The Senate met at 1:05 p.m. and was called to order by the Chief Justice of the United States.

TRIAL OF DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will convene as a Court of Impeachment.

The Chaplain will lead us in prayer.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, send Your Holy Spirit into this Chamber. Permit our Senators to feel Your presence during this impeachment trial. Illuminate their minds with the light of Your wisdom, exposing truth and resolving uncertainties. May they understand that You created them with cognitive capabilities and moral discernment to be used for Your glory. Grant that they will comprehend what really matters, separating the relevant from the irrelevant. Lord, keep them from fear, as they believe that Your truth will triumph through them. Eliminate discordant static with the music of Your wisdom.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chief Justice led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Justice asked the Senate to be seated.

If there is no objection, the Journal of proceedings of the trial is approved to date.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Jennifer Hemingway, made the proclamation as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silence, on pain of imprisonment, while the Senate of the United States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEEDING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, the Senate will conduct another question and answer period today. We were able to get through nearly 100 questions yesterday. Senators posed constructive questions, and the parties were succinct and responsive. I would like to compliment all who participated yesterday.

We will again break every 2 to 3 hours and look to take a break for dinner around 6:30.

We have been respectful of the Chief Justice’s unique position in reading our questions. I want to be able to continue to assure him that that level of consideration for him will continue.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. Chief Justice, the Senate will conduct another question and answer period today. We were able to get through nearly 100 questions yesterday. Senators posed constructive questions, and the parties were succinct and responsive. I would like to compliment all who participated yesterday.

We will again break every 2 to 3 hours and look to take a break for dinner around 6:30.

We have been respectful of the Chief Justice’s unique position in reading our questions. I want to be able to continue to assure him that that level of consideration for him will continue.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Senator MURRAY asks the House managers:

Yesterday, when asked about why the House did not amend or reissue subpoenas after it passed its resolution authorizing its impeachment inquiry, the House Managers touched upon the House having the sole Power of Impeachment as specified by Article I of the Constitution. Could you further elaborate as to why that authority controls despite any arguments brought forth by members of the defense team contesting the validity of those subpoenas?

Ms. Manager LOFGREN. Mr. Chief Justice and Senators, that is a good question.

The answer is that these were validly issued subpoenas under the House rules. The White House argument to the contrary is wrong, and it would have profound negative implications for how Congress and our democracy function.

On January 9, 2019, the House adopted its rules, like we do every Congress, and these rules gave the committee the power to issue subpoenas. They are not ambiguous rules. Here is the relevant portion of rule XI on slide 55: The House’s standing rules give each committee subpoena power ‘‘to the pur- pose of carrying out any of its functions and duties’’ as it considers necessary. This investigation began on September 9, before the Speaker’s announcement on September 24 that it would become part of the impeachment inquiry umbrella.

The President doesn’t dispute that the subpoenas issued by these committees were fully within their respective jurisdiction. The argument is that somehow, by declaring that this investigation also falls under an inquiry to consider Articles of Impeachment, which gives Congress actually greater authority, somehow it nullifies the traditional oversight authority. And this just doesn’t make any sense.

The President counters that we have to take a full vote on impeachment first because that is what has been done in the past. In the Nixon inquiry, however, the Judiciary Committee needed a House resolution to delegate subpoena power, and that is different than the Committee’s standing rules today.

The President actually compels the opposite conclusion. Several Federal judges have been investigated and im- peached and convicted in the Senate without the House having ever taken an official vote to authorize the inquiry, and a Federal court recently confirmed there was no need for a for- mal vote of the full House to commence impeachment proceedings.

Even assuming a House vote was necessary, there was a vote. The text of H.
You are right. They were not able to directly answer that question, and we believe that there is a tremendous amount of material out there in the form of emails, text messages, conversation, and witness testimony that lain should be light on that, including an email from last summer between Mr. Bolton and Mr. Blair, where we know from witness testimony this issue was discussed.

What we do know is from multiple witnesses and, indeed, the administration that actually has an explanation of why the hold on security assistance was at stake, and then they waited 33 days to bring it here. And now they are asking you to do all the

plenty of emails, text messages, and other correspondence within the entire interagency process that we know is robust that would illustrate that to be the case, but they have failed to provide any evidence to corroborate that. They have failed to provide any evidence to corroborate that. We happen to know that a lot of people in this Chamber, a lot of people in the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol, including me, have often described much consternation about red tape and bureaucracy, the layers of government that run too slow. And I sometimes share that concern, right, that sometimes it takes a long time. There are memos for everything, emails for everything. There are paper trails for everything in this town. I think that is true with respect to this issue, and it is time that we actually see that information so we can get to the bottom of what actually happened. This body could get that information.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators Sasse, McSally, Thune, Young, Ernst, and Braun.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question from Senator Toomey and others is for counsel for the President:

Given that the election of the president is one of the most significant political acts in which we as citizens engage in our democratic system, how much weight should the Senate give to the fact that removing the president from office and disqualifying him from ever holding future federal office would undo that democratic decision and kick the President off the ballot in this year’s election?

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate.

One of the concerns that we have raised throughout this process over the last several months, going back to the time when the House was working with this in their various committees, is we are in an election year. There are some in this room that are days away from the Iowa caucuses taking place. So we are discussing the possible impeachment and removal of the President of the United States not only during election season, in the heart of the election season. And I think that this does a disservice to the American people.

Again, we think the basis upon which this has moved forward is irregular, to say the least. But I do think it complicates the matter for the American people that we are literally at the dawn of a new season of elections. I mean, we are at that season now, and yet we are talking about impeaching a President.

And I want to tie this into the urgency that was so prevalent in December with my colleagues, the managers. It was so urgent to move this forward that they had to do it by mid-December. Mr. Chief Justice, national security was at stake, and then they waited 33 days to bring it here. And now they are asking you to do all the...
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Now, what is so striking to me is almost half a century ago we had a President who said: “Well, when the President does it, that means it is not illegal.” That, of course, was Richard Nixon. Watergate is now 40 to 50 years behind us. Have we learned nothing in the last 50 years? Have we learned nothing at all? It seems like we are back to where we were: The President says it is not illegal or Donald Trump’s version under article II, “I can do whatever I want,” or Professor Professor Dershowitz’ point that the President believes it helps his reelection, it is, therefore, in the national interest; he can do whatever he wants.

In fact, much as we thought that we progressed post-Watergate: We enacted Watergate reforms; and we tried to insulate the Justice Department from interference by the Presidency; we are trying to put an end to the political abuses of that Department—such as when we thought we enacted campaign finance reform. That might be back to where we were a half century ago. And I would argue, we may be in a worse place because this time—this time that argument may succeed.

That argument—if the President says it, it can’t be illegal. And, Richard Nixon was forced to resign. But that argument may succeed here now. That means we are not back to where we were; we are worse off than where we are. That is the normalization of lawlessness.

I would hope that every American would recognize that it is wrong to seek foreign help in an American election; that Americans should decide American elections. I would hope—and I believe that every American understands that, and every American understands that is true for Democratic Presidents and Republican ones. I would hope that we would understand it. I would hope that this trial would be one conducive of the truth.

The Senator asked what witnesses could shed light on when the President ordered the hold and why. Well, we know Mick Mulvaney would. That instruction came from OMB. You remember the testimony of Ambassador Taylor, the shock that went through the National Security Council and the shock he experienced in that video conference when it was first announced, and the instruction was, this comes through the President’s Chief of Staff, OMB, but it is a direct order from the President.

Well, Mick Mulvaney knows when that order went into place and he knows why that order went into place and he made that statement publicly, which he now wishes to recant. I am sure he got an earful from the President after he did, but, apparently, it doesn’t matter. None of that matters because if the President believes it is in his interest, it is OK.

Now, there is an argument also, what if it was a credible reason? Of course, there is no evidence that this was a credible reason to investigate the President’s political rival, but let’s say it was a credible reason; does that make it right?

What President is not going to think he has a credible reason to investigate his opponent? What President is going to think he doesn’t have a credible reason? It wouldn’t be credible to fabricate one or come up with some fig leaf?

They compounded the dangerous argument that they made that no quid pro quo is too corrupt if you think it will help your reelection. They compounded it by saying, if what you want is to target your rival, it is even more legitimate. That way, madness lies.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator YOUNG.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question from Senators CRAMER and YOUNG is for the counsel for the President:

Yesterday Mr. Schiff regularly states that if the President is innocent he would agree to all of the witnesses and documents that the Managers want. Is the President the first innocent defendant not to waive his rights?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question because the answer is, obviously, no. The President is not the first innocent defendant who decided not to waive his rights, and I think it is striking to see how shocking that is when you look at the arguments that has been repeatedly deployed by the House managers throughout these proceedings.

You heard Manager Nadler say only the guilty hide evidence, only the guilty don’t respond to subpoenas, and Manager Schiff say that this is not the way innocent people act. Well, of course, that is contrary to the very spirit of our American justice system, where people have rights, and asserting those rights cannot be interpreted as an indication of guilt.

The Supreme Court explained in Bordenkircher v. Hayes—a case that is cited in our trial memorandum—that the very idea of punishing someone, which is what the House managers are attempting to do here with their obstruction of Congress charge—they said that if the President insists on the constitutional prerogatives of his office; if the President insists that, like virtually every President—at least since Nixon and some going further back than that—he is going to assert the immunity of his senior advisers to compel congressional testimony; if he is going to assert those rights grounded in the separation of powers and essential for protecting constitutionally based executive branch confidentiality interests, we are going to call that obstruction of Congress and impeach him.

We see this fundamental theme running throughout, both the obstruction charge and their arguments generally here that if the President stands on his constitutional rights—if he tries to
It is this: Let’s say that a Democrat is counsel for the President would argue? can, in very practical terms. say, and let me break this down, if I my colleague Manager OFGREN had to Ellis, Preston Wells Griffith, and Mick Eisenberg and the subpoenas to Brian lolution were the subpoena to John have it. 

So there you are with a Democratic President. You are a chair, and you start to do oversight. You issue subpoenas. You start to learn more, and what you learn becomes more and more concerning, and you issue more subpoenas. The administration’s effort to cover up its misconduct says: We are not going to comply with any of your subpoenas. We are going to fight all subpoenas. And they come up with one bad-faith excuse after another as to why they don’t have to comply. As you investigate further and you are able to overcome the wall of obstruction, then you begin an impeachment inquiry and that leads to the passage of yet another resolution. They would argue to you that all of the work you did before you determined that it merited potential impeachment must be thrown out, that they were perfectly empowered to obstruct you in your oversight responsibility, that you must begin with your conclusion and you must begin with the conclusion that you were prepared to impeach the President before you issued any subpoena: otherwise, they can say whatever you did before you got to that place should be thrown out.

Now, we did not have the Justice Department do the initial investigation here, Why? Because Bill Barr turned it down. The same Attorney General that mentioned that July 25 call said there was nothing to see here. So there was no DOJ investigation. There was no special counsel investigation. It was not as if someone like Ken Starr handled the case: otherwise, they can say whatever you did before you got to that place should be thrown out.

We had to do that work ourselves. They would have you believe that any subpoena you issue as a part of your oversight responsibility that, down the road, reveals evidence that leads you to embark on an impeachment inquiry must be disregarded. That cannot and is not the law. It would render the oversight function meaningless. Court after court has looked at the Congress’s power to issue subpoenas, and they have all reached the same conclusions. That is, if you have the power to legislate, you have the power to oversee. Here, we have a violation of the Impoundment Control Act. That is, Congress passes military spending. The President doesn’t spend it, and he gives it back to Congress. We are investigating that. That can’t be more squarely within the oversight power of Congress—to find out why aid we appropriated was not going out the door. They would say: You can’t look into this, because you already impeached the President and announce it firsthand. That is the import of that argument. It would cripple your oversight capacity, and without your oversight capacity, your legislative capacity is crippled. That is the real-world import of this legal window dressing. They would strip you of your ability to do meaningful oversight.

Particularly here, where we are talking about the misconduct of an impeachable kind and character, it would mean that a President could obstruct his own investigation.

If you need any evidence of his bad faith, which is abundant—of the shifting and springing rationalizations and explanations—when we had Corey Lewandowski in the Intelligence Committee, they said, under instructions of the White House, he wouldn’t answer questions because they might claim executive privilege. Now, this was someone who had never worked for the executive, but they made the claim he might use executive privilege.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Time is expired.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators HAWLEY and GRAHAM.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator CRUZ, along with Senators HAWLEY and GRAHAM, is for both sides—the counsel for the President and the House managers:

Yesterday, Manager DEMINGS refused to answer whether Joe Biden sought any legal advice concerning his conflict of interest on Burisma, the corrupt Ukrainian company that was paying his son Hunter $1 million per year.

USA Today reported that, when asked about it, Vice President Biden said, “He hadn’t spoken to his son Hunter Biden about his overseas business.”

That account was contradicted by Hunter Biden, who told the New Yorker that he told his father about Burisma, and ‘Dad said, ‘I hope you know what you’re doing,’ and I said, ‘I do.’”

Why do Joe and Hunter Bidens’ stories conflict? Did the House ask either one that question?

The White House Counsel goes first.

Ms. Counsel BONDI. Chief Justice, Senators, you heard our answer regarding that yesterday, but it is very interesting that he said he never spoke to his son about overseas dealings and that his son said different things.
Joe Biden was the point man for Ukraine. The Ukrainians were investigating at that time a corrupt company, Burisma, and Zlochevsky, its owner—an oligarch—who, by all media accounts, as we have discussed, was extremely close to them.

Hunter Biden was paid $33,000 a month—a month—to sit on that board with having no experience in energy, no experience in the Ukraine, and didn’t speak the language. We clearly know that he had a very fancy job description and did none of those things. He attended one or two board meetings—one in Monaco. Then he went on a fishing trip with Joe Biden’s family in Norway.

The entire time, Joe Biden knows that this oligarch is corrupt. Everyone knows that. There are news reports everywhere. No one will dispute that. In fact, it raised eyebrows worldwide. Yet the Vice President, by his account, never once asked his son to leave the board. Instead, he started investigating the prosecutor who was going after Burisma and this corrupt oligarch, who they say was corrupt even by oligarch standards, who had fled the country—and was living in Monaco.

He does not ask him to leave the board. He does the opposite.

In 2015, what does he do? We know by reports he has close contact with President Poroshenko. He travels to Ukraine twice. He links it to the—He links their aid to the firing.

Same thing in 2016 at a White House meeting—links the aid to the firing of the prosecutor; calls him four times in the 8 days up—leading to the prosecutor—the prosecutor investigating Hunter Biden. Yet he never says that. All cases closed.

Days before Biden leaves office, he jokes to Poroshenko that he may have some experience—Josh Hawley, I hope you are able to find the 30,000 emails that we have seen on the other side that I think is important to see.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mr. Manager DEEMINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator ROSEN is addressed to the House managers:

Over the course of your arguments, you have tried to make a case that the President put his personal interests above those of the Nation, risking our national security in the process. What precedent do you believe the President’s actions set for future Presidents?

Mr. Manager CROW. Mr. Chief Justice, Senator, thank you for that question. It is one that I have wanted to answer for some time now.

You have heard me speak before about some of my personal experience in service to the country, and one thing that experience has taught me is that we are strong not just because of the service and the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, which is extreme and pure in all of its sense and something that I think everybody in this Chamber actually appreciates and respects, but we are also strong because we have friends. We are strong because America doesn’t go it alone.

You know, when I was in Iraq and Afghanistan, I worked frequently with Afghan Army partners, Iraqi Army partners, and we were very clear that it was important but because it was essential. We couldn’t accomplish the mission without it. But if those partners feel like our policies—what we say publicly—don’t matter; if they feel like we are not a reliable and predictable partner; if they feel like the American handshake isn’t worth anything, then they will not stand by us. They will not stand by us.

For over 70 years, since the end of World War II, the partnerships, the alliances that we have built, that we have strived to create, that have ushered in an unprecedented period of peace and prosperity throughout the world, the American handshake will not matter. Ukraine has started to learn that.

Our 68,000 troops throughout Europe deserve better because every day, they get up and they do their job—the job we have asked them to do—and they rely on our consistency, our predictability. They rely on the interest being in the national interest, not the whims and the personal interest of the President, whether that be President Trump or the other President.

It will continue to call into question our broader alliances, and it will send a message that the American handshake doesn’t matter.

We have a slide that shows the evolution of some of the different arguments that we have seen on the other side that I think is important to see.

(Video presentation:)

President Trump. Russia, if you are listening, I hope you are able to find the 30,000 emails that are relevant. I think you will probably be rewarded mightily by our press. Let’s see if that happens.

STEPHANOPoulos. The campaign this time around, if foreigners, if Russia and China, if someone else offers information on an opponent, should they accept it or should they call the FBI?

President Trump. I think maybe they do both. I think you might want to listen. There is nothing wrong with listening. If somebody called from Norway: We have information on your opponent—I think I would want to hear it.

Mr. STEPHANOPoulos. You want that kind of interference in your campaign?

President Trump. It’s not an interference. They have information. I think I would take it.

Unidentified Speaker. Let’s move to the third excerpt there related to Vice President Biden and it says, “The other thing, there’s a lot of talk about Biden’s son”—this is President Trump speaking—“that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that so that whatever you can do with the Attorney General would be great. Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution so if you can look into it . . . It sounds horrible to me.”

President Trump. Well, I would think that if they were honest about it, they’d start a major investigation into the Bidens.

It’s a very simple answer.

President Trump. If we feel there is corruption, like I feel there was in the 2016 campaign, there was tremendous corruption against me—if we feel there’s corruption, we have a right to go to another country.

President Trump. And by the way, likewise, China should start an investigation into the Bidens because what happened in China was just as bad as what happened with—Ukraine.

Mr. Manager CROW. The American people deserve to know what happened.
The American people deserve to know when they go to bed tonight that there is a President that has their interests in mind, that will put the national security of the country above his own political self-interest. The American people deserve answers. And, yes, it is still a proper time to call Ambassador Bolton to testify.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators TOOMEY, CORNYN, CRAPO, ERNST, and MORAN.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator PORTMAN and the other Senators is for the counsel for the President:

I have been surprised to hear the House managers repeatedly invoke constitutional law Professor Jonathan Turley to support their position, including playing a part of a video of him. Isn’t it true that Professor Turley opposed this impeachment in the House and has also said that abuse of power is exceedingly difficult to prove alone without an accompanying criminal allegation, abuse of power has never been the sole basis for a presidential impeachment and was not proven in this case?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question.

And that is exactly correct. Professor Turley was very critical of the entire proceeding in the House and of the charges that the House Democrats were considering here, both the abuse of power charge and the obstruction charge. He explained that this was a rushed process; they did not adequately pursue an investigation; that, as the Senators point out in the question, abuse of power is an exceedingly difficult theory to use to impeach a President, and it has never been used without alleging violations of the law.

I think that in the discussions we have had over the past week and a half, we have pointed that out multiple times. Every Presidential impeachment in our history, including even the Nixon impeachment proceedings, which didn’t actually lead to impeachment, have used charges that include specific violations of the law and the criminal law.

Andrew Johnson was charged mostly with contempt of Congress and refusal to provide electronic surveillance, using the CIA and others. Specific violations of law.

Clearly, in the Clinton impeachment, President Clinton was impeached for perjury and obstruction of justice.

Those are crimes.

While Professor Turley does not take the view that a crime is necessarily required, he pointed out here that there was not nearly a sufficient basis and not nearly a sufficient record compiled in the House of Representatives to justify an abuse of power charge.

He also was very critical of the obstruction of Congress theory, and he pointed out that it would be an abuse of power by Congress under these circumstances where Congress has simply demanded information, a refusal from the executive branch based on constitutionally based prerogatives of the executive or refusal to provide that information, then to simply go straight to impeachment without going through the accommodations process, without considering contempt, without going to the courts. That is Professor Turley’s view on how incrementally the House of Representatives would have to proceed to try to reach ultimately some theory of obstruction.

So to cite Professor Turley, it is true, in his academic writing and in his testimony, he did not adopt the view that you must have a crime and only a crime as the charge for an Article of Impeachment. He still thought that neither of the Articles of Impeachment here could be justified or sufficient or could be used to impeach the President—both the abuse of power article and the obstruction article. So taking his analysis of the law, I really do see an injustice to the totality of his testimony, because the totality of his testimony was entirely against what the House ended up doing.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chief Justice, on behalf of Senator WYDEN and myself, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Senators Brown and Wyden ask the following question to the House managers:

During yesterday’s proceedings, the President’s counsel failed to give an adequate response to a question related to whether acceptance of information provided by a foreign country to a political campaign or candidate would constitute either a high crime or a high misdemeanor—one of those terms—to make it clear that it was going to be used to trigger an impeachment.

In the proceedings in the Nixon impeachment inquiry, each of the Articles of Impeachment there—except for the obstruction of Congress charge—is sort of treated separately on the obstruction theory—included specific violations of law. There were specific violations alleged in the second Article of Impeachment, which is often sort of referred to loosely as the abuse of power article. It wasn’t actually entitled “abuse of power.” It didn’t charge abuse of power. The specifications there were violations of the law—violating the constitutional rights of the citizens, violating the laws governing executive branch agencies, unlawful electronic surveillance, using the CIA and others. Specific violations of law.

In the Clinton impeachment, President Clinton was impeached for perjury and obstruction of justice.

Those are crimes.

While Professor Turley does not take the view that a crime is necessarily required, he pointed out here that there was not nearly a sufficient basis and not nearly a sufficient record compiled in the House of Representatives to justify an abuse of power charge.

He also was very critical of the obstruction of Congress theory, and he pointed out that it would be an abuse of power by Congress under these circumstances where Congress has simply demanded information, a refusal from the executive branch based on constitutionally based prerogatives of the executive or refusal to provide that information, then to simply go straight to impeachment without going through the accommodations process, without considering contempt, without going to the courts. That is Professor Turley’s view on how incrementally the House of Representatives would have to proceed if they were going to try to reach ultimately some theory of obstruction.

So to cite Professor Turley, it is true, in his academic writing and in his testimony, he did not adopt the view that you must have a crime and only a crime as the charge for an Article of Impeachment. He still thought that neither of the Articles of Impeachment here could be justified or sufficient or could be used to impeach the President—both the abuse of power article and the obstruction article. So taking his analysis of the law, I really do see an injustice to the totality of his testimony, because the totality of his testimony was entirely against what the House ended up doing.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel JEFFRIES. Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished Members of the Senate, thank you for that question.

I will take the last part first. It would send a terrible message to autocrats and dictators and enemies of democracy and the free world for the President and his team to essentially put out there for all to consume that it is acceptable in the United States to solicit foreign interference in our free and fair elections or accept political dirt simply to try to cheat in the next election.

I was certainly shocked by the comments of the President’s Deputy White House Counsel yesterday, right here on the floor, when he said: “I think that the idea that any information that happens to come from overseas is necessarily campaign interference is a mistake.”

No. It is wrong. It is wrong in the United States of America.

He also added “Information that is credible, that potentially shows wrongdoing by someone that happens to be running for office, if it’s credible information, is relevant information for the voters to know . . . to be able to decide on who is the best candidate. . . .”

