is it true, sir, that you were being told you were considered to come in to run the investigation of Russia’s influence of the 2016 Presidential campaign just weeks before you were asked to tell the Attorney General to limit the special counsel’s investigation to future elections? Is that true, sir, that you were asked to come in—you were being considered to come in and run the Russia investigation? Is that a true fact, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. It’s true that’s what Mr. Priebus wanted, yes.

Mr. BERKE. So, what did you understand your role would be, that the President was going to bring in his former campaign manager, until June of 2016 when he fired you, to run the investigation of whether Russia influenced the 2016 campaign and did something improper with the Trump campaign? Is that what your understanding was, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That’s a question for what Mr. Priebus’ understanding was.

Mr. BERKE. What I want to know, sir, is the President would know, when he asked you to deliver the message to the Attorney General to tell the special counsel not to investigate the 2016 campaign, that you, sir, were under consideration yourself to be brought in by the President to run the very investigation of the 2016 campaign and Russian interference that you had previously been involved in. Isn’t that correct, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, you were not—it was not raised with you that you were going to be considered to run the Russia investigation?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. That was Mr. Priebus’ idea, not the President’s idea.

Mr. BERKE. Mr. Bannon, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don’t know if Mr. Bannon was involved in that. It’s possible.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. The President, prior to your meeting, had discussed with you how much he wanted you to come join the Administration, just part of that meeting as he was on his trip on his way back. Isn’t that what you said, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, I didn’t speak to him while he was overseas.

Mr. BERKE. On his way back he raised that issue. Isn’t that the truth, sir? That’s what you wrote.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I don’t believe I said that I spoke to the President while he traveled back from overseas.

Mr. BERKE. Did he raise with you joining the Administration before that meeting, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I’ve spoken to the President and President-elect multiple times about opportunities, but I can’t divulge those conversation. I’m sorry.

Mr. BERKE. Well, you already did in your book, sir. You’ve already said that those conversations happened and were true, Correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. What I stated was that was Mr. Priebus' idea, not the President's idea.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, you also wrote, and we just read it, that multiple times during his trip abroad and even during his plane ride home, the boss talked about bringing us in to restore order to the White House. Didn't you write that, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If that's what the book says. I don't have it in front of me.

Mr. BERKE. Yes, it does.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Okay. I'd like to see that so I can verify the validity of it.

Mr. BERKE. All right. Let's put the slide back.

You know, we're not going to take the time. We saw the slide earlier.

Let me continue, sir. Sir, let me ask you a question. You were asked about—you knew that the special counsel report found systematic interference by Russians in the election, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'd like to restate I've never read the special counsel's report.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, do you take the report lightly? Do you think it's not a serious matter what the special counsel did?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. If you're putting words in my mouth, those are inaccurate. Never have I stated that.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, did you know—you knew you were mentioned in there like 129 times, correct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Is that accurate, 129 times, sir?

Mr. BERKE. Do you know how many times?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I do not know. Do you?

Mr. BERKE. Sir, isn't it true that just last week, you were appearing at an event to autograph copies of the special counsel report, and you said you couldn't sign every page because you were mentioned in it so much?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. No, I think that's a misrepresentation of what someone else said.

Mr. BERKE. Did you go to an event where you signed copies of the special counsel report, sir?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I did attend a book signing where the report was available, but I never read the report.

Mr. BERKE. I ask you again, sir, you made light of the special counsel's finding of Russia's role, an attempt to try to interfere with the 2016 election?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I'm outraged at your characterization of my statements. Never have I said that. Never have I called into question the validity of the Mueller report or alluded to the fact that I want to see Russia interfere with the election. As a matter of fact, my testimony here today has been completely the opposite of that. So, for you to intimate that's what my statement is about the Mueller report is grossly out of line.

Mr. BERKE. Sir, let me show you something in the Mueller report that you had agreed to sign at an event. If we could go to the next slide, please.

Sir, so you asked about that, this is the findings. You don't have any reason to dispute the findings that Mr. Sessions was recused from the investigation and wasn't allowed to participate, do you?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have no idea what the findings of the report were. I have not read the report, as I've testified to now on dozens of occasions here today.

Mr. BERKE. Let me go to the next slide. You see where this says you were asked about it, the special counsel concluded that, taken together, the President's campaign, the purpose of the message was to have you tell the Attorney General to move forward with investigating election meddling for future elections.

Do you have any basis to dispute that conclusion by the special counsel in his report, sir, about your conduct?

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. Again, I've answered this question, asked and answered.

Mr. BERKE. I would ask you to answer it, sir.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will answer the question, whether he's answered it before or not.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI. I have stated, to the best of my knowledge, most of the information in the Mueller report is accurate.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Without objection the minority will designate a staff member to conduct its questioning during the allotted time from staff.