This is not a banana republic. It is the democratic Republic of the United States of America. It is wrong.

The single most important lesson that we learned from 2016 was that nobody should seek or welcome foreign interference in our elections. But now we have this President and his counsel essentially saying it is OK.

It strikes at the very heart of what the Framers of the Constitution were concerned about—abuse of power, betrayal by the President of his oath of office, corrupting the integrity of our democracy and our free and fair elections by entangling oneself with foreign powers. That is at the heart of what the Framers of the Constitution were concerned about.

Don’t just trust me. We have several folks who have made this observation. There’s the Acting Director of the FBI—President Trump’s FBI Director—said that the FBI would want to know about any attempt at foreign election interference.

The Chair of the Federal Elections Commission also issued a statement reiterating the view of U.S. law enforcement. She said in part:

Let me make something 100 percent clear to the American public and anyone running for [public] office: It is illegal for any person to solicit, accept, or receive anything of value from a foreign national in connection with a U.S. election.

This is not a novel concept. Election intervention from foreign governments
One example like that, I believe it was pointed out that aid was held up to Afghanistan. President Trump held up aid to Afghanistan specifically because of concerns about corruption. In situations like that, there would be nothing wrong whatever with conditioning one policy approach upon foreign policy modifying their policy to be more in line, to attune more directly to U.S. foreign interests. That is what foreign policy is all about. That could arise in situations of even calling for investigations.

I think it is interesting to point out that in May of 2018, three Democratic Senators sent a letter to the then-prosecutor in Ukraine suggesting that we have heard some things that you might not be cooperating with the Mueller investigation. And there was sort of an implicit indication behind the letter that there is not going to be as much support for Ukraine. This is something that is important. You have got to be helping with that investigation. There is nothing in the transcript linking them to a quid pro quo. The Ukrainians didn’t even know that there had been a temporary pause on the aid, and if I could go on with a list of points on that.

I think if there were any application hypothetically, it would come in the realm of the fact that in foreign policy there are situations where there can be situations where one government wants some action from another and wants that action from another in a way that would condition other policies of one country.

You can say: We would like you—and this happens. For example, with the Northern Triangle countries: We want you to do more to stop the flow of illegal immigration. We are going to be conditioning some of our policies toward you, unless and until you do a better job stopping the flow of illegal immigration. That is a real problem our southern border.

That happens all the time, and when there is something legitimate to look into, there could be a situation where the United States would say: You’ve got to do better on corruption. You’ve got to do better on these specific cases of corruption, or we are not going to be able to keep the same relationship with you.
On March 6, 2019, Speaker NANCY PELOSI said, “impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there’s something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, it should go down that path because it divides the country.” Alexander Hamilton also warned in Federalist 65 against the “persecution of an intemperate and dangerous man in the House of Representatives” with respect to impeachment. In evaluating the case against the President, should the Senate take into account the partisan nature of the impeachment proceedings in the House?

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Senate. Absolutely you should take that into account. That is dispositive. That should end it. Based on the statements that we heard the last time from our friends on the Democratic side, that is a reason why you shouldn’t have an impeachment. You need a vote. The subpoena was right when she said that. Unfortunately, she didn’t follow her own advice.

We have never been in a situation where we have the impeachment of a President on an election year. That is the goal of removing the President from the ballot. As I have said before, that is the most massive election interference we have ever witnessed. It is domestic election interference; it is political election interference; and it is wrong.

They don’t talk about the horrible consequences to our country of doing that, but they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible. They would tear us apart for generations, they would be terrible.
obligated to Ukraine in September, but in 2018, 67% of the funds were obligated in September and in 2017, 73% of the funds were obligated in September. In the State Department, the funds were obligated September 30 in 2019, but they were obligated September 28 in 2018. Each year, the vast majority of the funds were obligated in the final month or days of the fiscal year. Was there any risk that we were putting at risk, that is just not accurate.

The idea that on the frontlines in the Donbas, Ukrainian soldiers are being put at risk, that is just not accurate. And we know that also from Oleg Shevchuk, the Ukrainian Deputy Minister of Defense, who gave an interview to the New York Times and explained that the hold came and went so quickly that he didn’t even notice any change.

And, remember, the Ukrainians didn’t even mention President Zelensky and his advisors—Yermak and others—have made it abundantly clear. There was another interview just the other day with Danylyuk, who—I might get his title wrong. I think he was the Foreign Minister at the time. There was another interview just the other day that was published. And he explained, again, that they didn’t know the aid had been held up until the POLITICO article on August 28. And then he said there was a panic in Kyiv because they were just trying to figure out what to do. Well, within 2 weeks, it had been released.

And so we have also heard the idea that, well, it was just the fact of making that signal that was the damage. And it gave the Ukrainians a signal, and that was what the damage to the national security was. But the whole point is, leaders of the Government in Ukraine didn’t know. It wasn’t made public. It wasn’t even being given a signal by that, and the Russians weren’t being given a signal by that. So that theory for damage to the national security also doesn’t work.

There was a pause temporarily so that there could be some assessment to address concerns the President had raised. The money was released by the end of the fiscal year. There was no damage to the national security either in terms of materiel not being available to the Ukrainians or in terms of any signal sent to any foreign power.

The money got out the door roughly the same time as in prior years. A little bit more left over at the end that had to be fixed, but there is some left over at the end every year that has to be fixed within the next appropriations bill or continuing resolution. So no damage whatsoever to the national security of the United States.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. “Aloha.” I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator Hirono for the House managers reads as follows:

In contrast to arguments by the President’s counsel, acting White House Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney stated that President Trump held up aid to Ukraine to get his politically-motivated investigations. He claims: “We do that all the time with foreign policy” and “Get over it.” What was different about President Trump’s withholding of aid to Ukraine from prior aid freezes? Are you aware of any other Presidents who have withheld foreign aid as a bribe to extract personal benefits?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Thank you, Senator.

I will respond to the question, but let me begin with something in the category of: You can’t make this stuff up.

Today, while we have been debating whether a President can be impeached for essentially bogus claims of privilege for attempting to use the courts to cover up misconduct, the Justice Department, in resisting House subpoenas, is in court today and was asked: Well, if the Congress can’t come to the court to enforce subpoenas because, as we know, they are in here arguing Congress must come to court to enforce its subpoenas, but they are in the court saying: Congress, thou shall not do that, so the judge says: If the Congress can’t enforce its subpoenas in court, then what remedy is there? And the Justice Department lawyers’ response is impeachment—impeachment. You can’t make this up. I mean, what more evidence do we need of the bad faith of this effort to cover up?

I said the other day they are in this court making this argument; they are down the street making the other argument. I didn’t think they would make it on the same day, but that is exactly what is going on.

Now, in response to the question about how is this aid different, this hold different from other holds, it is certainly appropriate to ask that question.

The laws Congress passed authorizing this appropriation did not allow for the kind of hold this President did. And as the GAO—the Government Accountability Office—found, it violated the law to hold the aid the way it did.

Once the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Department of State, certified that Ukraine had met the anti-corruption benchmarks required under the law, there was nothing that would allow for a hold. The money had to flow.

And that was intentional. Military assistance to Ukraine is critical to our national security. It has overwhelming bipartisan support.

And recall that in the spring of 2019, the Defense Department certified Ukraine had met all of the anti-corruption benchmarks. The Department of State sent the Senate a letter saying that the benchmarks had been met. It issued a press release saying that the aid was moving forward. It began to spend the funds to help Ukraine, but then the President stepped in. Without legal authority, he secretly had placed a hold on the aid.

Now, the President’s counsel, in their presentation, gives specific examples of past holds, as if we cannot distinguish one for a corrupt reason and one that is for policy reason.

In many of their examples, the law explicitly provided the executive branch the authority to pause, reevaluate, or cancel foreign aid programs as the situation in a recipient country evolves.

For example, with regard to foreign assistance to El Salvador, Honduras, or Guatemala, the law explicitly allows
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Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.
The Senator from Virginia.
Mr. Kaine. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.
Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, I appreciate the question.
President Trump must be removed from office because of his ongoing abuse of power. It threatens the integrity of the next election.
As we saw from the video montage, the President has made no bones about the fact that he is willing to seek foreign intervention to help him cheat in the next election.
In the House Managers' opening statement, they said that it is necessary to pursue impeachment because “The President's misconduct cannot be decided at the ballot box. For we cannot be assured that the vote would be fairly won.” How would accounting the President prevent voters from making an informed decision in the 2020 presidential election?
The President's counsel goes first.
Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate.
That is exactly who should decide who should be President, the voters. All power comes from the people in this country. That is why you are here; that is why people are elected in the House; and that is why the President is elected. It is exactly who should decide the question of abuse of power. Those who have the confidence in the American people than that. But I will assure you of this: If you make the decision that a fair trial can be conducted without hearing from witnesses, the American people will not accept that judgment both the impeachment Articles. They went and told the court: They are actually still impeaching over there in the House; did you know that? They are actually still impeaching.
They are coming here, and they are telling you: Please do the work that we didn’t do, where we had 2 days in the House Judiciary Committee; we had to rush delivery for Christmas; and then we waited and waited and waited. But now we see, you want to slow the processes that we never called; that we didn’t subpoena. They want to turn you into an investigative body. In the meantime, they are saying: By the way, we are still doing it over there. We are still impeaching. We want to slow it down now. They don’t want to speed up. They want to slow it down and take up the election year and continue this political charade. It is all so wrong. It is all so wrong.
Let’s leave it to the people of the United States. Let’s trust them. They are asking you not to trust them. Maybe they don’t trust them. Maybe they won’t like the result. We should trust them. That is who should decide who the President of this country should be. It will be a few months from now, and they should decide.
Thank you.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.
Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, I appreciate the question.
President Trump must be removed from office because of his ongoing abuse of power. It threatens the integrity of the next election.
As we saw from the video montage, the President has made no bones about the fact that he is willing to seek foreign intervention to help him cheat in the next election.
In the House Managers' opening statement, they said that it is necessary to pursue impeachment because “The President's misconduct cannot be decided at the ballot box. For we cannot be assured that the vote would be fairly won.” How would accounting the President prevent voters from making an informed decision in the 2020 presidential election?
The President's counsel goes first.
part of every single subpoena served by the House.

A President who issues orders like this is a President who can place himself above the law and a system of checks and balances. He can do whatever he wants and get away with it by using his powers to orchestrate a massive coverup. The President’s lawyers haven’t disputed that point. They can’t. It is obvious that a President who ignores and can ignore all oversight is a threat to the American people.

Instead, they have argued assertion of a grab bag of legal privileges warranting this categorical defiance. These arguments are unprecedented and wrong.

The first thing to note is the President’s arguments conveniently ignore the October 8 letter sent at the President’s behest declaring that the President will not “participate” in the impeachment investigation.

If we assert privilege, this blanket defiance preceded all of the other letters and creative OLC opinions the President relied upon. It made clear that the rationale for blanket defiance was the President’s belief that he can declare privilege and make it illegitimate to investigate him. This was not about privileges or legal arguments. Those came later, as his lawyers rushed to justify that Congress has no power whatsoever to enforce subpoenas against anyone.

Let’s be clear. They may claim that their October 8 letter where they said they will not participate was somehow an offer to accommodate, but what the real condition was, was that the House simply drop the impeachment investigation or place the President in charge of its direction. That wasn’t a real offer. That was a poison pill.

Now, what about the remaining arguments? The first point is that none of them justify his order to defy all the subpoenas. He never asserted executive privilege over any documents, and his remaining arguments that absolute immunity or agency counsel not being allowed to attend depositions have nothing to do with documents—nothing. So none of his legal arguments even applies to his direction that every single office and agency defy every single subpoena for documents.

And what about the total obstruction of the witnesses? He’s said too, he never invoked executive privilege. Absolute immunity obviously couldn’t apply to many of the lower level officials we subpoenaed.

The only remaining legal ground for defiance was the argument it is unconstitutional for Congress to prevent agency counsel from going to depositions—thefallback of fallback of fallbacks—except this rule was originally passed by a Republican Congress and has been used repeatedly by both Republican and Democratic Democrats, Democrats, and committees. It can’t possibly justify obstruction of witness subpoenas. It is nothing more than a phony cover for an obstruction that President Trump decided upon at the outset.

These arguments are, thus, incorrect on their own terms and fail to explain this categorical order.

On final briefing, even before the argument in court today: At a recent oral argument in the DC Circuit, they made the same claim they made today. Let’s pull up slide 56. In litigation, again, to enforce subpoenas, the judge said they can make it grounds for impeachment for obstruction of Congress. And the President’s own lawyers said impeachment is certainly one of the tools that Congress has. We agree; it is one of the tools that you have for when a President would use a categorical obstruction of investigation into his own wrongdoing.

It is a tool that should be applied here. There cannot be a better case for impeachment on obstructing a coequal branch of Congress than the one before you when Mr. President is so complete and so categorical.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. Scott of Florida. Mr. Chief Justice, I am sending the desk on behalf of myself and Senator Braun, and it is to the President’s counsel.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question from Senators Scott of Florida and Braun for counsel for the President.

If Speaker Pelosi, Chairman Schiff, Chairman Nadler, and House Democrats were so confident in the gravity of the President’s conduct and the ‘overwhelming evidence’ of an impeachable offense that prompted the inquiry, why were the House Republicans denied the procedural accommodations and substantive rights afforded to the minority party in the Clinton impeachment? Additionally, why were the President’s counsel and agency attorneys denied access to cross-examine witnesses during the House committees? The testimony of a majority of witnesses in defense of the issues under review?

Mr. Counsel Cipollone. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. Members of the Senate, I don’t know why they would do that. I don’t know. They violated every past precedent. They violated all forms of due process.

Now, they say that is a process argument, and it is, but it is more than that. It is more than that. If you feel confident in your facts, then why do you design a process that completely shuts out the President? Why do you cook up the facts in a basement SCIF instead of in the light of day? Why do you do that?

Why don’t you allow the minority to call witnesses, as they have had the right to do in all past impeachments? And then they come here and say: By the way, we were fully in charge, so completely in charge that we locked out the President’s counsel, denied all rights to obstruct the minority any witnesses at all. But when we come here, they don’t—they still don’t get witnesses. They want you not only to do their job but to make the same mistake, the same violation of due process, that they did. They said: Well, let’s just pick the witnesses that we want. The other ones are irrelevant—not relevant.

I am listening to Mr. Schiff over these months, I have come to a determination about what he means by ‘irrelevant.’ He means bad for them, OK. He means witnesses that the President wants to call. So I don’t know why they did that. I will say something else. I will say something else. I have respect for you, and I have respect for the House. And when I first got this job, I went—one of the first things I did is I went to visit Mr. Schiff, Chairman Schiff. I went to visit Chairman Nadler. I went to visit Chairman Cummings at that time. And I said: We are here to work with you, to cooperate where we can, but in the institutional interest, obviously. We will participate in oversight, but if we have a constitutional point to make, we will make them and we will make them directly.

And the administration has participated in oversight. Many, many witnesses have testified in oversight hearings. A large number of documents have been provided in oversight hearings.

And in fact, in the letter that I sent on October 8, I made the same offer. I said: Look, this is not really a valid argument proceeding, for all of the reasons that we have stated, but if the committees wish to return to the regular order of oversight requests, we stand ready to engage in that process. But that never happened.

So I respect Congress. The administration respects Congress, but we respect the Constitution. We respect the Constitution, too, and we have an obligation to the executive branch and to the future Presidency—future Presidency to vindicate the Constitution and vindicate those rights.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Wyden. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for the House floor managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question from Senator Wyden for the House managers:

The Intelligence Community is prohibited from assisting in an investigation that targets an American citizen when the Intelligence Community is itself prohibited from doing so. In 2017, during [Director] Mike Pompeo’s confirmation hearing as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, he testified that “it is not lawful to outsource that which we cannot do.” So when President Trump asked a foreign country to investigate an American when the U.S. government had not established a legal predicate to do so, how is that not an abuse of power?

Mr. Manager Schiff. It is absolutely an abuse of power. And what is important, if you believe that a President can essentially engage in any corrupt activity as long as he believes that it will assist his reelection campaign and
that campaign is in the public interest, then what is to stop a President from tasking his intelligence agencies to do political investigations? What is to stop him from tasking the Justice Department? If it can come up with some credible claim of an opponent deserves to be investigated, their argument would lead you to the conclusion that he has every right to do that, to use the intelligence agencies or the Justice Department to investigate a rival. And when they become a rival, it is even more justified.

But you are absolutely right. If Secretary Pompeo was correct and you can’t use your own intelligence agencies, you sure shouldn’t be able to use the Russian ones or the Ukrainian ones.

And here we have the President on that phone call pushing out this Russian propaganda, this Russian intelligence service propaganda—CrowdStrike, the server, as if there was just one server and it was whisked away to Ukraine; the Ukrainians hacked the server and not the Russians. Professor Dershowitz’ word for it or Jonathan Turley’s word for it. Let’s look to our Attorney General. This is what he said: ‘Under the Framers’ plan, the determination whether the President is making decisions based on improper motives’—something that Professor Dershowitz says we are not allowing or incredible claim that he is ‘faithfully’ discharging his responsibilities is left to the People, through the election process, and the Congress, through the impeachment process. . . . The fact that [the President is answerable for] any abuses of discretion and is ultimately subject to the judgment of Congress through the impeachment process means that the President is not the judge in his own case.’

The Attorney General doesn’t agree with their theory of the case. But again, we don’t have to rely on Bill Barr’s opinion or Alan Dershowitz’ opinion or my opinion or the consensus of constitutional scholars everywhere; we can rely on our common sense. The conclusion that a President can abuse his power by corruptly entering into a quid pro quo to get a foreign intelligence service or a foreign government or foreign leader to do their political dirty work—that claim is not a theory. It’s a theory that every candidate—the election—our common sense tells us that cannot be compatible with the Office of the Presidency.

If we say it is, if we say it is beyond the reach of the impeachment power, or we engage in this sophistry and we say: Because you put it under the rubric of abuse of power—even though that was the Framers’ core offense—and you didn’t put it under some other rubric, you can consider it—if we are going to engage in that kind of legal sophistry, it leaves the country completely unprotected from a President who would abuse his power in this way. That cannot be what the Framers had in mind.

The Constitution is not a suicide pact. It does not require us to surrender our common sense. Our common sense, as well as our morality, tells us what the President did was wrong, does not have the best interests of the national security interests of the country, it is not only wrong, but it is dangerous. When a President says, as we saw just a moment ago, over and over again, he will continue to do it if left in office, it is dangerous. The Framers provided a remedy, and we urge you to use it.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager. Mr. BRAUN. Mr. Chief Justice.

Mr. Chief Justice. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. I ask to send a question to the desk on my behalf and Senator BARRASSO’s for the President’s counsel.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mr. BRAUN. Can the President and BARRASSO for counsel for the President:

The House Managers have said the country must be saved from this President, and he does a best sacrifice the American people and their families in mind. Do you wish to respond to that claim?

Mr. Counsel HERSCHMANN. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, while the House managers are coming before you and accusing the President of doing wrong solely for personal and political gain and claiming that he is not doing things in the best interests of the American people, the American people are telling you just the opposite.

The President’s approval ratings, while we are sitting here in the middle of these impeachment proceedings, have hit an all time high. A recent poll shows that the American people are the happiest they have been with the direction of the country in 15 years. Whether it is the economy, security, military preparedness, safer streets, or safer neighborhoods, they are all way up. We, the American people, are happier. Yet the House managers tell you that the President needs to be removed because he is an immediate threat to our country.

Listen to the words that they just said: We—we, the American people—cannot decide who should be our President because, as they tell us—and these leaders would not let me be reassured that the vote will be fairly won.” Do you really, really believe that? Do you really think so little of the American people? We don’t. We trust the American people to decide who should be our President. Candidly, it is crazy to think otherwise.

What is really going on? What is really going on is that he is a threat to them, and he is an immediate, legitimate threat to them. And he is an immediate, legitimate threat to their candidates because the election is only 8 months away.

Let’s talk about some of the things the President has done. We have replaced NAFTA with the historic MCA. We have killed a terrorist—al-Baghdadi and Soleimani. We secured $738 billion to rebuild the military. There have been more than 7 million jobs created since the election. Illegal border crossings are down 78 percent since May, and 100 miles of the wall have been built. The unemployment rate is the lowest in 50 years. More Americans—nearly 160 million—are employed than ever before. The African-American unemployment, the Hispanic-American unemployment, the Asian-American unemployment has the lowest rate ever recorded. Women’s unemployment recently hit the lowest rate in more than 65 years. Every U.S. metropolitan area saw per capita growth in 2018. Real wages have gone up by 8 percent for the low-income workers. Real median household income is now the highest level ever recorded. Forty million fewer people live in households receiving government assistance. We signed the biggest package of tax cuts and reforms in history. Since then, over $1 trillion has poured back into the United States. Six hundred and fifty thousand single mothers have been lifted out of poverty. We secured the largest ever increase for childcare funding, helping more than 800,000 low-income families access high-quality, affordable care. We passed, as Manager JEFFRIES will recall, bipartisan criminal justice reform. Prescription drugs have recorded the largest price decrease in over half a century. Drug overdose deaths fell nationwide in 2018 for the first time in nearly 30 years.

The Gallup poll from just 3 days ago says that President Trump’s upbeat view of the Nation’s economy, military strength, economic opportunity, and overall quality of life will likely resonate with Americans when he delivers the State of the Union Address to Congress next week.

One thing that is solely—solely, in their words—for his personal and political gain and not in the best interests of the American people, then I say: God bless him. Keep doing it. Keep doing it. Keep doing it. If the House managers stop opposing him and harassing him and harassing everyone associated with him, with the constant letters and the constant investigations, maybe we can even get more done.

Let’s try something different now. Join us. Join us. One Nation. One Nation. One people. Enough is enough. Stop all of this.
Thank you.
Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chief Justice. The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Colorado.
Mr. BENNET. Thank you. I send a question to the desk from myself and Senator SCHATZ and Senator MENENDEZ.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.
The question from Senators BENNET, MENENDEZ, and SCHATZ is to the House managers:
If the Senate accepts the President’s blanket assertion of privilege in the House impeachment inquiry, what are the consequences for American people? How will the Senate ensure that the current president or a future president will remain transparent and accountable? How will this affect the separation of powers? And, in this context, could you address the President’s counsel’s claim that the President’s advisers are entitled to the same protections as a whistleblower?
Mr. Manager NADLER. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, privileges are limited. We have voted to impeach the President for, among other things—article II of the impeachment is total defiance of House subpoenas. And the President announced it in advance: I will defy all the subpoenas. What does this mean? It means that there is no information to Congress. It means the claim of monarchical, dictatorial power. If Congress has no information, it cannot act. If the President can define—now, he can dispute certain specific claims. You can claim privilege, et cetera. But to defy categorically all subpoenas, to announce in advance you are going to do it, and to do it, is to say that Congress has no power at all, that only the executive has power.
That is why article II is impeaching him: abuse of Congress. That is why, for a much lesser degree of offense, Richard Nixon was impeached for abuse of Congress—for the same defiance of any attempt by the Congress to investigate.
What are the consequences? The consequences, if this is to be—if he is to get away with it, is that any subpoena you vote in the future, any information you want in the future from any future President may be denied you, with no excuses, announced in advance—I will defy all the subpoenas. It eviscerates Congress and establishes the executive department as a total dictatorship. That is the consequence.
I want to also talk about—and the motivation of that dictatorship. I want to also take a point, since I have the floor, to answer a question—
Mr. Chief Justice. The Senator from Colorado.
Mr. Chief Justice. The Senator from Colorado.
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That is why article II is impeaching him: abuse of Congress. That is why, for a much lesser degree of offense, Richard Nixon was impeached for abuse of Congress—for the same defiance of any attempt by the Congress to investigate.
What are the consequences? The consequences, if this is to be—if he is to get away with it, is that any subpoena you vote in the future, any information you want in the future from any future President may be denied you, with no excuses, announced in advance—I will defy all the subpoenas. It eviscerates Congress and establishes the executive department as a total dictatorship. That is the consequence.
I want to also talk about—and the motivation of that dictatorship. I want to also take a point, since I have the floor, to answer a question—
Mr. Chief Justice. The Senator from Colorado.
Mr. Chief Justice. The Senator from Colorado.
the motives, the bias, the reasons that the whistleblower—how this all came about.

All three of those errors affected this process from the very beginning. They resulted in a one-sided, slanted fact-finding that was rushed by a person concerned or engaged in that process. It was a partisan charade intended to justify a predetermined result and to get it done by Christmas, and it is not a record that can be relied on here.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator DUCKWORTH for the House managers:

If the hold on aid to Ukraine was meant to be kept secret until the President could gather internal U.S. government information on Ukraine corruption and European cost sharing, then is there any documentary evidence of this? For example, is there any evidence that the President was briefed on those issues by the NSC, DOD or State Department during the period of the hold in the summer of 2019, or any evidence that he requested specific information on anti-corruption reform measures in Ukraine? Prior to releasing the aid on September 11, 2019, did the President order any changes to Administration policy to address corruption in Ukraine or burden sharing with our European allies?

Mr. Manager CROW. Mr. Chief Justice.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. Manager CROW. Mr. Chief Justice. Thank you, Senator, for that question.

Let’s just take a moment and address what the process should have looked like, because, as we have already established and as President’s counsel has conceded and we have conceded, this does happen. Right? There is a legitimate policy process for review and for determination on hold because there is, indeed, legitimate policy reasons to hold aid. And we have never said that corruption is not one of those or burden-sharing wouldn’t be one of those. What we are saying is that there is no evidence that what we are talking about today—that the President was concerned or engaged in that process.

So what would normally happen is Congress would come together as we did. We passed appropriations bills, and we made the determination that funding was appropriate for the aid, which 87 Members of the Senate did this past year. The President would then rely on the advice of government experts from the National Security Council, the Department of Defense, State Department, and the Office of Management and Budget regarding that aid. That is the interagency process that we have talked so much about—the interagency process that we went through earlier last year. And at the conclusion of that interagency process, it was determined that it had met all the conditions for the aid and all the agencies determined that it should go forward. The President would then seek permission from Congress that he intended—normally, the President would go back and seek permission from Congress—to hold the aid. So let me repeat that. If there were a reason to hold it, the President—and President Trump has done this in the past under legitimate processes, as has President Obama and prior Presidents—would go back to Congress under predescribed processes and make sure that they are not violating the Impoundment Control Act and seek permission to hold it. That did not happen.

Congress would then weigh in on the request by approving or denying the President’s request. Unless Congress specifically approves the President’s request, the aid must be made available. Of course, none of that happened.

In this instance, a hold was put in place. We don’t know exactly when because the President and his agencies have prevented us, and his counsel prevented us, from getting that information. But a hold was put in place. No reason was given. The only one in the United States Government who apparently knows why that hold was put in place is President’s counsel, who tried to tell us last night why he thinks the hold was put in place, but nobody else knows.

So yes, the answer is if there was a legitimate policy process put in place, there will be a lot of information about burden-sharing—about corruption, about any of the other concerns to which we have no evidence.

And if burden-sharing—to the last point of the question—was a concern, then the person who should have been asked to discuss those concerns with the EU and our European partners would have been Ambassador Sondland, because he is the United States Ambassador to the European Union. And not once did President Trump go to Ambassador Sondland to discuss these issues with the EU and the Europeans, saying they need to provide more money. Not once did that happen, and it didn’t happen because it wasn’t the real concern.

All the evidence shows the President withheld taxpayer money, foreign aid to our partner at war to coerce them to start a political investigation to benefit his 2020 election campaign. That is what the evidence shows, and that is why we are still here. And there is one very significant piece of information on that, and that is Ambassador Bolton. And, yes, it is still a good time to subpoena Ambassador Bolton.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators CRAPO, BLUNT, and RUGG.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator COLLINS and the other Senators for both parties:

Are there legitimate circumstances under which a President could request a foreign country to investigate him, including a political rival, who is not under investigation by the U.S. government? If so, what are they and how do they apply to the present case?

The House goes first.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Chief Justice, Senator.

It would be hard for me to contemplate circumstances where that would be appropriate, where it would be appropriate for the President of the United States to seek a political investigation of an opponent.

One of the, I think, most important post-Watergate reforms was to divorce decisions about specific cases, specific prosecutions from those to the Justice Department, to build a wall. One of the many norms that has broken down in this Presidency is that wall has been obliterated, where the President has affirmatively and aggressively sought to investigate his rivals. I cannot conceive of circumstances where that is appropriate.

It may be appropriate for the Justice Department, acting independently and in good faith, to initiate an investigation. There is a process for doing that. We heard testimony about doing that. You can make a request under the mutual legal assistance treaty, MLAT, process when a foreign country has evidence involving a criminal case involving a U.S. person. There is a legitimate way to do that.

That didn’t happen here. In fact, when Bill Barr’s name was first revealed, when that transcript was brought to light, the Justice Department immediately said: We have nothing to do with this—nothing to do with this. Here, this particular domestic political error was being done by the President’s personal lawyer.

I want to just follow up also while I can, Senator, on my colleague’s comment in terms of mixed-motives. If you conclude the President acted with mixed-motives—some corrupt and forbidden, some legitimate—you should vote to commit. That principle is deeply rooted in our legal tradition. It is common sense in civil and criminal law going back centuries.

For example, in describing the standard for corrupt motive for obstruction, the 7th Circuit rejected any requirement that a defendant’s only or main purpose was to obstruct the due administration of justice. The court explained a defendant is guilty if his motives included any corrupt, forbidden goals. That case, United States
v. Cueto, which I cited earlier, is not only relevant here, but that case was argued by Professor Dershowitz and he lost. He made the argument he had made and the President’s lawyer have made today. They lost that case and for a good reason. It is contrary to the history of our legal traditions. If someone, and this is—the Founders were concerned, for example, that a President might be charged with bribing managers of the electoral college.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The President’s counsel.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question.

I would like to start by pointing out that the question sort of assumes that there is a request for an investigation in a foreign country of a United States person.

I would just like to bring it back, though, here, to the transcript of the July 25 call, where President Trump didn’t ask President Zelensky, specifically, for an investigation or investigation into Vice President Biden or his son Hunter. There is a lot of loose talk in sort of shorthand reference to it that way.

What he refers to is the incident in which the prosecutor was fired. The first thing that he says is that the whole exchange is talking about the prosecutor being fired—and he says it sounds horrible to him—and the situation with Burisma. And all the President says is: “So if you can look into it. . . . It sounds horrible.” It sounds like a bad situation.

That is not calling for an investigation, necessarily, into Vice President Biden or his son, but the situation in which the prosecutor was fired was which affected anti-corruption efforts in the Ukraine.

President Zelensky responded by saying the issue of the investigation of the case is actually the issue of making sure to restore the honesty. So we will take a look at that. He is explaining that he understands that it is an issue that has to do with, was an investigation over there, which their prosecutor was handling, deified in a way that affected their anti-corruption efforts, and was it something worth looking into?

It is the President’s making clear that we are not saying that it is off-limits. It sounds bad to the U.S. as well.

Let me get more specifically to the question of, Is there any situation where it might be legitimate to ask for an investigation overseas?

Yes. If there were conduct by a U.S. person overseas that potentially violated the law of that country but didn’t violate the law of this country but there were a national interest in having some information about that and understanding what went on, then it would be perfectly legitimate to suggest this was something worth looking into.

We have an interest in knowing about this, even if it is not something that would mean a criminal investigation here in the United States. So that could arise in various circumstances where a person had done something overseas, but there was a national interest in knowing what they had done. That is the President’s counsel responding to a history of our legal traditions. If someone, and this is—the Founders were concerned, for example, that a President might be charged with bribing managers of the electoral college.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Democratic leader is recognized. Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for President’s counsel and the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The Democratic leader’s question is this:

Yesterday I asked the President’s Counsel about the President’s claim of absolute immunity. Specifically, I asked the President’s lawyers to name a single document or witness that the President turned over to the House impeachment inquiry in response to their request or subpoena. Mr. Philbin spoke for 5 minutes and talked about the various types of immunities and privileges the President’s counsel has, but he did not answer my question. So I ask once again, can you name a single witness or document that the President turned over to the House impeachment inquiry?

It is directed to both parties, and the President’s counsel goes first.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Minority Leader SCHUMER, thank you for that question. I apologize if I was not direct at getting to the nub of the question.

I was intending to explain the rationales that the administration had provided for its actions and to explain, contrary to the question, that there was not simply absolute defiance and not simply a blanket assertion that we won’t do anything. That is the way the House managers have tried to characterize it.

So let me be clear. There were document subpoenas issued prior to the adoption of H. Res. 660. The President’s counsel explained—in various letters that all of those were invalid, and there were no documents produced in response. There were no documents produced in response because all of those subpoenas were invalid. There was no attempt to reissue those subpoenas or to retroactively attempt to authorize them.

There were then subpoenas for witnesses who were senior advisers to the President. The President advised the head of the committees that had issued those that those senior advisers had absolute immunity, and they were not produced for testimony. Those three senior advisers were not produced.

There were then subpoenas for witnesses to others whom the House Democrats insisted would be required to testify without the benefit of agency counsel, and I have explained that principle. The Office of Legal Counsel advised that those subpoenas attempting to require executive branch officials to testify without agency counsel were unconstitutional, and so those witnesses were not produced. Still, there were 17 witnesses who testified, not including the 18th witness, the ICIG, whose testimony is still secret.

There was quite a bit of testimony, and there have been, subsequently, some documents relevant to this, produced under FOIA. I just want to make clear that if you follow the law and you follow the rules and you make a document request that is valid, documents get produced. If you don’t follow the law, the administration resists. That is why the documents were not produced—because the subpoenas were invalid. We made that very clear.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. The quick answer, Senator, is that not a single document was turned over and not a single witness was produced. The witnesses who did come came in defiance of the orders of the President.

Counsel has, obviously, made all of these claims that we think are completely spurious, but what they don’t answer is, what was the motivation to fight all of these subpoenas?

They argue this interpretation which the courts have rejected—the courts have looked at it and that somehow these subpoenas were invalid. But why didn’t they produce the documents? Why did they insist on this “now discredited by the courts” legal theory? Because they were covering up the President’s misdeeds.

I want to return briefly to finish the comments I was making earlier about the Senator’s question earlier on mixed motives.

There is a good reason mixed motives are no defense. Otherwise, officials who commit misconduct could always claim that, even if they did it and even if it were corrupt, they must be acquitted because they were able to invent some phony motivation and insist it played some major role in their scheme.

Imagine how that principle would apply to a President charged with bribing members of the electoral college. Multiple Framers cited this specific threat while discussing impeachment at the Constitutional Convention. Could a President defend himself on the ground that he was motivated, in part, by a noble desire to reward members of the electoral college for their public service? Could he defend it on the ground that he handed over the bribes, he wasn’t just acting corruptly but was also seeking to advance the public interest by keeping himself in power? According to the President’s lawyers, yes, he could.

Indeed, for all of the reasons we provided, there is no doubt that the President’s quid pro quo, the solicitation of foreign interference, and his use of official acts to compel that interference were a fundamentally corrupt scheme, by which I mean the motive and intent was to obtain personal political gain while ignoring and injuring core national interests in our democracy and our security.
We have demonstrated, we believe, that the scheme was entirely corrupt, but if you have any question about that, ask John Bolton. If there is any question about whether the motive was mixed or not mixed, ask John Bolton. He had a role in the testimony. You can ask, also, Mick Mulvaney.

You can subpoena the documents and answer the earlier questions as to what the documents say about when the President withheld the aid and whether there was any interagency discussion of retaining the aid in the errata, I mean, the President's counsel literally made the argument that the circumstance that changed was a change in the errata, but there is no evidence to support that idea.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The manager's time has expired.

The majority leader is recognized.

RECESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m.

There being no objection, at 3:37 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, recessed until 4:03 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the CHIEF JUS-}

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators RISCH, GRAHAM, ERNST, FISCHER, CRUZ, and PERDUE.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator CRAPO and the other Senators for counsel for the President:

How many witnesses have been presented to the Senate at this point in this trial, how many pages of documentary evidence have been put in the record before the Senate in this trial, and how many other clips and transcripts of evidence have been presented to the Senate in this trial?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Jus-}

The CHIEF JUSTICE, Senators, thank you for that question.

I think it is important to recognize that—because the House managers keep talking about the need for witnesses, you can't have a trial without witnesses—you have seen a lot of witnesses. There were 17 witnesses who were deposed and testified—12 in public, 17 who were in closed hearings below.

So far you have seen in these presentations 192 video clips from 13 different witnesses. So testimony was shown here to you. Just as you would in a trial in an ordinary court sometimes play the video of a deposition instead of having the witness take the stand, you have seen video clips from 13 dif-}

The House managers dramatically wheeled into the Senate a record—a record that is already overwhelming. It is already proven.

There is no need to go on to anything else when you have already seen so much and House managers had their chance to prepare their case.

And again, I would also just make the point to bear in mind what is the set—what precedent would be set if this Chamber has to become the investigatory body for impeachments that were not prepared properly in the House.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chief Justice, I submit a question to the desk for the President's counsel on behalf of myself, Senator MANCHIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator COLLINS.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator SINEMA and the other Senators for counsel for the President:

The Logan Act prohibits any U.S. citizen without the authority of the United States from communicating with any foreign government with the intent that government's conduct in relation to any controver-}

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN, Mr. Chief Jus-}

And as a result of this, the House man-}

And, again, I would also just make

And, in fact, it was the testimony that it was the Ukrainians, Andriy Yermak, who asked to be connected to Mr. Giuliani simply because he was someone who could provide informa-}

And Ambassador Volker testified that it was not his understanding, he did not believe, that Mr. Giuliani was carrying out policy directives of the President but, rather, indicating his views of what he thought would be something useful for the Ukrainians to convince the President of their anti- corruption bona fides. So I just wanted to make that point.

It is, of course, the President's policy always to abide by the laws, and I am in no position to make pledges for the President here, but the President's policy is always to abide by the laws, and we continue to do so.
I think it is worth pointing out that many Presidents, starting with President Washington, have relied on persons who are their trusted confidants but who are not actually employees of the government to assist in the conduct of foreign diplomacy.

President Washington relied on Gouverneur Morris to carry messages in certain circumstances, I believe, to the French. FDR had his confidants whom he relied on in certain circumstances to be a go-between with foreign governments. There is a list of others. They were mentioned in some of the testimony during the House proceedings.

So I don’t think that there is anything—again, as I said, it was not here, but there would not be anything improper for a President in some circumstances to rely on a personal confidant to be able to convey messages or receive messages back and forth from a foreign government that would relate to the conduct of foreign affairs. That is not prohibited but within his authority under the Constitution under article II.

"Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. KENNEDY. Your Honor.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Your Honor. On behalf of myself and Senator Ernst, I send a question to the desk for Mr. NADLER and Mr. Philbin.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question from Senator KENNEDY and Senator ERNST to both parties, and the House managers will be first:

If the president asks for an investigation of possible corruption by a political rival under circumstances that objectively are in the national interest, should the president be impeached if a majority of the House believes the president was acting outside the proper reach?

Mr. Manager NADLER. The President, of course, is entitled to conduct foreign policy; he is entitled to look into corruption in the United States or elsewhere; he is entitled to use the Department of State or any other Department in that effort. He is not entitled to target an American citizen specifically, nor did he do so innocently here. It was only after Mr. Biden became an announced candidate for President that he suddenly decided that Ukraine ought to look into the Bidens.

And he made it very clear—he made it very clear—that he wasn’t interested in an investigation; he was interested in an announcement of an investigation just so the Bidens could be smeared.

So it is probably never suitable for a President to order an investigation of an American citizen. If he thinks there is general corruption and there is an investigation ongoing, the Justice Department certainly can ask the foreign government to assist in an investigation. But that wasn’t done here. The President specifically targeted an individual with an obvious political motive, and I would simply say that that is so clear that there is no question that it was a political motive against a specific individual.

There are about 1.8 million companies in Ukraine. The estimates were that about half of them were corrupt. The President chose one—the one with Mr. Biden.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question.

I think the short answer is no; the President should not be impeached. And I think what the focus of the question is getting at is to the situation of mixed motives, which has come up a couple of times here.

If the President, as chief law enforcement officer, head of the executive branch, is in a situation where there is a legitimate investigation being pursued, and he should be pursued, is it possible that he should be impeached for that if there is some dispute about his motives, whether there is a legitimate basis for that conduct?

The answer is no, and the House managers themselves way they framed the case, recognized this.

In the House Judiciary Committee report, they repeatedly say that the standard they are going to have to meet—they are going to have to show that those investigations; these are baseless investigations that they are alleging that the President wanted to initiate; and they had no legitimate—there was not any legitimate basis for pursuing the investigation. I am pretty sure that is page 5 of the House Judiciary report.

They use that standard and they talk about there not being a scintilla of evidence about anything that anyone could reasonably want to ask about reprotected interests because they know they can’t get into a mixed-motive scenario, because if you have a legitimate basis for asking a question about something, if there is a legitimate national interest there, it is totally unacceptable to start getting into the field of saying: Well, we are going to impeach the President and remove him from office by putting him on the psychiatrist’s couch to try to get inside his head and find out was it 48 percent in this motive and 52 in the other motive—some other rationale? No. If it is a legitimate inquiry in the national interest, that is the end of it, and you can’t say that we are going to impeach the President, remove him from office, decapitate the executive branch of the government, disrupt the functioning of the government of the country in an election year by trying to parse out subjective motives and which percentage of the motive was a good motive or some other motive—something like that. If it is a legitimate investigation in the national interest, if that possibility is there, if the national interest is there, that is the end of it. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

I haven’t specified this before, but I think it would be best if Senators directed their questions to one of the parties or both and leave it up to them to figure out who they want to go up to bat, rather than particular counsel.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, now I send a question to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question from Senator DURBIN to the House managers:

Would you please respond to the answer that was given by President’s counsel to Senator SENNA’s question?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators, Mr. Chief Justice, in answer to that question, we heard a rather breathtaking admission by the President’s lawyer, and it was said in an understated way, so you might have missed it. But what the President’s counsel said was that no foreign policy was being conducted by a private party here; that is, Rudy Giuliani was not conducting U.S. foreign policy. Rudy Giuliani was not conducting policy.

That is a remarkable admission because, to the degree that they have attempted to suggest or claim or insinuate that this is a policy difference, that a concern over burden-sharing or some big corruption was a policy issue, they have now acknowledged that the person in charge of this was not conducting policy. That is a startling admission.

So the investigations that Giuliani was charged with trying to get Ukraine to announce into Joe Biden, into this Russia propaganda theory, they have just admitted were not part of policy. They were not policy conducted by Mr. Giuliani.

So what were they? They were, in the words of Dr. Hill, “a domestic political errand,” not to be confused with policy. They have just undermined their entire argument—even as to mixed motives—because they have now acknowledged that the person in charge of it was undergoing a domestic errand.

You heard a suggestion that he was only doing this because he was asked by Andriy Yermak. That is laughable. Giuliani tried to get the meeting with Zelensky, remember? And he couldn’t get in the door, and then he announced that there were enemies among President Zelensky. And then they go into the phone call on July 25, and the Ukrainians try to persuade the President. You don’t have enemies in Ukraine; we are only friends. And what was the President’s response? I want you to “talk to Rudy.” That is not policy being conducted; that is a personal, political errand. They just undermined their entire argument.

Now the President’s counsel also essentially argues, in terms of witnesses, if their case is as strong as Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. NADLER and others say, then why do they need witnesses? You know, you can imagine a scene in any courtroom in America where, before the trial begins, defense counsel for the defendant stands up and says: Your
Mr. Manager SCHIFF. So it is certainly true that when public officials take actions, they may have in mind, when they make a policy judgment, what is the impact on my political career going to be, or, what is the impact going to be on my prospects, but that is a very different question than whether they can engage in a corrupt act to help their election—in this case, to get foreign help to cheat in an election.

You think we can distinguish between the fact that political actors have political interests and what the President’s defense would argue, and that is, if he believes it is in his reelection interest, then no quid pro quo is too corrupt. If we go down that road, there is no limit to what this or any other President can do. There is no limit to what foreign powers will feel they can offer a corrupt President to help their reelection if that is the precedent we intend to establish.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chief Justice, I have a question, which I set to the desk and ask the House managers to respond to it.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question for the House managers from Senator MENENDEZ.

The President was seeking investigations from a foreign power based partly on what Fiona Hill called “a fictional narrative perpetrated and propagated by the Russian security services.” The US Intelligence Community has warned that the Russian government is already preparing to attack our elections in 2020, and the President has publicly he would welcome foreign interference in our elections. Why should Americans be concerned about foreign interference and why does it matter that the President continues to solicit foreign interference in our elections?

Mr. Manager CROW. Mr. Chief Justice and Senator, thank you for the question.

Let’s outline the facts that we do know about today. None of the 17 witnesses who testified as part of the House’s impeachment inquiry were aware of any factual basis to support the allegations that it was Ukraine and not Russia that interfered in the 2016 election. FBI Director Christopher Wray, who was nominated by President Trump and confirmed by this body, stated as recently as this past December that we have no reason to believe that Ukraine interfered in the 2016 election. He said: “We have no information that indicates that Ukraine interfered with the 2016 Presidential election.”

President Trump’s own Homeland Security advisor, Tom Bossert, said about this allegation: “It’s not only a conspiracy theory, it is completely debunked.” He added: “Let me just repeat here again, it has no validity.”

And, of course, Ms. Hill, as the question indicated, the narrative that is being perpetrated and propagated by the Russian security services themselves.”
The U.S. intelligence community has unanimously determined that there is no validity to this—our own intelligence and law enforcement. Special Counsel Mueller found that Russia’s interference was “sweeping and systematic.”

But don’t take our own law enforcement and intelligence community’s word for it; let’s hear what Vladimir Putin himself said recently about this. In November of 2019, Mr. Putin was overheard saying “Thank God someone is accusing us of interfering in the U.S. elections anymore. Now they are accusing Ukraine.”