Mr. COLLINS. That's me. Adjoining to your wild range and definition of staff, I'm staff.

Chair NADLER. You are not staff.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, I am.

Chair NADLER. You are not staff, just like—

Mr. COLLINS. Ms. Lofgren's own definition, interns—I'm staff.

Chair NADLER. You are not staff. You're a Member. Just as we are not permitting any Member of the majority to—

Mr. COLLINS. So you're—

Chair NADLER. —the 5 minute rule—

Mr. COLLINS. Okay. I'm not going to interrupt.

Chair NADLER. We will not—I'm not going to permit ½ hour now for minority Members beyond what they had under the 5-minute rule. If you have a staff member, you'll designate him or her. That's what the rules call for. If not, we'll adjourn.

Mr. COLLINS. I wish that you had actually designated a staff member; that would have been nice.

Chair NADLER. We did.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, you're really, right now with everything rolling, cameras rolling, you're going to deny a Member of Congress, the Ranking Member of this Committee, this time. I know you've got willing accomplices in the majority, that's fine, because you have the most votes.

Mr. COHEN. Move to adjourn.

Chair NADLER. Stop.

Mr. COLLINS. Are we really coming to this point, Mr. Chair? Thirty minutes.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will suspend.

The rules of the Committee provide for Members of the House—or Members of the Committee, I should say—for Members of Committee to question Witnesses under the 5-minute rule. We've done that. The rules of the Committee, as amended by the procedures adopted last week, permit the majority and the minority each to designate a staff member to examine the Witness for 30 minutes.

If you wish to designate a staff member, you may do so. A Member of the House is not a staff member.

Mr. COLLINS. Give me just a moment. I am thinking about my designation, but you will possibly, hopefully give me a moment after we have been—

Chair NADLER. The House will stand in recess for 1 minute while the gentleman considers his appointment.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, I did not ask for a recess.

Chair NADLER. You wanted a minute.

Mr. COLLINS. No, I did not. I said I'm thinking about it as I talk to you. I mean, because your definition of staff, anybody walking along—according to Zoe Lofgren's statement, I could make a guy walking across my intern and they're staff. You said interns. They're not paid.

Here's to folks, take the picture, you do see this railroad. This is amazing. I'll take my minute and I may take 3 minutes to figure out.

[audio off]

Chair NADLER. Just so everybody is clear, we are in a 1-minute recess.

[Recess.]

Chair NADLER. The Committee will reconvene. Without objection, the minority will designate the staff member to conduct its questioning during the allotted time for staff.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, after deliberation and looking at this, I cannot go along with the Chair's sham and the majority's sham in this hearing in designating a staff member. We have said all along this is not an impeachment inquiry. This is not something that should have happened to start with. I refuse to go along with the Chair's faux impeachment process. So, we're not going to designate. We'll continue to litigate this on other fronts. Mr. Chair, you have made a shame of this Committee today.

Chair NADLER. Very well. Very well.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, a Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. This completes the questioning of Mr. Lewandowski for today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair?

Chair NADLER. We thank our Witness for participating.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, can you hear me? Can you hear me now?

Chair NADLER. All right. I'll recognize the Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you. Parliamentary—

Chair NADLER. For what purpose—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I just want to be sure—

Chair NADLER. For what purpose—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. —I understand the rules—

Chair NADLER. Just a minute. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. A Parliamentary inquiry.

Chair NADLER. The gentleman will state his Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. So, I understand the rules correctly, as an elected Member of the House of Representatives—

Chair NADLER. You have to talk into your mike. I can't hear you. Say again.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. As dually elected Members of this Committee and as elected Members of the House of Representatives, each of us is limited to 5 minutes.

Chair NADLER. That's correct.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. An unelected consultant is allotted 30 minutes in open hearing. Is this correct?

Chair NADLER. The rules of the Committee, as amended by the Committee vote last week, provide that Members of the House—of the Committee, that is, have 5 minutes a piece to question Witnesses—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. So, Members of the House—

Chair NADLER. The rules of the Committee, as amended last week, also provide a ½ hour per Witness for counsel—for staff questioning of the Witness, 30 minutes for the majority and 30 minutes for the minority staff. Those are the rules of the Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. So, Members of the House are now subordinate to hired consultants.

Chair NADLER. That's not a Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS. That is true.

Chair NADLER. This completes the questioning of Mr. Lewandowski for today. We thank our Witness for participating. In light of his repeated assertions of privilege, I will take those matters under advisement. We will recess the hearing, subject to the call of the Chair, until a later date.

The hearing will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. CHAVKIN. Mr. Chair, we're going to be submitting a letter to the Chair with a couple of areas of clarification once the hearing is done.

[Whereupon, at 6:34 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

The slides are available at the following link:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/7rw7lhevzgx5br/Slides.pdf?dl=0>.