Let me end with that one because that one demonstrates to me why this matters. That one demonstrates to me why anyone in the United States should matter. Vladimir Putin could care less about delivering healthcare for the people of Russia and building infrastructure in Russia. Vladimir Putin, as many people in this Chamber know well—because I have worked with some of you on this—wakes up every morning and goes to bed every night trying to figure out how to destroy American democracy, and he has organized, reorganized, and institutionalized his government around that effort.

This is a battle over resolve. It is the battle over the hearts and minds of our people. It is the battle over information and disinformation. And if a message from the very top of our government, from the very top of our leaders—if the message from some folks over the last couple of weeks is that facts don’t matter, that our law enforcement doesn’t matter, that our intelligence communities’ unanimous consensus doesn’t matter, that is dangerous. That is what Vladimir Putin and Russia are looking for, and that makes us less safe.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators HAWLEY, CRUZ, CUMMINGS, WATERS, RUBIO, RISCH, SULLIVAN, ERNST, SCOTT of Florida, DAINES, and PISCHE for both the House managers, with response from the counsel for the President.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question from Senator JOHNSON and the other Senators for both parties:

Recent reporting described two NSC staff holders from the Obama Administration attending an “all hands” meeting of NSC staff held about two weeks into the Trump Administration and talking loudly enough to be overheard saying “we need to do everything we can to take out the President.” On July 26, 2019, the House Intelligence Committee hired one of those individuals, Sean Misko. The report further describes relationships between Misko, Lt Col Vindman, and the alleged whistleblower. Why did your committee hire Sean Misko the day after the phone call between President Trump and Zelensky, and what role has he played throughout your committee’s investigation?

The House will begin.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. First of all, there have been a lot of attacks upon my staff, and, as I said when this issue came up earlier, I am appalled at some of the spear of the professional people that work for the Intelligence Committee.

Now, this question refers to allegations in a newspaper article which are circulating smears on my staff and asks me to respond to those smears, and I will not dignify those smears on my staff by giving them any credence. This so-called information that I believe could or could not lead to the identification of the whistleblower.

I want to be very clear about something. Members of this body used to care about the protection of whistleblower identities. They didn’t use to gratuitously attack members of committee staff, but now they do. Now they do. Now they will take an unsubstantiated, repressed article and use it to smear my staff, and I think that is disgraceful. I think it is disgraceful.

You know, whistleblowers are a unique and vital resource for the intelligence community. And why? Because, unlike other whistleblowers who can go public with their information, whistleblowers in the intelligence community cannot because it deals with classified information. They must come to a committee. They must talk to the staff of that committee or to the inspector general. They are supposed to do. Our system relies upon it.

And when you jeopardize a whistleblower by trying to out them this way, then you are threatening not just this whistleblower but the entire system.

Now, the President would like to have nothing better than that, and I am sure the President is applauding this question because he wants his pound of flesh and he wants to punish anyone that has the courage to stand up to him. Well, I can’t tell you who the whistleblower is because I don’t know, but I can tell you who the whistleblower should be. It should be every one of us. Every one of us should be willing to blow the whistle on Presidential misconduct. If it weren’t for this whistleblower, we wouldn’t know about this misconduct, and that might be just as well for this President, but it would not be good for the country.

And I worry that future people that see what I am doing are going to watch what I am doing, be afraid, be afraid of what I am doing, and maybe they are wrong.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, I am not saying that we should disclose the individual’s name. I would be happy to handle that in executive session or any way you want.

But this idea that there is complete anonymity—and I am not saying that the President could disclose the individual’s name, but I am saying that you need to be careful about what you are doing. The President was accusing us of interfering in the U.S. elections, and Russia is accusing us of interfering in the U.S. elections.

In my view, now, that is enough. Now you have an accusation from the President of the United States and now you have an accusation from Russia.

And when you jeopardize a whistleblower by trying to out them this way, then you are jeopardizing not just this whistleblower but the entire system.

Now, the President would like to have nothing better than that, and I am sure the President is applauding this question because he wants his pound of flesh and he wants to punish anyone that has the courage to stand up to him. Well, I can’t tell you who the whistleblower is because I don’t know, but I can tell you who the whistleblower should be. It should be every one of us. Every one of us should be willing to blow the whistle on Presidential misconduct. If it weren’t for this whistleblower, we wouldn’t know about this misconduct, and that might be just as well for this President, but it would not be good for the country.

And I worry that future people that see what I am doing are going to watch what I am doing, be afraid, be afraid of what I am doing, and maybe they are wrong.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Counsel.
A vote against article II is a vote to condemn President Trump’s corrupted view of America’s constitutional balance. Voting against article II would grant President Trump—and every other President from now until forever—the power to simply ignore all congressional subpoenas unless and until we seek a court to enforce it.

Under President Trump’s view, even if all of you Senators were to vote to favor issue a subpoena for documents or witnesses, the administration could still ignore them until a court ruled on it.

I think Mr. SCHIFF addressed some of that earlier in another question. You could go to court to enforce it. Then, it would get appealed, then, go back to court. We could go on and on because, quite frankly, that is what their position is.

So, again, as Mr. SCHIFF said earlier, imagine yourselves having jurisdiction over an item that you care deeply about, but you need the needed information. You heard of some wrongdoing. You heard there was a whistleblower complaint on something, and you decided that you wanted to do a hearing. It is very possible that the President would just refuse your subpoena, because, if we ignore article II, that would be the precedent—to ignore all subpoenas. But we need you to issue a subpoena for us today not only to get Mr. Bolton here but Mr. Dufey, Mr. Mulvaney, and Mr. Toner, who have relevant evidence on this case.

Now, when the administration exerts executive privilege, there might be some privilege, one, that is available to them on any of these documents, but those have to be asserted with every document as we send a subpoena.

So don’t buy the White House argument that our subpoenas are invalid because we don’t have any authority to issue them. We know we do. You know we do. The President’s counsel make sure that this body will make sure that no future President will just simply defy, disrespect, and ignore subpoenas because some day you may be in our shoes wanting to get information, wanting to get to the bottom line to ensure that no President is above the law.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. Ms. Manager.

Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. Chief Justice.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators RISCH, BLUNT, KENNY, JOHNSON, and CAPITO for the President’s counsel.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator SULLIVAN and the other Senators for counsel for the President:

Given that the Senate is now considering the very evidentiary record assembled and voted on by the House, which Chairman NADLER has repeatedly claimed constitutes overwhelming evidence for impeachment, how can the Senate be accused of engaging in, what Mr. NADLER described as a “coverup,” if the Senate makes its decision based on the exact same evidentiary record the House did?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN, Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question.

I think that is exactly right. I think it is rather preposterous to suggest that this Senate would be engaging in a coverup to rely on the same record that the House managers have said is overwhelming.

They have said it dozens of times. They have said that, in their view, they have had enough evidence presented before them to prove their case beyond any doubt, not just beyond a reasonable doubt. And it is totally incoherent to claim at the same time that it would be improper for the Senate to rely on that record.

Your judgment should be, we submit, different from the House managers’ assessment of that evidence because it hasn’t established their case at all. But if they are willing to tell you that it is complete and it has everything they need to establish everything they want—I think you should be able to take them at their word that that is all that is there.

And to switch now to say, “Well, no, we need more; we need more witnesses,” I think just demonstrates that they haven’t proved their case. They don’t have the evidence to make their case.

As I went through a minute ago, they have already presented a record with over 28,000 pages of documents that is here. They have already presented video clips of 13 witnesses. You have heard all of the key evidence that they gathered. It was their process. They were the ones who said what the process was going to be, how it had to be run, who ought to testify, when to close it, when to decide they had all the information. It is either Russia or Ukraine; if you ignore it, you hear all the key highlights from that, and that is sufficient for this body to make a decision. In the time I have remaining, I just want to turn to one point in response to something that was said a couple of minutes ago. We keep hearing repeatedly today the refrain of the idea that President Trump was somehow trying to peddle Vladimir Putin’s conspiracy theory that it was Ukraine and not Russia that interfered in the 2016 election. And the Democrats tried to present this binary view of the world that only one country, and one country alone, could have done something to interfere in the election, and it was Russia. And if you mention any other country doing something related to election interference, you are just a pawn of Vladimir Putin, trying to peddle his conspiracy theories.

That is obviously not true. More than one country and foreign nationals from more than one country could be doing different things so that Russia is not the only country interference. If you mention any other country doing something related to election interference, you are just a pawn of Vladimir Putin, trying to peddle his conspiracy theories.

And what is that referring to, surrounding yourself with the same people? President Zelensky refers immediately to changing out the Ambassador because the previous Ambassador, who had been there under Poroshenko, had written an op-ed criticizing President Trump during the election.

And we know that there was a POLITICO article in January 2017 cataloging multiple Ukrainian officials who did things either to criticize President Trump or to assist a DNC operative, Alexandra Chalupa, in gathering information against the Trump campaign.

And they said: There was no evidence in the record; no one said that there was anything done by Ukraine.

That is not true. One of their star witnesses, Fiona Hill, specifically testified in her public hearing, because she went back and because she hadn’t recalled the POLITICO article. And then she said that she acknowledged that some Ukrainian officials “bet on Hillary Clinton winning the election.” And so it was quite evident, in her words, that they were trying to favor the Clinton campaign, including trying to collect information on people working in the Trump campaign. That was Fiona Hill. She acknowledged the Ukrainian officials were doing that.

So this idea that it is a binary world—it is either Russia or Ukraine; if you mention Ukraine, you are just doing Vladimir Putin’s bidding—is totally false, and you shouldn’t be fooled by that.

Ukrainians—various Ukrainians—were doing things to interfere in the election campaign, and that is what President Trump was referring to.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask to send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator BLUMENTHAL to the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Senator.

The question for the House managers from Senator LEAHY and Senator BLUMENTHAL:

The President’s counsel claimed, “If a president does something which he believes will help him get elected, he has an peculiar interest that cannot be the kind of quid pro quo that results in impeachment.” He added a
hypothetical, “I think I’m the greatest president there ever was and if I’m not elected, the national interest will suffer greatly.” That cannot be an impeachable offense. Under no circumstances can it be an impeachable offense. You cannot remove a president from holding foreign security assistance, in violation of the Impoundment Control Act, on the recipient’s willingness to do the president’s political favor. If the Senate fails to reject this theory, what would stop a president from withholding disaster aid funding from a U.S. city until that mayor endorses him? What would stop the president from withholding nearly any part of the $4.7 trillion annual federal budget subject to his personal political benefit?

Mr. Manager JEFFRIES. Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished Members of the Senate, I thank the Senators for that very important question.

Certainly, what we have alleged in this case is that the President solicited a personal political benefit in exchange for an official act, solicited dirt on a political opponent in exchange for the release of $391 million in military aid, and solicited dirt in exchange for a White House meeting. And if this Senate were to say that is acceptable, then precisely as was outlined in that question could take place all across America in the context of the next election and any election—grants allocated to cities or towns or municipalities across the country, where the President could say: You are not going to get that money, Mr. Mayor, Mrs. County Executive, Mrs. Town Supervisor, unless you endorse me for reelection. The President could say that to any Governor of our 50 States.

That is unacceptable. That cannot be allowed to happen in our democratic Republic.

Now, by my count, as of this afternoon, the Framers of the Constitution and the Founders of our great Republic had been quoted either directly or mentioned by name 123 times: Alexander Hamilton, 48 times; James Madison, 35 times; George Washington, 24 times; John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin, pulling up the rear, 4 times.

It seems to me that Ben Franklin and Thomas Jefferson need a little bit more love, and so let me try to do my part.

Thomas Jefferson once observed that “tyranny is defined as that which is legal for the government but illegal for the citizenry.” “Legal for the government but illegal for the citizenry”—that is the question.

President Trump corruptly abused his power. He targeted an American citizen, pressured a foreign government to try to cheat in the upcoming election, and the President’s counsel would have you believe that is OK because he is the President of the United States.

But our fellow citizens cannot cheat the Workers’ Compensation Board by claiming a false injury and escape accountability. Our fellow citizens cannot not trade on stock market by leveraging insider trading and then escape accountability. Our fellow citizens cannot cheat the college admissions process in order to get their child into an elite university and then escape accountability.

Why should the President of the United States be allowed to cheat in the upcoming election and escape accountability? Tyranny is defined as that which is legal for the government and illegal for the citizenry.

The President’s counsel has suggested that President Trump can do anything—and he wants—to cheat and escape accountability. President Trump can solicit foreign interference in the upcoming election and escape accountability. He can cheat and escape accountability. He can engage in a coverup and escape accountability. He can corruptly abuse his power, escape accountability; elevate his personal political interest, subordinate America’s national security interest, and escape accountability.

That is the Fifth Avenue standard of Presidential accountability: I can do anything I want. I can shoot someone on Fifth Avenue, and it doesn’t matter. No. Lawlessness matters. Abuse of power matters. Corruption matters. The Constitution matters.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of the Senate. The Speaker of the House managers and the White House counsel. And although I cannot pick, ideally, it would be Manager LOFGREN.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question from Senators Cassidy and Risch for both parties is as follows:

In the Clinton proceedings, we saw a video of Manager LOFGREN saying, “This is unfair to the American people. By these actions you would undo the free election that expressed the will of the American people in 1996. In so doing, you will damage the faith the American people have in this institution and in the American people.” You will set the dangerous precedent that the certainty of Presidential terms, which has so benefited our wonderful America, will be replaced by the partisan politics of impeachment. Future Presidents will face election, then litigation, then impeachment. The power of the President will diminish in the face of the Congress, a phenomena much feared by the Founding Fathers.”

What is different now? If the response is that the country cannot risk the President interfering in the next election, isn’t impeachment the ultimate interference? How does this not cheat those who did and/or would vote for President Trump from their participation in this process? I ask Manager LOFGREN to address the question directly and to not avoid, as Manager JEFFRIES did with a related question last night.

The President’s counsel answers first.

Mr. Counsel CIOPOLLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate.

Well, as I have said before, I agree 100 percent with Manager LOFGREN’s comments from the past, and I think they should guide the Senate. There is really no better way to say it.

What they are doing here—they keep falsely accusing the President of wanting to cheat, when they are coming here and telling you “take him off the ballot” in a political impeachment. Talk about cheating. You don’t even want to face him.

And let me say one more thing while I am up here. I listened to Manager SCHIFF come up here and say he wouldn’t even dignify a legitimate question about his staff with a response because he wouldn’t stand here and listen to people on his staff be besmirched—who will join his staff.

Since the beginning of this Congress, Manager SCHIFF, the other House managers, and others in the House have falsely accused the President—and they have come here and done it—the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Chief of Staff, lawyers on my staff—false accusations, calumny after calumny, in dulcet tones. And that is wrong.

When you turn that around and say he will not respond to a legitimate question that I ask—it is a legitimate question: Who communicated with the whistleblower? Why were you demanding something that you already knew about?

I asked him, in another part of my October 8 letter that doesn’t get a lot of attention from Mr. SCHIFF—I said: You have the full ability to release these documents on your own. No response.

So I think—I think you deserve an answer to that question, and I think it is time in this country that we start that we stop assuming that everybody has horrible motives, in the puritanical rage of just everybody is doing something wrong except for you—you cannot be questioned. That is part of the problem here.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Manager LOFGREN. Mr. Chief Justice and Senators, I was a member of the House Judiciary Committee during the Clinton impeachment, and I was a member of the staff of a member of the Judiciary Committee during the Nixon impeachment. And during the Clinton impeachment, I found myself comparing what we were doing in Clinton to what we were doing or had done with Nixon, and here is what I saw and I share today: a special prosecutor started with Whitewater, spent several years, until they found DNA on a blue dress. And they had a lie. The President lied about a sexual affair under oath, and that was wrong. It was a crime, but it was not a misuse of Presidential power.

Any husband caught would have lied about it. It was wrong, but it was not a misuse of Presidential power. And so, throughout the Clinton matters, I kept raising the issue that it was a misuse— and it turned out to be a partisan misuse—of impeachment to equate a lie about a sexual affair to a high crime and misdemeanor.
Mr. MARKS said they rubbed out the word "high" and made it "any crime and misdemeanors." That was what was wrong in the Clinton impeachment, compared to the Nixon impeachment where Richard Nixon engaged in a broad scope, upending the constitutional order, corrupting the government for his own personal benefit in the election.

I would add, unfortunately, that I never thought I would be in a third impeachment. Unfortunately, that is what we see in this case with President Trump.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Ms. Manager.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator GILLIBRAND, and Senator SCHATZ to the President’s counsel and the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators MANCHIN, GILLIBRAND, and SCHATZ for both parties:

Have you ever been involved in any trial—civil, criminal, or other—in which you were unable to call witnesses or submit relevant evidence?

I believe the House is first.

Ms. Manager DEMINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and thank you to the Senator for the question.

I want us to imagine for just a moment someone broke into your house; stole your property; police caught them; they returned the property. Now, the fact that they returned the property changes nothing. They would still be held accountable.

But imagine if they had the power to obstruct every witness, prevent witnesses from appearing. Imagine if they had the power to destroy or obstruct any evidence in the case against them from being presented to the court.

I have had the opportunity to appear in a lot of depositions and be a part of building a lot of cases. We all know, I know everybody here knows that witnesses testimony and evidence or documentation in a case is everything. It is the life and breath of any case. It is the prosecutor’s dream or the police officer’s or detective’s dream to have information and evidence.

It truly baffles me, really, as a 27-year law enforcement officer, that we would not accept or welcome or be delighted by the opportunity to hear from direct witnesses, people who have firsthand knowledge.

We know that the President cannot be charged with a crime. We know that. The Department of Justice has already ruled on that. But the remedy for that is impeachment. That is the tool that, as we know, has solely been given—that power, solely—to the House of Representatives, solely tried before the Senate.

So, to answer your question, it is extremely—I let me say it this way: Only in a case where there are no available witnesses or no available evidence have I ever seen that occur.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mrs. Manager.

Counsel.

Mr. Counsel CIOPOLLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate.

I would respond to that question in this way. Thank you for the question. The House managers controlled the process in the House. I think we can all agree to that. They were in charge, and they ran it. And they chose not to allow the President’s counsel to have any witnesses. And they chose not to call the witnesses that they are now asking you to call, demanding you to call, accusing you of a coverup if you don’t call.

I have never been in any proceeding, trial or otherwise, where you show up on the first day, and the judge says: Let’s go. And you say: Well, I’m not ready yet. Let’s stop everything. Let’s take a bunch of depositions.

Well, did you subpoena the witnesses you are now seeking?

Well, some but not others. Well, when you did subpoena them, did you try to enforce that subpoena in court?

No.

The other witnesses that you did subpoena, did they go to court?

Yes.

What did you do? I withdrew the subpoena and mooted out the case. And now I want them. I want them. Otherwise, you are doing the coverup.

Let me make another point because they keep making this point: What will we do? The President is not producing documents.

I would like to refresh your recollection about the Mueller investigation, OK. The Mueller investigation had 2,800 subpoenas, 500 search warrants, 500 witnesses. The President’s Counsel, the Chief of Staff, and many, many others from the administration testified. Documents—voluminous documents—were produced. And what happened? Bob Mueller came back with a conclusion. He announced it. There was no collusion.

What did the House do? They didn’t like it. Didn’t like the outcome. So what did they do? They wanted a do-over. They wanted to do it all again themselves, despite the $34 million or more that was spent.

So I don’t think anybody really believes that the Trump administration hasn’t fully cooperated with the investigations. The problem is, when they don’t like the outcome, they just keep investigating. They keep wasting the public’s money because they don’t really care about truth; they care about a political outcome.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators HAWLEY, ERNST, and BRAUN.

Mr. Counsel HERSCHMANN. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate. Under the standard under the House managers, would President Obama have been subject to impeachment charges based on his handling of the Benghazi attack, the Bergdahl swap, or DACA? Would President Bush have been subject to impeachment charges based on his handling of NSA surveillance, detention of combatants, or use of waterboarding?

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question for counsel for the President from Senator LEE and other Senators:

Under the standard embraced by the House managers, would President Obama have been subject to impeachment charges based on his handling of the Benghazi attack, the Bergdahl swap, or DACA? Would President Bush have been subject to impeachment charges based on his handling of NSA surveillance, detention of combatants, or use of waterboarding?

Mr. Counsel HERSCHMANN. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate. Under the standard, which is no standard that they bring their impeachment to the Senate, any President would be subject to impeachment for anything. Presidents would be subject to impeachment for exercising longstanding constitutional rights, even when the House chose not to enforce their subpoenas under their vague theory of abuse of power.

I guess any President—as Professor Dershowitz, he had a long list of Presidents who might have been subject to impeachment. So I am not going to go through the particular incidents because I don’t want to besmirch past Presidents.

I don’t think the standard that they announced is helpful. I think it is very dangerous. I mean, you might want to get a lock on that door because they are going to be back a lot if that is the standard.

The truth of the matter is, you don’t have to look at anything. They are talking about witnesses. You don’t have to look at anything, except the Articles of Impeachment.

I tried to seek areas of agreement. I think we all agree that they don’t allege a crime. That is why they spend all their time saying you don’t need one. I remember one of the clips I showed where someone was saying, "Well, the President had a lot of passion. They are trying to cross out "high crime" and make it "any crime." Now they are trying to cross out "crime," any crime. No crime is necessary.

That is not what impeachment is about. This is dangerous. And it is more dangerous because it is an election year. So, yes, under the standardless impeachment, any President can be impeached for anything. And that is wrong. By the way, they should be held to their Articles of Impeachment. A lot of what they are trying to sell here, their own House colleagues weren’t buying. They didn’t make it into the Articles of Impeachment.

Read the Articles of Impeachment. They don’t allege a crime. They don’t allege a violation of law. You don’t need anything else, except their Articles of Impeachment, your Constitution, and your common sense, and you can end this. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator CORTEZ MASTO, and Senator ROSEN.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question for the House managers from Senators STABENOW, CORTEZ MASTO, and ROSEN to both parties:

In June 2019, Ellen Weintraub, then-chair of the Federal Election Commission, wrote in a statement that "It is illegal for any person to solicit, accept, or receive anything of value from a foreign national in connection with a U.S. election. This is not a novel concept. Electoral intervention from foreign governments has been considered unaccept-
able since the beginnings of our nation." In a 2007 advisory opinion, the FEC found that campaign contributions from foreign nationals are prohibited in federal elections, even if "the value of these materials may be nomi-
nal or difficult to ascertain." How valuable would a public announcement of an investiga-
tion into the Bidens be for President Trump's reelection campaign?

Begin with the White House Counsel. Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice and Senators, thank you for the question.

The idea that these investigations were a thing of value—something that was specifically examined by the Department of Justice—as I explained the other day, the inspector general for the intelligence community wrote a cover letter on the whistleblower complaint, in which he had actually exaggerated in the complaint—the idea that there was a demand for some assistance with the President's reelection campaign. That was forwarded to the Department of Justice, and then they announced back in September that there was no election law violation because it did not qualify as a thing of value. I think that that issue has been thoroughly examined by the Depart-
ment of Justice here.

I just want to clarify one thing. The other day there was—yesterday there was a question about information coming from overseas, and I was asked a question about that. And I want to be very clear: that I understood the question to be about was there a viola-
tion of a campaign finance law, would there be one if someone simply got infor-
mation from overseas? And the an-
swer is no, as a matter of law.

Think about this. If pure informa-
tion—if information that came to someone in a campaign could be called a thing of value, if it comes from overseas, a thing of value is a prohibited campaign contribution; it is not al-
lowed from within the country, it has to be reported.

So that would mean that anytime a campaign got information from within the country about an opponent or about something else that maybe would be useful in the campaign, they would have to report the receipt of in-
formation as a thing of value under the campaign finance laws.

That is not how the laws work, and there would be tremendous First Amendment implications if someone attempted to enforce the laws that way. So that is simply the point that I wanted to make.

Pure information that is credible infor-
mation is not something that is pro-
hibited from being received under the campaign finance laws.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Chief Jus-
tice, The CHIEF JUSTICE. Yes, Mr. Man-
ger.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. How valuable would it be for the President to get information from oversea-
s? And the answer is immensely valuable. And if it wasn't going to be immensely valuable, why would the President go to such lengths to make it happen? Why would he be willing to violate the law, the Impoundment Con-

Act; why would he be willing to igno-

re the advice of all of his national se-
curity professionals; why would he be will-
ing to withhold hundreds of mil-

lions of dollars from an ally at war if he didn't think it was going to really benefit his campaign? You have only to look at the President's actions to de-
terminate just how valuable he believed it was to him.

Now, how would he make use of this? Well, if we look in the past, we get a person who is not interested in Donald Trump would have made use of this po-

itical help from Ukraine.

Let's look at 2016, when the Russians hacked the DCCC and the DNC, and they started dripping out these docu-
ments through WikiLeaks and other Russian platforms.

What did the President do? Did he make use of it? Did he condemn it? Oh, he made beautiful use of it. Over 100 times in the last 3 months of the cam-
paign, the President brought up time after time after time, rally after rally after rally, the Clinton Russian stolen documents.

We have had a debate since then. What was the impact of the Russian in-

terference in the election that close, was it decisive? No one will ever know. Was it valuable? You only have to look at Donald Trump's actions to know just how valuable he thought it was. He thought it was immensely val-

uable.

And you can darn well expect that if he had gotten this help from Ukraine, he would be out there every day talk-

ing about how Ukraine was inves-
tigating Joe Biden, and Ukraine is con-

cerned about Joe Biden's campaign. Did it help the President do it all over again?

One of the things I found so signifi-
cant was the day after Bob Mueller re-
hached his conclusion that this Presi-
dent was back on the phone asking yet another country to help cheat in an-
other election. You are darn right that would have been valuable.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chief Justice, The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators CRUZ and CORNYN, for both parties.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators GRAHAM, CORNYN, and CRUZ is for both parties:

When DOJ Inspector General Horowitz tes-
tified before the Judiciary Committee, he said their DOJ had a "low threshold" to in-
vestigate the Trump campaign. At the hear-
ing, Sen. FINNSNĐ said, "your report con-
cluded that the FBI had an adequate predi-
cate, reason, to open the investigation on the Trump campaign. Could you define the predicate?" Horowitz replied, "yeah, so the predicate here was the infor-
mation that the FBI got at the end of July have to ignore the evidence that had come to their attention that the cam-
paign for the President was having il-
licit contacts, potentially; that it may be colluding or conspiring with a for-

gn power. Indeed, it would have been de-

sirable for them to ignore it.

But the argument—the implicit argu-
ment here is, because there were prob-

lems, albeit serious problems, on the FISA Court application involving a sin-
gle person, that somehow that justifies the President's embrace of the Russian propaganda; that somehow that justifies the Presi-
dent's distrust of the entire intel-
ligence community; that somehow that justifies his ignoring what his own Di-

rector of the FBI said, which his law-

yers ignore today, which is there is no evidence that Ukraine interfered in the 2016 election. Because of a single FISA application against a single person and the flaws in it, you should ignore the ev-

dence of the President's wrongdoing.

Turn away from that. Let's not look at the flaws in how the FBI conducted a FISA application. The one does not foreclose the other.

The reality is that what you must judge here is: Did the President com-
mit the conduct he is charged with?
Did the President withhold military aid and a coveted meeting to secure foreign interference in the election? And if he did, as we believe we have shown, does that warrant his removal from office? That is the issue before you, whether the FBI made one mistake or a series of mistakes with the FISA application.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, let me actually answer the question.

The inspector general said, in a response to Senator Graham, when James Comey said he was vindicated by the inspector general’s report, the inspector general said: No one who touched this was vindicated.

With regard to the FISA—you make so light, Manager Schiff, of what the FBI did. It wasn’t a FISA warrant.

There was an order unsealed just days ago saying the process was so tainted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—so tainted—that not only was the NSD misled, but so was the FISA Court.

For those that don’t know that are watching, the FISA Court—you can’t blame the court on this, by the way. You have to blame the Federal Bureau of Investigations for allowing this to happen. That is the court that issues warrants on people that are alleged to be spies. There are no lawyers in those proceedings. There is no cross-examination. The court itself in its order said: We rely on the good faith of the officers of the affidavit.

Are there two standards for investigations? That is an understatement. But to belittle what took place in the FISA proceedings—frankly, Manager Schiff, you know better than that.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators Risch, Young, Fischer, Blunt, and Capito.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. The question from Senator Barrasso and the other Senators is for the counsel to the President:

Is it within a U.S. President’s authority to potentially address the issue of corruption with a head of a foreign government when he believes the established U.S. process has been unsuccessful in the past?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question.

The short answer is yes. The President can, under article II, vested with the entirety of the executive power, and it has been made clear since the founding, since the early part of the 1800s, in decisions by the Supreme Court, that the President is the sole officer of the Nation for foreign affairs. He is vested with the authority to speak on behalf of the Nation. As the Supreme Court has described it, he is to be the sole voice of the Nation in foreign affairs. And that is why that authority was assigned in the Constitution to the Executive.

Alexander Hamilton explained in the Federalist Papers that the Executive is characterized by unity and dispatch, the ability to have one view, to act quickly, and also the ability to maintain secrecy, and therefore it is the Executive that is uniquely suited and uniquely has the ability to carry out the responsibilities of engaging with foreign nations and carrying out diplomacy.

So when the President believes that there is an issue of interest to the United States, including corruption in another country, there hasn’t been the sort of progress that he would want to see in dealing with that issue in the foreign country—perhaps interactions
with prior administrations, prior officials of prior administrations that don’t look great from an anti-corruption perspective—it is entirely within the President’s prerogative and his province to raise those issues with a foreign leader, to point out where he believes things have to be something done in the interest of the United States. If there is an issue related to corruption or whether it is something else—an issue related to economic matters, trade matters, antitrust matters, cross-border trade—those are all things the President can raise with a foreign leader.

Corruption is not taken off the table. And it is also not taken off the table if it is an issue that happens to involve an official from a prior administration, whether that official is not or may have recently decided to run for another office. If it relates to the national interest of the United States, he has legitimate reason for raising it, and it is within his authority as the Chief Executive.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator WARREN is for the House managers:

At a time when large majorities of Americans have lost faith in government, does the fact that the Court is presiding over an impeachment trial in which Republican senators have thus far refused to allow witnesses or evidence contribute to the loss of legitimacy of the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court, and the Constitution?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senator, I would not say it contributes to a loss of confidence in the Chief Justice. I think the Chief Justice has presided admirably.

But I will say this: I was having a conversation the other day on the House floor with one of my colleagues, Tom MALINOWSKI, from Jersey—a brilliant colleague—and I was harkening back to what I thought was a key exchange during the course of this saga.

This is when Ambassador Volker, in September, is talking with Andriy Yermak. Volker is making the case that the new President of Ukraine should not do a political investigation and prosecution of the former President of Ukraine, Poroshenko. He is making the case we often make when we travel around the country and meet with other Parliamentarians about not engaging in political investigations. And when he makes that remark, Yermak throws it right back in his face and says: Oh, you mean like the investigation you want us to do with the Clintons and the Bidens?

I was lamenting this to my colleague. What is our answer to that? What is the answer to that from a country that prides itself on adherence to the rule of law? How do we answer that? And his response, I thought, was very interesting. He said: This proceeding is our answer. This proceeding is our answer.

Yes, we are a more than fallible democracy and we don’t always live up to our ideals, but when we have a President who demonstrates corruption of his office, who sacrifices the national interest for his personal interests, unlike other countries, there is a remedy. So, yes, we don’t always live up to our ideals, but this trial is part of our constitutional heritage, that we were given the power to impeach the President.

I don’t think a trial without witnesses reflects adversely on the Chief Justice. I do think it reflects adversely on us. I do think it diminishes the power of this example to the rest of the world if we cannot have a fair trial in the face of this kind of Presidential misconduct. This is the remedy. This is the remedy for Presidential abuse. But it does not reflect well on any of us if we are afraid of what the evidence holds.

This will be the first trial in America where the defendant says at the beginning of the trial: If the prosecution case is so good, why don’t they prove it without any witnesses? That is not a model we can hold up in pride to the rest of the world.

Yes, Senator, I think that will feed cynicism about this institution, that we may disagree on the President’s conduct or not, but we can’t even get a fair trial. We can’t even get a fair shake. Oh my God, we can’t hear what John Bolton has to say.

God forbid we should hear what a relevant witness has to say. Hear no evil.

That cannot reflect well on any of us. It is certainly no cause for celebration of the trial perspective—it is entirely within his authority as the President can raise with a foreign leader.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Chief Justice, I find that the McDonnell case made clear, there may be aeryl arising a method for someone—simply setting up a meeting with other government officials—couldn’t be treated as a thing of value in an exchange under the bribery statute. It pointed out, particularly in terms of government officials who all the time are asked by their constituents to introduce them to someone else in the government, to arrange a meeting, that that is not an official act. It is not an official policy decision, an action that is determining some government policy. It is simply arranging someone to have a meeting and then talk about something. If that is the nature of the meeting, that can’t be the thing of value that is being exchanged and can’t support a charge of bribery.

They can’t raise it because it is not in the Articles of Impeachment. If they wanted to charge them they had to charge it in the Articles of Impeachment. They can’t come here now and try to try a different case from the one they framed in the charging document that they had complete control over drafting. Every time they can’t make out the claim with respect to the White House meeting because the McDonnell case prohibits that.

I would like to make one other point because the House managers today have brought up a lot. There have been a lot of questions again and again about the subpoenas. These were their subpoenas actually valid and how it is going to destroy oversight if the President’s arguments are accepted. I just want to point something out.

The subpoenas that were issued—that were purported to have been issued—were not under oversight authority but pursuant to—every letter that came out said: pursuant to the House’s impeachment inquiry. They purported to be exercising the authority of impeachment, and that makes a difference.

One of the House managers mentioned that the legislative oversight—
the authority to acquire the information for legislative purposes—has to actually relate to something that legislation could be passed on. There are certain constraints on what information can be sought. It is slightly different if you are going under the impeachment power which can then you can investigate into specific past facts more readily because that is relevant to an impeachment inquiry that might not be for legislative purposes. They purported to be using the impeachment authority. They said that authority because the Speaker’s press conference did not validly give them that authorization. We pointed out that the subpoenas were invalid. They did nothing to try to cure that deficiency. They didn’t reissue the subpoenas. They didn’t have the votes to reissue them or anything.

To say now that all oversight will be destroyed forever if you accept the President’s arguments is totally false. It is misleading because they were not purporting to do just regular oversight. As we pointed out several times in the October 8 letter that the White House Counsel sent to Chairman Schiff and others, it said, specifically, if you want to return to regular oversight, we are happy to do that. As we have in the past, subject to constitutional constraints, we will participate in the accommodation process. It was the House Democrats who didn’t want to take that route. They insist on using the impeachment authority. We pointed out that they didn’t have it, and they didn’t seek to cure that problem.

Accepting the President’s position here has nothing to do with destroying oversight by Congress for all time and all circumstances. It has to do with the mistake that they made in trying to assert a particular authority that they didn’t have in this case.

Thank you.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.
The Senator from Virginia.
Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chief Justice, on behalf of myself, Senator BENNET, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and Senator HINCH. I have a question to send to the desk for the House managers.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.
The question from Senators WARNER, BENNET, BLUMENTHAL, and HINCH is for the House managers:

Our intelligence community and law enforcement leadership unanimously concluded Russia interfered in the 2016 election and that Russia continues those efforts toward the 2020 election. The Mueller report and the Senate Intelligence Committee reached the same conclusion. Yesterday the President’s counsel said that foreign election interference could be legal if it’s related to “credible” information. Does this mean it is proper for the President to accept or encourage Russia, China, or other foreign countries to produce damaging intelligence or information that implicates political opponents as long as he deems it to be from “credible information”?

This is for the House managers.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators and the Mr. Chief Justice, that is the natural conclusion of what the President’s lawyers are arguing.

Essentially, if the President believes that it would serve his reelection interest to seek the help of a foreign intelligence service to provide dirt on his opponent or in other ways assist his campaign, as long as he thinks his winning is in the national interest, then that is OK.

It is not OK, but no restraint can be placed upon him. Even if he were to go so far as to proclaim a quid pro quo—hey, Russia, you have got among the best intelligence services on the planet. If you will engage those intelligence services on my behalf, I will refuse to enforce sanctions on you over your invasion of Ukraine. That may injure the security of our country, but, look, I think my reelection is more important—that is where the basis argument of the Constitution leads us—to the idea that no abuse of power is within reach of the Congress.

Now I want to take this opportunity to respond to a couple of other quick points if I can.

First, counsel neglects the fact that, when we issued those subpoenas, we stated in the letters accompanying their issuances that they were being issued consistent with both the impeachment inquiry and our oversight authority. They neglected to tell you the latter part—that we explicitly made reference to our oversight capacity as legislators.

Finally, on the issue of bribery, in the Nixon impeachment, there was an umbrella Article of Impeachment that listed a series of specific acts. Some of those acts involved criminal activity, and some involved just unethical activity. If you were to accept counsel’s argument, you would have said that the articles that passed out of the House Judiciary Committee in Nixon were likewise infirm because, if they were going to charge President with engaging in a criminal act, they needed to make a separate article of it. Otherwise, how dare they? It would be a violation of due process, and it would be thrown out of any court—prosecutorial misconduct, and the like.

OK. That is nonsense. On the one hand, they want to argue there is no conduct here that is even akin to a crime, when, under McDonnell, in fact, this would constitute bribery. Withholding a White House meeting and withholding the provision of hundreds of millions of dollars in aid under the precedent of McDonnell would be bribery, but there is no doubt it is akin to bribery. They would say, unless you charge it as a crime, that if they had 15 articles on each particular act, criminal and noncriminal—then you could not make out a viable charge. That has never been a constitutional principle. Just as they would have had to charge President with executive branch appointment as they made reference to the terms they dictate, they now want to dictate how we can charge an offense.

At the end of the day, the task is to determine whether the conduct that is charged has been committed and whether that abuse of power rises to the level warranting impeachment. This is a technical legal argument. Unlike the House, we could like you to charge it, and you can’t make reference to the fact that, yes, these acts also constitute bribery and that is somehow offensive to legal or constitutional principles. It is offensive, yes, we could have used bribery. We could have had two separate counts. That is not a constitutional requirement. Had we done that, as I said last night, they would have attacked that, saying you are taking one offense and making it into two.

That does not detract from the fact that the President’s conduct violated our bribery laws, particularly as they were understood by the Framers, not as they were understood 200 years later. That is what the Framers understood from British common law to constitute extortion. They violated the modern-day Impoundment Control Act. They violated the Whistleblower Protection Act. They violated multiple laws but that is not what matters.

What is necessary is that they abused their power. Counsel says: Well, claims are made of abuse of power all the time. Yes, that is true in political rhetoric, but these circumstances warranted impeachment. The President was not impeached over climate change or any of the other enumerable examples they gave of people rationally saying the President is abusing his power.

Thank you.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.
The Senator from Oklahoma.
Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Chief Justice, I have a question for the President’s counsel, and I am being joined by Senators ROUNDS and YOUNG.

Mr. Manager.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.
The question from Senator INHOFE, joined by Senators ROUNDS and YOUNG, is for counsel to the President:

Even if additional witnesses are called, do you ever envision the House Managers agreeing there has been a fair Senate trial if it ends in the President’s acquittal?

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, the answer is no.

Now, they will not agree that it is fair because what will happen is, if there is a discussion of witnesses and if we go to witnesses, Mr. SCHUMER has laid out the four he wants, and he tells me we could have anybody we want. The reality is that also includes documents, and that includes other witnesses that it may lead to. So, at some point, this body will say—because this cannot go on forever, and we will be at that point where to an end, and they will say: Aha, it has been brought to an end as we were about to get the key evidence.
But what is so interesting here is they had 17 witnesses—that they had. When the hearing took place before the Judiciary Committee, if I am not mistaken, Manager Nadler, you had four witnesses at one point, when you had the case first. And there were three law professors from the Democratic side and there was one from the Republican side. So if we are going to take that same four-to-one analysis, for every one of their witnesses, we should get four.

But there was a question earlier asked about the truth of the poisonous tree. The taint of the poison does not age well. The longer it goes does not make that poison go away. It gets deeper and deeper into the soil, and here, the soil we are talking about is a trial that would be not only ongoing, but they put up 17 witnesses. You have heard them. They are acting like there have been no witnesses presented here. They presented the testimony of 17. They asked that we were able to respond to those 17 by playing those witnesses’ words. By the way, those witnesses—the testimony of those witnesses—were never done with cross-examination by the counsel for the President.

So does this end? Will it ever be enough? No, it will only be enough if they put up 17 witnesses. You have heard them. They are acting like there have been no witnesses presented here. They presented the testimony of 17. They asked that we were able to respond to those 17 by playing those witnesses’ words. By the way, those witnesses—the testimony of those witnesses—were never done with cross-examination by the counsel for the President.

So to understand the answer to this, you don’t have to look inside the President’s mind. You just have to look at recent history and then what was done last year.

As I talked about earlier, and even yesterday, other Presidents have held holds in aid for legitimate reasons, even this President. We concede that. But there are a variety of legitimate policy reasons for holding aid, whether it is pending corruption or burden-sharing. See, even in the President’s other holds—like Afghanistan, because of concerns about terrorism, or Central America, because of immigration concerns—even though some might disagree with that, that is a legitimate policy debate.

The difference here is that every witness testified—these 17 witnesses that you hear about testified—that there was no reason provided for the implement of this hold. And for this hold, whether it is pending corruption or burden-sharing.

The Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Burr, Mr. Chief Justice, I have a question for both sets of counsel, sponsored by myself. Senator Chiz, Senator Scott of South Carolina, Hawley, Sasse, and Rubio.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senate from North Carolina, Mr. Burr, Mr. Chief Justice, I have a question for both sets of counsel, sponsored by myself. Senator Chiz, Senator Scott of South Carolina, Hawley, Sasse, and Rubio.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator Burr and the other Senators is for both parties. The House will answer first:

Hillary Clinton’s campaign and the Democratic National Committee hired a retired foreign spy to work with Russian contacts to build a dossier of opposition research against her political opponent, Donald Trump. Under the House Manager’s standard, would the Steele dossier be considered as foreign interference in a US election, a violation of the law, and/or an impeachable offense?

Mr. Manager Jeffries, thank you, Mr. Chief Justice and distinguished Senators. I thank you for the question.

The analogy is not applicable to the present situation here. To the extent that opposition research was obtained, it was opposition research that was purchased. But this speaks to the underlying issue of the avoidance of facts—the avoidance of the reality of what President Trump did in this particular circumstance.

Now, I have tremendous respect for the President’s counsel, but one of the arguments that we consistently hear from both sides is that the Steele dossier was purchased. So, yes, it is still a good time to subpoena Ambassador Bolton and get that information.

This is the Senate. This is America’s great body of distinguished Senators. We have heard about the Burisma conspiracy theory. We have heard about the “Adam Schiff is the root of all evil” conspiracy theory. We have heard about the CrowdStrike conspiracy theory. We have heard about the whistleblower conspiracy theory. It is hard to keep count.

This is the Senate. This is America’s most exclusive political club. This is the world’s greatest deliberative body, and all you offer us is conspiracy theories because you can’t address the facts in this case, that the President corruptly abused his power to target an American citizen for political and personal gain. He tried to cheat in the election by soliciting foreign interference. That is an impeachable offense. That is an impeachable offense. That is the reason that we are here. That is what is before this great body of distinguished Senators.
Mr. SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, so, I guess you can buy—that is what it sounds like; you can buy a foreign interference. If you purchase it, if you purchase their opposition research, I guess that is OK.

So let me try to debunk the conspiracy, Manager JEFFRIES; and that is, it is not conspiracy that Christopher Steele was engaged to obtain and prepare dossier on the Presidential candidate for the Republican Party, Donald Trump. It is not a conspiracy that Christopher Steele utilized his network of assets—including assets, apparently, in Russia—to draft the dossier. It is not a conspiracy that the dossier was shared with the Department of Justice through Bruce Ohr, who was the No. 4 ranking member of the Department of Justice at that time, because his wife, Nellie Ohr, happened to be working for the organization, Fusion GPS, that was put together the dossier together. This is also not a conspiracy. It sounds like one, except it is real. And it is also not a conspiracy that that dossier—purchased dossier—was taken by the FBI, submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to obtain a foreign intelligence surveillance order on an American citizen. It is also not a conspiracy that that court issued an order—two of them now—condemning the FBI’s practice and acknowledging that many of those orders were not properly issued. None of that is a conspiracy theory. That is just the facts.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for both President’s counsel and House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator BALDWIN is for both parties, and counsel for the President will answer first:

Can you assure us that the Jennifer Williams’ supplemental testimony? I don’t think you can conclude that it is, except that it would be inconsistent with what you are being told and what the American people are being told. Well, they deserve the whole truth, and that is part of the truth. So let the people see it.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator Durbin, and Senator Cruz.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators ALEXANDER, DAINES, and CRUZ is for the House managers:

Compare the bipartisanship in the Nixon, Clinton and Trump impeachment proceedings. Specifically, how bipartisan was the vote in the House of Representatives to authorize and direct the House committees to begin formal impeachment inquiries for each of the three Presidents?

Ms. Manager LOFGREN. Mr. Chief Justice and Senators, in the Nixon impeachment, you look back and think about the vote in the House Judiciary Committee. It ended up bipartisan, but it didn’t start that way. Those parties were dug in, as parties are today. The Republicans and Democrats saw it differently. But as the evidence emerged, a bipartisan consensus emerged on the committee, and a number of Republicans, including just passed away, and Caldwell Butler, who loved Richard Nixon—he was a huge fan of Richard Nixon’s. But they couldn’t turn away from the evidence that their President had committed abuse of power, cheated the election, and they had to vote to impeach him.

When it came to the Clinton impeachment, that was—again, it started out along very partisan lines, and it ended along partisan lines. I believe the reason why, as I said to committee, and a number of Republicans—Tom Railsback, who just—I loved Richard Nixon—he was a huge fan of Richard Nixon’s. But they couldn’t turn away from the evidence that their President had committed abuse of power, cheated the election, and they had to vote to impeach him.

With Nixon, we had clear abuse of Presidential authority to upend the Constitution, scheme to cheat in an election, and Members of both parties voted to impeach. With Clinton, we had private misconduct. Yes, I would call it a crime because he lied about that under oath, but it wasn’t misuse of Presidential authority. As I said, any crime, any crime caught in a crime, it could have lied about it. And it didn’t involve the use of Presidential authority. So we never got beyond our partisan divisions on that. And many of us—and I will include myself—believed that it was being done for partisan purposes, because it didn’t reach a high crime and misdemeanor.

In the Trump case—and I will say I have been disappointed, because I serve with a number of Republicans in the House whom I like, whom I respect, whom I support. I have no problem with him, and I honestly believed that when this evidence came out, as with the Nixon administration, we would have a coming
together. But it didn’t happen, much to my disappointment.

I think you have a new opportunity here in the Senate. For one thing, this is a smaller body. You are, as has been mentioned, the greatest deliberative body. You have a capacity to do something that we didn’t have a chance to do, which is to call firsthand witnesses and hear from them.

A lot of things have happened since the impeachment articles were adopted. One of them was emails that have been released that we didn’t know about.

It has been said by counsel that the Freedom of Information Act information shows that if you follow the process, you get information. No, they had to sue, and they are still in a lockdown fight over the Freedom of Information Act and redactions that were not proper. So that is a big fight that is still going on.

But most tellingly, Mr. Bolton has now stepped forward and said he is willing to testify. He is willing to come here and testify under oath. And I think we can all learn something. As Mr. Schiff has mentioned, I think we can see such a way that would respect the Senate’s need to do other business, which we also do in the House.

Let’s get that done, and let’s see if that kind of information can help the Senators come together, as happened in the House Judiciary Committee so many years ago when we dealt with the serious problem of Presidential misconduct—abuse of power to cheat an election—when Richard Nixon shocked the Nation and ultimately had to re-elect.

In this case, H. Res. 660, which was passed on October 31, had bipartisan opposition. The votes in favor of the resolution were 232 Democrats and 1 Republican. The opposition was all Republicans, 194, plus 2 Democrats voting against.

In terms of other assertions that have been made, there are just a couple of points I wanted to touch on. There has been a lot said about—House managers have suggested that counsel for the President have argued that the President could do anything he wants now—solicit any foreign interference in any election. If he thinks it will help him get re-elected, that is the theory of the case. That is absolutely false. That is a gross distortion of what has been presented, and let me make a couple of points about that.

There have been questions about the campaign finance laws. The narrow point that we have made in response to specific questions about the campaign finance laws is simply that information—limited information—being provided by one party is not a contribution, a thing of value under the campaign finance laws. And that is not just my conclusion; that is what the Mueller report said. When the Mueller report looked into this, it said: “No judicial decision has treated the voluntary provision of uncompensated opposition research or similar information as a thing of value that could amount to a contribution under campaign-finance law.” That is volume I, page 187. So that is a limited point.

The bigger point: The suggestion has been made, because of Professor Dershowitz’s comments, that the theory that the President’s counsel is advancing is the President can do anything he wants. If he thinks it will advance his reelection, any quid pro quo, anything he wants, anything goes. That is not true. Professor Dershowitz today issued a statement to show that was an exaggeration of what he was saying.

But let me make an even more narrow point. Aside from what Professor Dershowitz was saying the other night and explaining in abstract and hypothetical terms and academic terms, we have a specific case here. And the specific case here is the one that has been framed by the House managers. And the defects in that case and their theory of the case are, there is abuse of power that involves no allegation of a crime whatsoever and no allegation of a violation of established law. Instead, the contribution under campaign-finance law that, on its face, is objectively permissible under the powers of the President and determine that it is going to be
treated as impeachable and impermissible solely on an inquiry into subjective motives—that is what the House Judiciary Committee report says. That is a theory that is infinitely malleable. It provides no standard—no real standard at all. One can come up with a perfect argument that the President could. Professor Dershowitz was making, that it is tantamount to impeachment for maladministration.

The other point I will make is they set the standard for themselves with respect to investigations. They have to establish, in order to establish their bad motive, that there is not a scintilla of evidence—there is nothing that you can look at that would suggest any possible legitimate national interest in inquiring into 2016 election interference or the Biden and Burisma affair. They can’t possibly meet that standard. It is overdetermined that there is a legitimate policy interest in at least raising a question about those things.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. COONS. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. On behalf of myself and Senator KLOBUCHAR, I send a question to the desk, addressed to the President’s counsel and the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The House will go first in answering the question from Senators COONS and KLOBUCHAR:

Mr. Sekulow said earlier that the President’s Counsel would expect to call their own witnesses in this trial if Mr. Bolton or others are called by the House managers. Can you tell the Senate if any of those witnesses would have first-hand knowledge of the charges against the President and his actions?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Justice and Senators, there certainly are witnesses that the President could call with firsthand information. I don’t know that they are—the witnesses that they have described so far, their position is, apparently, if you are the chairman of a committee doing an investigation, that makes you a relevant witness. It doesn’t—or you all become witnesses in your own investigations.

They want to call Joe Biden as a witness. Joe Biden can’t tell us why military aid was withheld from Ukraine while it was fighting a war. Joe Biden can’t tell us why President Zelensky couldn’t get in the door of the White House while the Russian Foreign Minister could. He is not in a position to answer those questions. He can’t tell us whether this rises to an impeachable abuse of power, although he probably has opinions on the subject.

But are there witnesses they could call? Absolutely. They have said Mick Mulvaney issued a statement saying: The President couldn’t do what he said he had said earlier. Well, if that is the case, then why don’t they call Mick Mulvaney? He should be on their witness list. If Secretary Pompeo has evidence that there was a policy basis to withhold the aid and it was discussed, well, then, why don’t they call him? That is a relevant fact witness.

They don’t want to allow the Chief Justice to decide issues of materiality because they know what they are trying to do involves witnesses that don’t shed light on the charges against the President. They do satisfy the appetite of their client, but they don’t have probative value in any area.

So, yes, there are witnesses. Now, the reason they are not on the President’s witness list is because if they were truthful under oath, they would incriminate the President. Otherwise, they would be begging to have Mick Mulvaney come testify; otherwise, they would be begging to have the head of OMB, who helped administer the freeze on behalf of the President: Let’s bring him in. He will tell you it was completely innocent. It was all about burden-sharing.

So why don’t they want the head of OMB in? Why don’t they want their own people in? Because their own people will incriminate the President. But there is no shortage of relevant, probative witnesses. They just don’t want you to hear what they have to say.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, so besides the fact that Mr. SCHUMER said—and it is on page 675 of the transcript—that we can call any witnesses we want, Mr. SCHIFF just said we don’t really get—we can call their witnesses. That is what he said. We can call their witnesses because, under their theory, if we wanted to talk to the whistleblower, even in a secure setting to find out if he, in fact, may have worked for the Vice President or may have worked on Ukraine or may have been in communication with the staff, that is irrelevant.

We can’t talk to Joe Biden or Hunter Biden because that is irrelevant—except the conversation that is the subject matter of this inquiry, the phone call transcript that you selectively utilized, has a reference to Hunter Biden. The conversation with Burisma, they raised it for about a half a day, saying we would have first-hand knowledge of the whistleblower, even in a secure setting to find out if he, in fact, may have worked for the Vice President or may have worked on Ukraine or may have been in communication with the staff, that is irrelevant.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk, addressed to the President’s counsel and the other Senators is addressed to Mr. SCHUMER said—and it is on page 675 of the transcript—that we can call any witnesses we want, Mr. SCHIFF just said we don’t really get—we can call their witnesses. That is what he said. We can call their witnesses because, under their theory, if we wanted to talk to the whistleblower, even in a secure setting to find out if he, in fact, may have worked for the Vice President or may have worked on Ukraine or may have been in communication with the staff, that is irrelevant.

We can’t talk to Joe Biden or Hunter Biden because that is irrelevant—except the conversation that is the subject matter of this inquiry, the phone call transcript that you selectively utilized, has a reference to Hunter Biden. The conversation with Burisma, they raised it for about a half a day, saying there was nothing there. Well, let me find out through cross-examination.

But I just think of the irony of this—before we go to dinner—that we could call someone who wants except for witnesses we want, but we can call their witnesses that they want.

Remember we said “the fruit of the poisonous tree”? It is still the fruit of the poisonous tree. It doesn’t get better with age.

This idea that this is going to be a fair process—call the witnesses they want; don’t call the witnesses you want because they are irrelevant. They may be irrelevant to them. They are not irrelevant to them. They are not irrelevant to us. They are not irrelevant to our case. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.
that would last for years. And in the Clinton impeachment, they made those warnings when it was not even arising in the context of an election year.

Now we have a partisan impeachment—as we have pointed out—when there is an election only 9 months away, and it will be perceived, and is perceived by many in the country, as simply an attempt to interfere with the election and to prevent the voters from having their choice of who they want to be President for the next 4 years.

And the House managers have said: We can’t allow the voters to decide because we can’t be sure it will be a fair election. That can’t be the way we approach democracy in the United States. We have to respect the ability of the voters to take in information, because all the information is out now. They have had plenty of opportunity, with the process that they ran in the House, to make all the information public that they want and to be able to make arguments against the President. We think they have been disapproved, and the voters should be able to decide.

And the most important thing, the greatest danger from this partisan impeachment, I believe, is the one that Minority Leader SCHUMER warned about back in 1998, which is that, once we start down the road of purely partisan impeachments, once we start to normalize that process and make it all right to have purely partisan impeachments, especially in an election year, then we have just turned impeachment into a partisan political tool, and it will be used again and again and again and more frequently and more frequently. And that is not a process—that is not a future—for the country that this Chamber should accept.

Instead, this Chamber should put an end to the growing pattern towards partisan impeachments in this country, put an end to that practice and definitively make clear that a purely partisan impeachment not based on adequate charges, not based on charges that meet the constitutional standard will not get any consideration in this Chamber and will be rejected.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

MR. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chief Justice. The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Maryland.

MR. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chief Justice, on behalf of myself and Senator KLOBUCHAR, I send a question to the desk directed to both parties.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator VAN HOLLEN is to both parties. The President’s counsel will go first:

In his response to an earlier question this evening, Mr. Sekulow cited individuals like the Bidens as being “not irrelevant to our case.” In responding to having the Chief Justice make the initial determinations regarding the relevance of documents and witnesses, particularly as the Senate could disagree with the Chief Justice’s ruling by a majority vote?

The President’s counsel is first.

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, again, to make our position clear, obviously, that would not be the appropriate way to go.

Again, no disrespect to the Chief Justice at all, who is presiding here as the Presiding Officer, but our view is that, if there is evidence that has to be resolved on constitutional matters, that it should be done in the appropriate way.

You have Senate rules that govern that. As to what you would do, and then there is—you know, if litigation were to be necessary for a particular issue, that would have to be looked at. But this idea that we can short circuit the system, which is what they have been doing for 3 months, is not something we are either. I have said that. I said it all day yesterday. And, again, no disrespect to the Senator’s question, but we are just—

That is not a position that we will accept as far as moving these proceedings forward.

Thank you.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators, counsel for the President says that would not be constitutionally appropriate. Why not? Where is it prohibited in the Constitution that in an impeachment trial, on the discharge of the parties, the Chief Justice cannot resolve issues of materiality of the witnesses? Of course that is permitted by the Constitution.

Now, counsel earlier said that the House managers want to decide on which witnesses the President should be able to call; we want them to call our witnesses. Well, you would think that Mick Mulvaney, the White House Chief of Staff, would be their witness. If they independently think that the President is claiming, if indeed he is willing to say under oath what he is willing to say in a press statement, you would think he would be their witness.

But I am not saying that we get to decide. That is not the proposal here. The proposal is we take a week; the Senate goes about its business; we do depositions. The witnesses are not witnesses on the President’s behalf that we get a decision on as House managers; we are trying to protect our position. I guess that is the nature of the allegation. And that is a baseless smear.

What the President asked for was an investigation of Joe Biden, and the smear against Joe Biden is that he sought to fire a prosecutor because he is not a Joe Biden type of prosecutor. I guess that is the nature of the allegation. And that is a baseless smear.

As we demonstrated—as the unequivocal testimony in the House demonstrated, when the Vice President sought the dismissal of a corrupt and incompetent prosecutor, it had nothing to do with Hunter Biden’s position on the board. It had everything to do with the fact that the State Department, our allies, the International Monetary Fund were in unanimous agreement that the prosecutor was corrupt. And the uncontradicted testimony was also that, in getting rid of that prosecutor, it would increase the chances of real
corruption proceedings going forward, not that it would decrease them.

So the sham is this: The sham is that Joe Biden did something wrong when he followed United States policy, when he did what he was asked to do by our European allies when he did what he was asked to do by international financial institutions.

And the other sham is the Russian propaganda sham that this CrowdStrike—kooky conspiracy theory that because these are not the Russians, hacked the DNC and that someone whisked the server away to Ukraine to hide it. That is Russian intelligence propaganda, and yes, it is a sham. And it is worse than a sham. It is a Russian propaganda coup is what it is. Thank God, Putin says, that they are not talking about Russian interference anymore; they are talking about the Ukrainian interference.

Now, counsel says: Well, isn’t it possible that two countries interfered? But what is it? That is a sham. And that is why—what we refer to it as such.

But at the end of the day, what this is all about is the President using the power of his office, abusing the power of that office to engage in soliciting investigations—and actually just the announcement of them. If the President thought there was so much merit there, then why was it that he just needed their announcement?

And what is more, as counsel just conceded before the break, Rudy Giuliani was not pursuing the policy of the United States. OK. If it wasn’t the policy of the United States, then what was it? If it wasn’t the policy to pursue an investigation of the Bidens, then what was it?

It was a “domestic political errand” is what it was.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chief Justice, on behalf of Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BROWN, and myself, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Senators WYDEN, MENENDEZ, and BROWN ask the House managers:

The President’s counsel has argued that the President’s actions are based on his desire to root out corruption. However, new reporting indicates that Attorney General Barr and former National Security Advisor Bolton shared concerns that the President was granting personal favors to autocratic foreign leaders in order to serve his own interests in the worst environments for corruption in the world.

I think, first and foremost, there has been a troubling pattern of possible conflicts of interest that we have seen from the beginning of this administration through this moment, but the allegation here related to the abuse of power charge is that, in this specific instance, the President tried to cheat by soliciting foreign interference in an American election by trying to gin up phony investigations against a political opponent.

Now, what counsel for the President has said is that what the President was really interested in is corruption, that he is an anti-corruption crusader. For you to believe the President’s narrative, you have to conclude that he is an anti-corruption crusader. Perhaps his domestic record is part of what Senators can reasonably consider, but let’s look at the facts of the central charge here.

The President had two calls with President Zelensky, on April 21 and on July 25. In both instances, he did not mention the word “corruption” once. The relevant portion of the call where the word “corruption” was not mentioned by Donald Trump once.

We also know that in May of last year President Trump’s own Department of Defense indicated that the new Ukrainian Government had met all necessary preconditions for the receipt of the military aid, including the implementation of anti-corruption reforms. That is President Trump’s Department of Defense saying there is no corruption problem as it relates to the release of the aid.

Now, I think we can all acknowledge, as the President’s counsel indicated, that there was a general corruption challenge with Ukraine. I think the exact quote from Mr. Poroshenko was: “Since the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine has suffered from one of the worst environments for corruption in the world.”

Certainly I believe that that is the case, but here is the key question: Why did President Trump wait until 2019 to pretend as if he wanted to do something about corruption? Let’s explore.

Did Ukraine have a corruption problem in 2017, generally? The answer is yes. Did President Trump dissemble in 2017? The answer is no. What did President Trump do about these alleged concerns in 2017? The answer is nothing.

Under the exact same conditions that the President now claims motivated him to seek this political investigation against the Bidens and place a hold on the money, the President did nothing. He did not seek an investigation into the Bidens in 2017. He did not put a hold on the aid in 2017.

Mr. Manager JEFFRIES. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. I also want to thank the Senators, again, for your hospitalities. It is with great regret that we have endeavored to answer your questions. Thank you for that question.

I think, first and foremost, there has been a troubling pattern of possible conflicts of interest that we have seen from the beginning of this administration through this moment, but the allegation here related to the abuse of power charge is that, in this specific instance, the President tried to cheat by soliciting foreign interference in an American election by trying to gin up phony investigations against a political opponent.

Now, what counsel for the President has said is that what the President was really interested in is corruption, that he is an anti-corruption crusader. For you to believe the President’s narrative, you have to conclude that he is an anti-corruption crusader. Perhaps his domestic record is part of what Senators can reasonably consider, but let’s look at the facts of the central charge here.

The President had two calls with President Zelensky, on April 21 and on July 25. In both instances, he did not mention the word “corruption” once. The relevant portion of the call where the word “corruption” was not mentioned by Donald Trump once.

We also know that in May of last year President Trump’s own Department of Defense indicated that the new Ukrainian Government had met all necessary preconditions for the receipt of the military aid, including the implementation of anti-corruption reforms. That is President Trump’s Department of Defense saying there is no corruption problem as it relates to the release of the aid.

Now, I think we can all acknowledge, as the President’s counsel indicated, that there was a general corruption challenge with Ukraine. I think the exact quote from Mr. Poroshenko was: “Since the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine has suffered from one of the worst environments for corruption in the world.”

Certainly I believe that that is the case, but here is the key question: Why did President Trump wait until 2019 to pretend as if he wanted to do something about corruption? Let’s explore.

Did Ukraine have a corruption problem in 2017, generally? The answer is yes. Did President Trump dissemble in 2017? The answer is no. What did President Trump do about these alleged concerns in 2017? The answer is nothing.

Under the exact same conditions that the President now claims motivated him to seek this political investigation against the Bidens and place a hold on the money, the President did nothing. He did not seek an investigation into the Bidens in 2017. He did not put a hold on the aid in 2017. But the Trump administration oversaw $560 million in military and security aid to Ukraine in 2017.

In 2018, the same conditions existed. If Putin brings Trump truly an anti-corruption crusader—but what happened in 2018? He didn’t seek an investigation into the Bidens. He didn’t put a hold on the aid. Rather, the Trump administration oversaw $620 million in military and security aid to Ukraine, which brings us to this moment.

Why the sudden interest in Burisma, in the Bidens, in alleged corruption concerns about Ukraine? What changed in 2019? What changed is that Joe Biden announced his candidacy. The pursuit was concerned with that candidacy. Polls had him losing to the former Vice President, and he was determined to stop Joe Biden by trying to cheat in the election, smear him, solicit foreign interference in 2020. That is an abuse of power. That is corrupt. That is wrong.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. Chief Justice, I see a question to ask on behalf of myself, Senator RUINO, and Senator RISCH.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators COLLINS, RUINO, and RISCH is addressed to the House managers.

The House of Representatives withdrew its subpoena to compel Charles Kupperman’s testimony. Why did the House withdraw the Kupperman subpoena? Why didn’t the House pursue its legal remedies to enforce its subpoena?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators, I thank you for the question.

When we—our practice in the House was to invite witnesses to come voluntarily; if they refused, to give them a subpoena. In the case of Dr. Kupperman, he refused to come in voluntarily, and we subpoenaed him.

Almost instantly upon receipt of the subpoena, a lengthy complaint was filed in court where he sought to challenge that subpoena. Interestingly, and contrary to, I think, what you are hearing from the President’s counsel here today, the House took the position that a witness cannot challenge—does not have standing to challenge a congressional subpoena.

We were joined, by the way, in that position by the Justice Department, which also said that Dr. Kupperman didn’t have jurisdiction to challenge or get a declaratory judgment as to the validity of the subpoena.

So, in that litigation, we were often on the same page as the Justice Department. But more meaningful to us, we were simply not going to engage in a yearslong process of delay to get the answers that we needed.

We proposed to Dr. Kupperman’s counsel that if, as you claim, this is really about just wanting to get a court blessing, there is a willingness to
come forward, but we just want to make sure that it is appropriate that we do so, if you are sincere about that, there is already a case that has been filed, the McGahn case, that is about to be decided. Let’s agree to be bound by what conclusion Judge Jackson reaches in that case. And their answer was no.

And, indeed, that opinion would come out shortly thereafter. That opinion said, this claim of absolute immunity is absolute nonsense, and there is no precedent in the 250 years of jurisprudence on this subject.

So we went back to Dr. Kupperman, and, of course, Dr. Kupperman said: No, we would like to get our own judicial opinion.

Now, had we gone to fruition, even though we don’t believe—and it would have created a bad precedent that they have standing to challenge subpoenas that way. Had they lost, they would have gone to the court of appeals and the Supreme Court. They would have come back to the district court. And now no longer arguing absolute immunity because that would have been, we believe, defeated, they would make claims of executive privilege, and they would litigate those up through the court of appeals and the Supreme Court.

We knew that course because we are in it with Don McGahn. Nine months after he was subpoenaed, we are still litigating it. And they are in Court saying Congress shouldn’t do what they are saying that we should do before this body.

So that is why we withdrew the subpoena. We were not going to go through that exercise. You have to ask the question, I think, why did Fiona Hill feel that she could come and testify? She worked for Dr. Kupperman. Why was she willing to show the courage to come and testify when her boss wasn’t?

There is not a good answer to that question, but I am awfully glad that she did because, without her, we would be that much less knowledgeable about this President’s scheme.

So that was the history of the Kupperman subpoena. Likewise, John Bolton, who has the same counsel, told us if we subpoenaed him, he would sue.

Now, why is it that he is willing to testify now, and he wasn’t willing to testify before the House? You should ask him that question. But that was the predicament we faced. And in our view, a President should not be able to defeat an investigation into his wrongdoing by endlessly litigating the matter in court, particularly when they are in court saying you can’t use the court to enforce your subpoenas.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator HIRONO is for the House managers:

Can you talk about what has happened to whistleblowers when they have been ousted against their will? What are the consequences of whistleblowers who are subject of retaliation, although I have no doubt that there are many. We can seek by the latter part of this evening to get a list of some of the whistleblowers who have confronted retaliation?

But I—their role does give me an opportunity to speak a little more—in a more fulsome way about a point I made earlier about the unique importance of whistleblowers in the intelligence community.

Our area of intelligence is unique in this respect. If you are a whistleblower who wants to blow the whistle on a fraudulent contract in a transportation project, you can go public. If you are blowing the whistle on misconduct in the area of housing, you can go to the press conference, and you can declare the wrongdoing that you have seen.

If you are a whistleblower in the intelligence community, however, you cannot go public. You have no recourse to bring to the public’s attention wrongdoing, except one of really two vehicles. You can go to an Intelligence Committee or you can go to the inspector general.

And in this area, where our hearings are in closed session, where you don’t have outside stakeholders that can point out the flaws in what an agency is representing, if you are on the Transportation Committee and some claim is made that the high-speed rail project is on time and under budget, you have outside validators and stakeholders that can say that is not true.

In the intel world where our hearings are in closed session, there are not outside stakeholders that are listening, that can hold those agencies to account. And so we are uniquely dependent when there is wrongdoing on two things: self-reporting by the agencies and the willingness of people of good faith to come forward and blow the whistle.

And we do injury to that when we expose those whistleblowers to retaliation. I don’t think any of us would have imagined a circumstance in which a President would publicly say: I have no recourse now; before would have called a whistleblower a traitor or a spy or suggested that people that blow the whistle on his wrongdoing are traitors and spies, and we should treat them as we used to treat traitors and spies.

I don’t think we could have imagined a circumstance where a President of the United States would have told a foreign leader that the U.S. Ambassador—our anti-corruption champion in Ukraine—was “going to go through some things.” I don’t think we could have imagined that happening before this Presidency. And sometimes you just have to step back and realize just how striking and abhorrent this is and what a risk it is to civility, to decency, to our institutions.

We have become inured to it through endless repetition of attacks on anyone who will stand up to this President. And, of course, the risk is—the very reason why we have a whistleblower protection, the very reason why whistleblowers should enjoy a right of anonymity, is that in the absence of that, misconduct and wrongdoing will proliferate. If there is not a mechanism for people lawfully to expose wrongdoing, you can bet that wrongdoing is going to increase. And that is why there have been great champions, like Senator Grassley, of whistleblower protections, Senator Burr and Senator Warner, and many others. We all understand—at least we did heretofore—the vital importance and contributions that are made by American citizens who bring wrongdoing to our attention.

Mr. BLUNT, Mr. Chief Justice.

The question from Senators BLUNT, HAWLEY, WICKER, and CAPITO is addressed to counsel for the President:

What responsibility does the President have to safeguard the use of taxpayer dollars for foreign aid and work to root out corruption?

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice and Members of the Senate.

The President has an important responsibility to safeguard taxpayer dollars that are used in foreign aid or used anywhere, frankly, and to root out corruption. Now, it is no secret that President Trump, from the beginning, from the time he came down the escalator, has been committed to ensuring that American taxpayer dollars are used appropriately—are used appropriately. And they are going to foreign countries, he wants to make sure that they are used wisely. And there is ample evidence of that—ample evidence of that. I don’t think that is even disputed or disputable. And he is fulfilling that obligation.

The other point that he makes repeatedly is that if we are helping countries around the world, other countries should help us help them. We use the word “burden-sharing.” What does that mean? “Burden-sharing” means that if American taxpayers are going to help with a problem in a country around the world—and we do, and we do a lot. We do it to the tune of billions and billions
of dollars. When here in our country, we need to fix our roads; we need to fix our bridges. So if we are going to take money away from those important projects here in America that come from the hard-earned dollars of taxpayers, why can't other countries help us? That is called burden-sharing. It is also called fairness. So he has that obligation, and every day he fulfills that obligation.

Let me make another point in response to Senator Warren's question. The most important thing, in terms of the fairness of this proceeding—and that is why I have quoted repeatedly. I haven't played the videos over and over again, but you remember them—the wise words, the true words of the Democrats in the Clinton impeachment years. And the only point the American people understand—they understand it, and I think everyone in this body understands it; that there can't be one standard for one political party and another for the other political party. That is important. Those words should be applied here. We can't have a standard that changes depending on what somebody thinks about political issues.

In order to be fair, the same standard has to be applied, regardless of your party. So that is the critical issue here. And that is the bedrock principle, not a double standard for justice in the Senate but one standard—the true standard, the standard that has been articulated by Democrats over and over again in the Clinton proceedings. That is the standard that is right. That is the standard that we ask for, regardless of political party.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. I am sending a question to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Senator King asks the President's counsel:

Would it be permissible for a President to disclose to the Prime Minister of Israel that he was holding congressional appropriated military aid unless the Prime Minister promised to come to the United States and publicly charge his opponent with antisemitism in the midst of an election campaign?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, we have heard—there was some evidence that there was a sudden, he is put on the board at the last minute, and the President changed his mind about it the very next day. That is really pretty preposterous, for the House managers to come and say, particularly with respect to the Biden-Burisma incident, there can't be any legitimate interest in raising that question because it has all been debunked. And the question has been asked: Where was it debunked? By whom was it debunked? Who conducted that investigation? Where is the report from that investigation? Who established that there is nothing there? There is not such a report. They have not been asked; they haven't been able to cite it. There has been no such investigation.

But what do we know? We do know that every witness who was asked about it said, at a minimum, there was an appearance of a conflict of interest. We do know that these two members of the Obama administration—Amos Hochstein and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Kent—raised the issue during their conversations with the Vice President Biden's Office. We know that Chris Heinz, the stepson of Secretary of State Kerry, who had been a business partner with Hunter Biden, broke off his business ties with him because Hunter Biden took a seat on the board of Burisma.

So to say that there is nothing that could possibly merit asking a question about that is utterly disingenuous. It can't be said with a straight face. Every witness who was asked about it said that there was something, at least, that gave the appearance of a conflict of interest. There hasn't been any investigation to debunk this theory. There hasn't been any inquiry to find out if there is "there" there or not.

It doesn't have to be, as Manager SCHIFF was suggesting, just with, well, why was Hunter Biden on the board, or were they paying him? It is the whole situation—the whole situation of, all of a sudden, he is put on the board at the same time when his father was put in charge of Ukraine policy. And there are people—there were witnesses who testified in the House proceedings that it appeared like Burisma was trying to whitewash their reputation by putting people with connections on their board. And then there is the prosecutor being fired. It just is just not reasonable to say that no one could possibly say: That looks fishy. There is something maybe that somebody should look into there.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. I thank you, Senator Murkowski asks for the President:

You explain that Ambassador Scudder and Senator Johnson both said the President explicitly denied he would not release the aid unless the President told Bolton directly that the aid would not be released. The report on Ambassador Bolton's book suggests the President told Bolton directly that the aid would not be released. He announced the investigations the President desired. This dispute about material facts weighs in favor of calling additional witnesses with direct knowledge. Why should we not subpoena Ambassador Bolton?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question.

I think the primary consideration here is to understand that the House could have pursued Ambassador Bolton. The House considered whether or not they would try to have him come testify. They chose not to subpoena him.

This all goes back to the most important consideration, I think, that this Chamber has before it in some ways, especially on this threshold issue of whether there should be witnesses or not. It has to do with the precedent that is established here for what kind of impeachment proceeding this body will accept from now going forward, because whatever is accepted in this case becomes the new normal for every impeachment proceeding that is to come in the future. And it will do grave damage to this body as an institution to say that the proceedings in the House don't have to really be complete. You don't have to subpoena the witnesses that you think are necessary to prove your case. You don't really have to put it all together before you bring the package here. When you are impeaching the President of the United States—the gravest impeachment that they could possibly consider—you don't have to do all of that work before you get to this institution.

Instead, when you come to this Chamber, it can be kind of half-baked, not finished—we need other witnesses, and we want this Chamber to do the investigation that wasn't done in the House of Representatives. And then this Chamber will have to be issuing the subpoenas and dealing with that. And that is not the way this Chamber should allow impeachments to be presented to it.

We have heard—there was some exchange the other day about, well, there...
were a lot of witnesses in the Judge
Porteous impeachment, and this Cham-
ber was able to handle that. It is very
different in the impeachment of a
judge, which is being handled by a com-
mittee. My understanding is that,
under rule XI of the Senate procedures,
therefore, precedent is not evident. But in a Presidential
impeachment, there is not going to be
just a committee; it is the entire
Chamber that is going to have to be
sitting as Court of Impeachment, and
that will greatly affect the business of the Chamber.

So I think the idea that something
comes out and somebody makes an
assertion in a book, allegedly—it is only
an alleged; it is simply alleged now
that the manuscript says that; Ambas-
sador Bolton hasn’t come out to verify
that, to my knowledge—that then we
should start having this Chamber call-

ing new witnesses and establish the
new normal for impeachment pro-
cedure—being that there doesn’t
have to be a complete investigation
in the House, I think that is very dam-
aging for the future of this institution.

Thank you.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.
The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. Chief Justice, I
have a question on behalf of myself and
Senators WHITEHOUSE and HENRICH,
and this is for the counsel for the
President and the House managers.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.
Question from Senators SCHATZ,
WHITEHOUSE, and HENRICH for both
parties:
Can the White House really not admit that
Senator Kinko’s hypothetical would be wrong?
We begin with the House managers.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senator, we
have no trouble recognizing just how
wrong that would be, but more than
that, it is the natural extension of Pro-
fessor Dershowitz’ argument that if the
President believed that kind of quid
pro quo would help his reelection, then
it is perfectly fine and nonimpeach-
able. There was a reason, of course,
why they didn’t want to address that
hypothetical.

Let me go back also to the question
that was asked about the other written
reports that Ambassador Bolton and
Attorney General Barr were concerned
that the President was intervening in
cases in which he had business invest-
ments, like Turkey. Under the theory
of the President’s lawyers, that is per-
fectly OK, too. If the President thinks
something about that is in the United
States’ interest because it is in his in-
interest, that is perfectly fine. It is un-
 impeachable.

Now, is it a crime to give preference to
autocrats, to give special consider-
ation to autocrats where your business
investments are? That may not be
criminal, but it is impeachable. It cer-
tainly should be impeachable if we are
going to sacrifice the national security
of the country, if we are going to be-
now favors in U.S. resources to coun-
tries where the President has invest-
ments. Is that what we want driving
U.S. policy? But that is the implication
of what they have to say.

I agree with counsel about one thing
they said: If we have a trial with no wit-
nesses, that will be the precedent.
We should be very concerned about the
precedent we set here because it will
mean heretofore—that when a Presi-
dent is impeached, that one party can
deny the other witnesses, and that will
be the new normal for impeachment
trials without witnesses, and I don’t think
that is the precedent we should be set-
ting here.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr.
Manager.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Jus-
tice, Senator, thank you for the ques-
tion.

Let me just begin by noting I think
it is a little bit rich for Manager
SCHIFF to say that one party—i.e., the
President—is going to deny them wit-
nesses. It was the President who was
denied any witnesses throughout this
process up until now.

But to get back to the question on
Senator King’s hypothetical, if the
President insisted that a foreign leader
come here and lie about someone else
and he was holding up military aid or
a package of congressional aid and say-
ing “You have to go out and lie about
this,” that would be wrong. But that is
not this case, and it has nothing to
do with this case.

But I would like to address some-
thing that Manager SCHIFF said be-
cause he immediately pivoted now to
the next thing. What is in the news-
papers? What else can we bring in from
the newspapers? There is an allega-
tion that the manuscript says something
about conversations that Ambassador
Bolton had with Attorney General Barr.
Well, Attorney General Barr has issued a statement saying that allega-
tion, that assertion, is not accurate,
that that is false. And there are other
allegations that are made about what
might be in this manuscript. Mick
Mulaney has issued a statement say-
ing that is not true.

So to sort of play the game of, there
is going to be another leak; somebody
might write a book; there is something
else—and that is, again, turning this
body into the one doing the investiga-
tion because the House didn’t pursue
the investigation. That is not pru-
dently a wise move for this Chamber to
take on that task.

Thank you.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.
The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Your Honor, I send a
question to the desk for counsel for the
President.
The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator KENNEDY
is for counsel to the House.

Has the House of Representatives, in its
impeachment proceedings or otherwise,
investigated the veracity of the statement by
former Ukrainian Prosecutor General Victor
Shokin that Mr. Shokin ‘believes his ouster
was because of his interest in [Burisma Hold-
ings], and his claim that he remained in his post
Shokin said he would have ques-
tioned Hunter Biden,” as reported on July 22,
2019 in an article in The Washington Post en-
titled “As Vice President, Biden said to
Shokin, ‘You should be questioned. Then
His Son got a job with a Ukrainian Gas
Company,” by Michael Krashin and David L.
Stern.

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Jus-
tice, Senator, thank you for that ques-
tion.

The answer, to the best of my knowl-
edge, is no, the House of Represen-
tatives did not investigate the veracity of the truth of that reporting about
Prosecutor General Shokin. In fact,
that was part of the point.

As Manager SCHIFF was saying here,
again, the House Democrats’ position
is that everything related to the entire
incident of the Bidens and Burisma and
what was going with the prosec-
utor—it is all debunked. There is
nothing to see there. Move along. Don’t
ask about it. But they didn’t inves-
tigate it, and they can’t point to any-
one who has investigated it. They can’t
point to anyone who has really looked
at it.

As I said a minute ago—and I will not
belabor the point—every witness who
was asked said that they thought, yes,
there was at least the appearance of a
conflict of interest there. At least one
of them was there. And there is a public report-
ing of another person, whose name is
Hochstein, in the Obama administra-
tion—raised the issue with Vice Presi-
dent Biden’s Office, but nothing was
done about it.

There have been questions about
whether Vice President Biden sought
or received an ethics opinion. We don’t
know— not that I have heard of, not
that I have seen anywhere. It is just
something that no one has actually in-
quire into.

There have been questions raised
about “Why now?” “Why are they
being raised now?” The implication
the House managers have tried to make
is it is just because Joe Biden decided in
April he was going to run for the Presi-
dency.

As I explained the other day, Rudy
Giuliani, as the President’s private
counsel, was exploring matters in
Ukraine starting in the fall of 2018. He
said he was because he believed in
finding out—remember, the Mueller in-
vestigation was still ongoing at that
point. It wasn’t clear what the out-
come of the Mueller investigation was
going to be. He was trying to find out
what were the origins of Russian inter-
ference, of the Steele dossier, of allega-
tions of collusion by the Trump cam-
paign. That led, in part, to Ukraine,
and he got information that led him to
various strands to pursue. One of them
became the issue of the Biden and Burisma
incident.

He prepared a little package on that
based on interview notes on January 23
and January 25 of 2019. Months before
Joe Biden announced that he was going to run for the Presidency. Rudy Giuliani was interviewing Shokin and Lutsenko and wrote down in the interview notes stuff about the Biden and Burisma incident and the firing of Shokin. He put it all in a package, and he delivered a copy to the State Department in March—still before Joe Biden said he was going to be running for President. That didn’t happen until April 25. It was all done—all put in a package, all delivered.

The reason I say this is because that little package that he sent to the State Department was released, I think it was, under the FOIA litigation, but it has been released publicly, and the notes that he took, his interview notes, were released publicly.

So the timing dates back to when Rudy Giuliani was pursuing that, starting back in the fall of 2018 with his taking time to pursue leads. He was trying to get Shokin to come to this country to interview him. He couldn’t get him a visa and had to interview him by phone. Lutsenko was in New York, and he prepared this package. That is why there is that timing.

Then there were public articles published about the Biden-Burisma affair. One of them was just mentioned in the question—a Washington Post article, July 22, 2019, specifically about it—about the firing of Shokin 3 days before the July 25 telephone call. It was in the news. It was topical.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Chief Justice, on behalf of myself and Senator CORNYN, I send a question to the desk for both House managers and the President’s counsel.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators PETERS and CORNYN for both parties reads:

How will the determination in this trial alter the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches in the future?

The President’s counsel goes first.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. A verdict—a final judgment—of acquittal would be the best thing for our country and would send a great message that will make a final judgment—of acquittal would be the best thing for our country and would send a great message that will

The only appropriate result that will not damage our country horrified—maybe forever but certainly for generations—is a verdict of acquittal.

Here is why. If we are getting back to the question of witnesses, Mr. SCHIFF is up here: Let’s make a deal. How about we have the Chief Justice—and we have the greatest respect for the Chief Justice. Here is the problem. We are talking about constitutional rights that have been protected by the Supreme Court over our history. So what is he really saying? Think about these questions.

The Senate can decide about executive privilege by a vote—by a majority vote. With the greatest respect—with the greatest respect—if the Senate can just decide there is no executive privilege, guess what? You are destroying executive privilege. Can the Senate decide the House’s speech or debate protections? Have the Senate subpoena documents from Mr. SCHIFF and his staff and he says “speech or debate,” are you going to decide that? Is that how we are going to do this? Are we going to flip a coin? Is that going to be your next suggestion?

We are talking about an election of the President. There are critical constitutional issues that will alter our balance of power for generations if we go down that road.

Down this road is the path provided by the Democrats so wisely during the Clinton administration.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Chief Justice, it may be different in the court than it is in this Chamber and in the House, but when anybody begins a sentence with the phrase “I have the greatest respect for,” you have to look out for what follows.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators CORNYN of South Carolina—with all due respect.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question from Senators RUBIO, CAPITO, and SCOTT of South Carolina is directed to both parties, and we will begin with counsel for the House managers.

The question reads:

If I understand the Managers’ Case: The President abused his power because he acted contrary to the advice of his advisors, and he was defying the Constitution of Congress because he acted in accordance to the advice of his advisors.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. That is not our argument at all. The President is impeached on article I not because he acted contrary to the advice of his advisors. That is a red herring offered by the President’s legal team. We are not saying that the President is not free to disregard the advice of his counsel. He is. He is entitled to disregard even really good advice. What he is not free to do is to engage in corruption. What he is not free to do is to withhold military aid—not for a valid policy disagreement. They have conceded Rudy Giuliani was not doing policy. What is not permitted is for the President to withhold congressionally appropriated money for a corrupt purpose—to secure help, to illicit foreign help, and cheat in an election. That is no policy disagreement.

The Senator from South Carolina.

With respect to the question about what this will do to the balance of power, I would say this: As I mentioned earlier, our relationship with Ukraine will survive this debate. But if we hold that a President can defy all subpoenas, can tie up the Congress endlessly with bad-faith claims of privilege—claiming here one thing and claiming in court something else—it undermines our oversight power. If the President can decide which subpoenas they will deign to consider valid and which they will deign to consider invalid, your oversight power and our oversight power is gone. That is an irrevocable change to the balance of power.

What is more, if we adopt their theory of the case that a President can abuse his power and do so by holding another country hostage by withholding congressionally appropriated funds and can violate the law in doing so as long as they think it is in their interest, imagine what that will do to the balance of power. Article II will really mean what the President says it means, which is he can do whatever he wants.

So, yes, the stakes are big here. Article II goes to whether our oversight power—particularly in a case of investigating the President’s own wrongdoing—continues to have any weight or whether the impeachment power itself is now a nullity.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators CORNYN of South Carolina.
the legal window dressing to that. They were going to court and arguing one thing and coming before you and arguing another. He was not following their advice; they were following his. You can say a lot about Donald Trump, but he is not led around by his legal counsel. Ask Don McGahn about that. Don McGahn stood up to the President.

Bob Mueller—if we are going to talk about the Mueller report—found several instances—and this goes to the pattern when the President’s misconduct—in which he sought to obstruct that investigation, including telling the President’s lawyer that he should fire the special counsel and then that he should lie about that instruction.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel CIPOLLONE. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate.

You are right. That is yet another way in which the House managers’ theories of impeachment are incoherent and dangerous.

With respect to article II—and again, I won’t respond to the ad hominem attacks that keep coming. I will say, just for the record, you are right—I haven’t been elected to anything, but when I say “with the greatest respect,” I mean it.

Article II: The President has been impeached for exercising longstanding constitutional rights. He is looking out for constitutional rights in the face of a House process that violated all of them against all precedent, and he is looking out for future Presidents and for the executive branch. How? If he had said, “OK, Fine. No rights. No counsel. No witnesses. No right to cross-examine. Here is everything you asked for,” what sort of precedent would that set? That would irreparably damage the separation of powers.

Again, all you need to look at are the Articles of Impeachment. The Articles of Impeachment do not allege a crime. They do not even allege a violation of law. They are purely partisan. They were opposed by Democrats in the House.

It is an election year, and they are here, saying: Instead of an election, let’s confront very consequential, controversial, and critical issues. Let’s let him make the decisions. Let’s let him make the appearances by dint of a subpoena. The immunity is absolute nonsense. The debate is simply whether or not the President is entitled to absolute immunity.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senator, thank you for the question.

I think the key point here is the McGahn case is not going to directly resolve something related to the obstruction charges here. It is going to address a legal issue with respect to an assertion of absolute immunity for Don McGahn.

There should be a decision from the DC Circuit sometime soon, but that will almost certainly go to the Supreme Court. I mean, that immunity is being asserted by the President of the United States, so it is going to have to be resolved in a final resolution of that litigation, and that is an important point, because this is something that Alexander Hamilton pointed out in Federalist No. 65, when he was discussing who should be the body to try impeachments. One consideration was potentially drawing in judges from various States to create a new body to try impeachments, and the rationale that Hamilton gave that that would be a bad idea is that there has to be something that doesn’t make the executive branch to the trial, to a verdict, to having it finished, precisely because this is where he talked about “the persecution of an impeachable and controlling major office in the House of Representatives.”

He recognized there could be partisan impeachments, and that accusation, that impeachment, shouldn’t be proving out there. There should be a swift trial to determine things finally, and that is why all of the preparation and the demands of the other side is saying that you cannot force the executive branch to the trial, to a verdict, to having it finished, precisely because this is where he talked about “the persecution of an impeachable and controlling major office in the House of Representatives.”

So the idea—it is not going to be just to slow down here a little bit. This trial can’t be held open pending a final resolution of that litigation, and that is an important point, because this is something that Alexander Hamilton pointed out in Federalist No. 65, when he was discussing who should be the body to try impeachments. One consideration was potentially drawing in judges from various States to create a new body to try impeachments, and the rationale that Hamilton gave that that would be a bad idea is that there has to be something that doesn’t make the executive branch to the trial, to a verdict, to having it finished, precisely because this is where he talked about “the persecution of an impeachable and controlling major office in the House of Representatives.”

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.
Mr. Schiff has said: We have the decision whether that was privileged. The constitutional process was followed over documents and temptation. That the then-Attorney General of the House determined it reached such a significant point there. And in that particular investigation, it reached such a significant point that Members of the House determined that the then-Attorney General of the United States should be held in contempt.

Now, President Obama exercised executive privilege over documents and testimony related to Fast and Furious. The constitutional process was followed.

Now, I am not the one that makes the decision whether that was privileged or not privileged. If there was going to be a challenge, it would have been adjudicated. But the fact of the matter is, at least 10 times tonight Manager Schiff has said: We have complete confidence in the Chief Justice, ignoring the fact that it is not his call. And I mean that with all sincerity, since you are making fun of people who are saying "with due respect," it is not—that is not the way it is set up.

Now, you could agree to anything. Sure, you can negotiate. You can negotiate that all the witnesses that will be called will be the witnesses they requested, or you could negotiate that since they had 17 and we had none, we get 17 and they get 4. All kinds of things can be negotiated under their view.

But this is brought to you by the managers who have an overwhelming case, and they proved over and over again. That is what they say. They have proved it. It is overwhelming. It is incredible. We were able to put it together in a record amount of time. And now we want you, the U.S. Senate, to start calling witnesses for our overwhelmingly proved case.

I would just lay this down: If we are negotiating, why don't we just go to closing arguments, and see what this body decides.

But I respect the process. The process is we have 2 days of questioning. Tomorrow there will be an argument on the motion. There will be a decision on the motion, and we have to—that is the system that is in place. That is the system we should follow.

But this idea that two district court judges have decided an issue of this magnitude and that is now the determination—that you know if they were in our position. They would say: Well, the district court decided; so that is going to be it.

So I think we need to look at what is really at stake. These are really significant issues. I mean, the idea that executive privilege should just be waived or doesn't exist, that, in your view, absolute immunity can't possibly exist—it has only been utilized for administrations for 50 years or more. Professor Dershowitz gave you the list of Presidents that have put forward executive privilege, and in a lot of his writings, he talks about it.

But to say tonight that we are just going to—you will just cut a deal. We will do it in a week. We will get some depositions, and that will make everyone happy.

It doesn't make the Constitution happy. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. Brown. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of Senators Casey, Toomey, Warner, and Wyden for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question for the House managers from Senator Brown and the other Senators is as follows:

Yesterday, you referenced how President Trump's perpetuating and propagating Russian conspiracy theories undercut our national security objectives. If acquitted in the Senate, what would prevent the President from continuing to side with Putin and other adversaries, instead of our intelligence community and career diplomats, and what are the steps, in your view, to ensure national security objectives are maintained? If acquitted in the Senate, what would prevent the President from maintaining a foreign policy that runs counter to national security objectives? If acquitted in the Senate, what would prevent the President from continuing to side with Putin and other adversaries, instead of our intelligence community and career diplomats, and what are the steps, in your view, to ensure national security objectives are maintained? If acquitted in the Senate, what would prevent the President from maintaining a foreign policy that runs counter to national security objectives?

Mr. Manager Crow. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question.

You know, I have talked a lot tonight and throughout the last week about what is at stake here, because, you know, it is getting late into the night, and we have been having this debate for several days now. There is a lot of discussion of legal aspects of this. So I don't want to get into, again, you know, the issues of our troops in Europe, the hot war that continues to happen right now as we are speaking in Ukraine, but I will reiterate the precedent that we set with regard to Russia and foreign adversaries—you know, this idea that it is OK to continue to peddle in Russian propaganda and debunk conspiracy theories—because counsel for the President would have you believe that you know, this is a policy discussion. If you know, we have not resolved this, that there is a lot of debate about this issue. And if that is indeed the case, if we concede that, then, there are some witnesses that we can call on, including Ambassador Bolton, that could shed additional light on it.

But the fact pattern that we are sitting at right now—what we are talking about right now—that is that we were called in the House, none of whom had any indicia or had any data to provide that any of these theories were accurate.

We have the entire intelligence and law enforcement community of the United States unanimously saying that there is no indication that Ukraine was involved in the 2016 election, that it was Russia.

And don't buy the red herring, by the way, that counsel for the President has brought forth—this idea that, oh, it can only be Russia. You know, they said earlier that we are claiming that it can only be Russia. That is not what we are saying. Nobody on this team has ever said it can only be Russia, because, indeed, we know, as many of these people in the Chamber know well, that there are a lot of mal actors out there. That there are states that have the capability and the will and the will and the regularity to try to attack us in a variety of ways.

What we are saying is, with respect to this issue that is before the body right now, that, unanimously, the law enforcement agencies of the United States and the intelligence communities of the United States have said that it was Russia that interfered in the 2016 election and that there is no data to suggest Ukraine was involved. That is the issue.

So the precedent—bringing it all around to the beginning of the question, the precedent is that all of our adversaries, including Vladimir Putin, will understand that they can play to the whims of one person, whether that be President Trump or some future President, Democrat or Republican. They can play to the whims and the interests and the personal political ambitions of one person and get that individual to propagate their propaganda, get them to undermine our own intelligence and law enforcement communities. That is a precedent that I don't think anybody here is willing and interested in sending, and that is truly what is at stake.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. Hoeven. Mr. Chief Justice, I am sending a question to the desk for myself, Senator Boozman, Senator Wicker, and Senator Capito.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question for counsel for the President from Senators Hoeven, Boozman, Wicker, and Capito:

House managers contend that they have an overwhelming case and that they have made their case in clear and convincing fashion. Doesn't that assertion directly contradict the argument they are making?

Mr. Philbin. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question.

I think it does directly contradict their claim now that they need more
witnesses. They said for weeks that it was an overwhelming case. They came here and they have said 63 times that it is overwhelming or proved beyond a reasonable doubt. Manager NADLER said twice today that based on what they have already shown you, it has been proved beyond a doubt.

All right, if that is their position, why do they need more witnesses or evidence? It is completely self-contradictory. I would like to address a couple of other points while I am here and I have the time, and we have gone back and forth on this, and I don’t know why I have to say it again, but the House managers keep coming up here and saying and acting as if, if you mention Ukraine in connection with election interference, if you even mention it, you are a pawn of Vladimir Putin because only the Russians interfered in the election and there is not any evidence in the record—they say—the Ukrainians did it all.

I read it before; I will read it again. One of their star witnesses, Fiona Hill, said that some Ukrainian officials ‘bet on Hillary Clinton winning the election,’ so it was ‘quite evident’ that ‘they were courting favor with the Clinton campaign,’ including by ‘trying to collect information . . . on Mr. Manafort and on other people as well.’ That was Fiona Hill.

There was also evidence in the record from a POLITICO article in 2017. There was a whole bunch of Ukrainian officials who had done things to try to help the Clinton campaign and the DNC and to harm the Trump campaign.

In addition, two news organizations, both POLITICO and the Financial Times did their own investigative reporting, and the Financial Times concluded that the opposition to President Trump led ‘Kiev’s wider political lead-up to the 2016 election’—the Financial Times.

So the idea that there is no evidence whatsoever of Ukrainians doing anything to interfere in any way is just not true. They come up here and say it again and again, and it is just not true.

The other thing I would like to point out, Manager SCHIFF is suggesting that somehow we are coming here and saying one thing and the Department of Justice is saying something else in court about litigation. That is also not true.

We have been very clear every time. The position of the Trump administration, like the Obama administration, is that what Congress seeks in an article III court is to try to enforce a subpoena against an executive branch official, that is not a justiciable controversy, and there is not jurisdiction over it. The House managers in the House, though, take the position that they have that power and they can go to court.

So our position is when we go to court, we will resist jurisdiction in the court, but if the House managers want to proceed to impeachment, where they claim that they have an alternative mechanism available to them, our position is, the Constitution requires incrementalism in conflicts between the branches, and that means that first there should be an accommodation process, and then Congress has to consider other mechanisms at its disposal, such as contempt or such as squeezing the President’s policies by withholding appropriations or other mechanisms to deal with that interbranch conflict or, if they claim they can sue in court, to sue in court. But an impeachment is a measure of last resort.

Now, earlier, Manager SCHIFF suggested that today in court, the Department of Justice went in and said: There is no jurisdiction. And when the judge said: Well, if there is no jurisdiction to sue, then what can Congress do? And the DOJ, the key representative, simply said: Well, if they can’t sue, then they can impeach—as if that was the direct answer to just go from if you can’t sue, the next step is impeachment.

Now that didn’t seem right to me, because I didn’t think that was what DOJ would be saying, and DOJ put out a statement: I don’t have a transcript of the hearing. They don’t have the transcript ready yet, as far as I know, but DOJ said, and this is a quote from the statement:

The point we made in court is simply that Congress has various political tools it can use in battles with the executive branch—appropriations, legislation, nominations, and potentially in some circumstances even impeachment. For example, it can hold up funding for the President’s preferred programs, pass legislation he opposes, or refuse to confirm his nominees.

This is continuing their statement:

But it is absurd for Chairman SCHIFF to portray our court’s finding of jurisdiction as somehow endorsing his rush to an impeachment trial.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator BLUMENTHAL to the House managers:

On April 24, 2019—one day after the media reported that former Vice President Biden would formally enter the 2020 U.S. Presidential race—the State Department executed a final removal order to recall Ambassador Marie Yovanovitch, a well-regarded career diplomat and anti-corruption crusader. Why did President Trump want, in his words, to “take her out”?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. Giuliani has provided the answer to that question. He stated publicly that the reason they needed to get Ambassador Yovanovitch out of the way was that she was going to get in the way of these investigations that they wanted. This is the President’s own lawyer’s explanation for why they had to push out—why they had to smear—Ambassador Yovanovitch.

So the President’s own lawyer gives us the answer, and that ought to tell us something in a couple of respects: one, that the President’s own agents have said that she was an impediment to getting these investigations. She was the anti-corruption fighter, a woman who had acid thrown in her face and died a painful death 15 months later. She is at the very center of acknowledging this other champion fighting corruption when she gets the word: You need to come back on the next plane.

One of the reasons the Ukrainians knew they had to deal with Rudy Giuliani is that Rudy Giuliani was trying to get this Ambassador replaced. And you, know, he succeeded. He succeeded, and that sent a message to the Ukrainians that if Rudy Giuliani had the juice with the President of the United States, the power with the President of the United States to recall an Ambassador from her post, this is nobody somebody who had the ear of the President but could make things happen.

So the short answer is that Rudy Giuliani tells us why she had to go.

Now why they had to smear her, why the President couldn’t simply recall her—that is harder to explain. But the reason they wanted her out of the way is they wanted to make these investigations go forward, and they knew someone there fighting corruption was getting in the way of the thing they wanted to get.

Now I wanted to say, with respect to some of the arguments against having the testimony of John Bolton, these are some of the former National Security Advisors who have been called to hearings and depositions: Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Advisor for President Carter, provided 8 hours of public hearing testimony and additional deposition testimony before the Senate Select Committee to Investigate Individuals Regarding the Interests of Foreign Governments; Admiral Poinsette testified, providing 25 hours of public hearing testimony and 20 hours of deposition testimony; and Robert McFarland, former National Security Advisor for President Ronald Reagan, provided over 20 hours of hearing testimony and 3 additional hours of deposition testimony; Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor to President Clinton, provided 2 hours of public hearing testimony before the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, about anti-corruption practices; Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor to President George W. Bush, 3 hours of public testimony, additional closed session testimony; Susan Rice provided direct testimony to the House Select Committee on how the Obama administration handled identification of U.S. citizens in U.S. intelligence reports.
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There is ample precedent where it is necessary to have testimony of National Security Advisors.

Now you saw, I think, President's counsel dancing on the head of a pin to try and explain why they are before you arguing: "We can't have these people come here; the House should sue in court" and why they are in court saying "The court can't hear it."

I have to say I have a great understanding of the difficulty of that position. I wouldn't want to be in a position of having to advocate that argument. But it goes to the demonstration of bad faith here. How can you be before this body saying "You have got to go to court; the House was derelict because it didn't go to court," and go to the same court and say "The House shouldn't be here"? How do you do that?

Now, they say: Well, the House is in court, so the House must think it is OK, even though we don't think so, and we urge you that and take it all the way up to the Supreme Court if we have to.

We don't think that is an adequate remedy. That is the whole problem. When you have bad faith indication of privilege when you have, in fact, non-assertion of privilege, when you have a President who wants to continue to cover up his wrongdoing indefinitely—a President who is trying to get foreign help on the very next election—that process of going endlessly up and down the courts with a duplicitive counsel to the President arguing "In one place you can do it and the other place you can't" shows the flaw with a precedent that Congress must exhaust all remedies before it can insist on answers with the ultimate remedy of impeachment.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I suggest we take a 5-minute break.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:13 p.m., sitting as a Court of Impeachment, recessed until 9:25 p.m., whereupon, the Senate reconvened when called to order by the CHIEF JUSTICE.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will come to order.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for myself and Senator LANKFORD.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, the question from Senators ERNST and LANKFORD is for the counsel for the President:

Members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which Manager SCHIFF sits as Chairman, conducted a number of depositions related to this impeachment inquiry. One of the individuals deposed was Intelligence Community Inspector General Michael Atkinson. Has the White House been provided a copy of this deposition transcript? Do you believe this transcript would be helpful? If so, why?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice and Senator, thank you for that question.

We have not been provided that transcript. My understanding is that the inspector general for the intelligence community, Mr. Atkinson, testified in the Executive session SSCI has retained that transcript in executive session and was not transmitted to the House Judiciary Committee, and, therefore, under the terms of H. Res. 660, was not turned over to the White House counsel, so we have not seen it. I just want to clarify: We don't think there is any need to start getting into more evidence or witnesses, but if one were to start going down that road, I think that that transcript could be relevant because it is my understanding, from public reports, that there were questions asked of the inspector general about his interactions with the whistleblower, and there is some question in public reports about whether the whistleblower was entirely truthful with the inspector general on the forms that were filled out and whether or not, you know, there were certain representations made about whether or not there had been any contact with Congress, and that then ties into the contact that the whistleblower apparently had with the staff and committee, which we also don't know about.

So if we were to go down the road, we don't think it necessary. We think that this—these Articles of Impeachment should be rejected. But if one were to go down the road with any more evidence or witnesses, it would certainly be relevant to find out what the inspector general of the intelligence community has to the whistleblower, along with the other issues that we mentioned about the whistleblower's bias, motivation: What were his connections with the whole situation of the Bidens? And, apparently, if he worked over with the Biden, did he work—he worked on Ukraine issues, according to public reports—how does that all tie in? All of those things would become relevant in that instance. Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator SINEMA.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, the question from Senators JONES, MANCHIN, and SINEMA is directed to the House managers:

So much of the questions and answers, as well as the presentations, have focused on the completeness of the House record. The House selected three protocols for the formal accommodations process with the Administration to negotiate for documents and witness testimonies after the passage of H. Res. 660. And regardless of whether the House record is sufficient or insufficient to find the President guilty or not guilty, what duty, if any, does the Senate owe to the American public to ensure that all relevant facts are made known in this trial and not at some point in the future?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators, thank you for the question.

It was apparent from the very beginning, when the President announced that they would fight all subpoenas, when the White House Counsel issued its October 8 diatribe saying they would not participate in any inquiry, that they were not interested in any accommodation.

We tried to get Don McGahn to testify. We tried that route. We have been trying that route for 9 months now. We tried for quite some time before we took that matter to court, with absolutely no success.

And I think what we have seen is, there was no desire on the part of the President to reach any accommodation. Quite the contrary. He was adamant that they were going to fight in every single way.

Now, if they had an interest in accommodation, we wouldn't be before you without a single document. There would have been hundreds and hundreds of documents provided. We would have entered an accommodation process over claims of—narrow claims of privilege as to this sentence or that sentence. They would have had to make a particularized claim that we could have negotiated over. But, of course, they did none of that.

They said: Your subpoenas are invalid. You have to depart from the bipartisan rules of how you conduct your depositions. Essentially, our idea of accommodation is you have to do it our way or the highway. And the President's marching orders were: Go pound sand.

Now, what is the Senate's responsibility in the context of a House impeachment for which there was such blanket obstruction? And bear in mind, if you compare this to the Nixon impeachment, Richard Nixon told his people to cooperate, provided documents to the Congress. Yes, there were some that were withheld, and that led to litigation, and the President lost that litigation. But the circumstances here are very different.

Frankly, the President could have made this difficult case but didn't because of the nature of the obstruction.

Now, in terms of the Senate's responsibility, the Constitution says:

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation.

And so you have the sole power. That expression is used, I believe, only twice in the Constitution: One, when it tells the House we have the sole power to conduct an impeachment proceeding; and, again, the process we used—and they can repeat this.
Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for that question.

The answer is, we don’t know. Nobody knows. We don’t know when the first contact was. We don’t know how many contacts there were. We don’t know what the substance of the contact was. That all remains shrouded in secrecy.

And as I said a moment ago, we think that the way this case has been presented to you would simply acquit. There is no need to get more evidence to probe into that.

But if we were to go down the road of any evidence or witnesses, then those are certainly relevant questions and relevant things to know about, to understand what those contacts were, what the whistleblower’s motivation was, what is the connection between the whistleblower and any staffers, and how that played any role in the formulation of the complaint. That would all be relevant to understand how this whole process began.

Now, I do want to mention something else, while I have the moment, in response to some things that Manager SCHIFF said.

Again, the House managers come up—it seems like they keep saying the same thing, and we keep pointing to actual evidence and letters that disprove what they are saying. They come up and say that the President said: It is my way or the highway—blind deference—there is nothing you can do. And they say that, well, they would have accommodated if we were willing to participate in the accommodation process.

The October 8 letter that Counsel for the President, who Mr. SCHIFF says acts in bad faith and called duplicitous here on the floor of the Senate, sent a letter on October 8 to Mr. SCHIFF and others explaining: “If the Committees were to be here, we would accommodate in the process as we have in the past, in a manner consistent with well-established bipartisan constitutional protections and a respect for the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution.”

That was followed up in an October 18 letter that I mentioned before, a letter that specified the defects in the subpoenas that had been issued—not blanket defiance, not simply “we don’t cooperate”—specifying the legal errors in the subpoenas.

And it concluded: “As I stated in my letter of October 8th, if the Committees were to be here, we would accommodate in the process as we have in the past, in a manner consistent with well-established bipartisan constitutional protections and a respect for the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution.”

The President stood ready to engage in the accommodations process. If anyone said: “My way or the highway” here, it was the House because the House was determined that they wanted just to get their impeachment process done on the fastest track they could. They didn’t want to do any accommodation. They didn’t want to do any litigation. They didn’t want anything to slow them down. They wanted to get it done so that they could so it was finished by Christmas.

It was a partisan charade from the beginning. It resulted in a partisan impeachment, with bipartisan opposition, and it is not something this Chamber should condone.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. I have a question I send to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator ROSEN is for the House managers:

During the President’s phone call with Ambassador Sondland he insisted there was no quid pro quo involved in the exchange of aid and a White House meeting for an investigation, but he also said, according to Sondland, that the stalemate over aid will continue until President Zelensky announces the investigations. Isn’t that the definition of the exact quid pro quo that the President claimed didn’t exist?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. The short answer is yes; that is exactly what a quid pro quo is.

When someone says: “I am not going to ask you to do this,” but then says: “I am going to ask you to do this,” that is exactly what happened here.

Sondland calls the President, and the first words out of his mouth are “no quid pro quo.” Now, that is suspicious enough when someone blurts out there—what we would find out is a false exculpatory, but then the President goes on, nonetheless, to say: “No quid pro quo.”

At the same time, Zelensky has got to go to the mic to announce these investigations—that is the implication—and he should want to do it. So no quid pro quo over the money, but Zelensky has got to go to the mic.

And if you have any question about the accuracy of that, you should demand to see Ambassador Taylor’s notes, Tim Morrison’s notes. And, of course, Sondland goes and tells Ukraine about this coupling of the money in order to get the investigations.

Let me just, if I can, go through a little of the history of that. You have Rudy Giuliani and others trying to make sure the Ukrainians make these statements in the runup to that July phone call. This is the quid pro quo over the meeting. So they are trying to get the statement that they want. They are trying to get the announcement of the investigations. And around this time, prior to the call, the President froze the aid on the military aid. And then you have that call, and the minute that Zelensky brings up the defense support and the desire to buy...
more Javelins, that is when the President immediately goes to the favor he wants.

So the Ukrainians, at this point, know that the White House meeting is conditioned on getting these investigations done. In that call, the minute military aid is brought up, the President pivots to the favor he wants of these investigations they already know about.

Now, after that call, the Ukrainians quickly find out about the freeze in aid. According to the former Deputy Foreign Minister, they found out within days. July 25 is the call. By the end of July, Ukraine finds out the aid is frozen. The Deputy Foreign Minister is told by Andriy Yermak: Keep this secret. We don’t want this getting out. She had planned to come to Washington. They canceled her trip to Washington because they don’t want this made public.

And so, in August, there is this effort to get these investigations announced. That is the only priority for the President and his men. So the Ukrainians know the aid is withheld. They know they can’t get the meeting. They know what the President wants, these investigations. The Ukrainians, like the Americans, can add up two plus two equals four. But if they had any question about that, Sondland removes all doubt on September 1 in Warsaw, when Sondland goes over—after the Pence-Zelensky meeting—he goes over to Yermak, and he says that “until you announce these investigations, you are not getting this aid.”

He makes explicit what they already knew—that not just the meeting but the aid itself was tied. And on September 7, Sondland tells Zelensky directly: The aid is tied to your doing investigations. And if it wasn’t clear enough, they understood withholding military aid without exceptions about that hold. The Ukrainians are sophisticated actors. As one of the witnesses said, they found out very quickly about this hold. The Ukrainians know about these investigations. And if it wasn’t clear enough, they understood the consequences of announcing these investigations. They tell Zelensky himself on September 7:

You are not getting the money without these investigations. And finally the resistance of this anti-corruption reform, Zelensky, is broken down. He desperately needs the aid. Finally, the resistance is broken down: All right; I will do it. He is going to go on CNN.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Kansas.

MR. MORAN. Mr. Chief Justice, I have a message to be sent to the desk, a question. It is on my behalf and on behalf of Senator Rubio, Senator Cruz, and Senator Risch.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators Moran, Cruz, Rubio, and Risch for the counsel for the President reads as follows:

Impeachment and removal are dramatic and consequential responses to Presidential conduct, especially in an election year with a highly divided citizenry. Yet checks and balances is an important constitutional principle. Does the Congress have other means—such as appropriations, confirmations, and oversight hearings—less damaging to our nation?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question. And yes, Congress has a lot of incremental steps, a lot of means short of impeachment or conflicts with the executive branch. That was the point that I was making a moment ago with respect to what the Department of Justice has said in litigation today where the absolute immunity for the President is actually or actually, I think it was a different issue in that case. I beg your pardon.

But anyway, there is a dispute in that case about information requests, and the point the DOJ was making there is the Constitution requires incremental steps where there is friction between the branches.

As I mentioned the other day, friction between the branches—between Congress and the executive—on information requests in particular is part of the constitutional design. It has been with us since the first administration. George Washington denied requests from Congress for information about the negotiation of the Jay Treaty. So from the very beginning, there has been this friction leading to jockeying for position and accommodations and confrontation and leading to ways of working things out when Congress demands information from the executive and the executive asserts to protect the interests of the executive branch, the sphere where the executive can be able to keep information confidential.

But the first step in response to that should be the accommodations process. And the courts have described that as constitutionally mandated, something that actually furthers the constitutional scheme, to have the branches negotiate and try to come to an arrangement that addresses the legitimate needs of both branches of the government.

Part of that accommodations process is—or as it gets—as the confrontation continues can involve Congress exercising the levers of authority that it has under article I to try to put pressure on the executive. So, for example, appropriations, not funding the policy priorities of a particular administration or cutting funding on some policy priorities. If there is an underlying legislation that the President favors or passing other legislation that the President doesn’t favor. Or the Senate has the power not to approve nominees. As I am sure many of you well know, having up nominees, the Senate can be effective in some points, putting pressure on an administration to get particular policies picked loose, things accomplished in a particular department or agency.

All of these elements of the interplay of the branches of government—that is part of the constitutional design. But impeachment is the very last resort for the very most serious conflict where there is no other way to resolve it.

So there are all of these multiple intermediate steps, and they all should be used. They all should be exercised in an incremental fashion. That is exactly what didn’t happen in this case. There was no attempt at the accommodations process. There was no attempt to respond to the legal issues, the legal defects that counsel for the President and the departments and agencies pointed out in each of the subpoenas that were issued by the House committees.

Then even the issue of agency counsel—there was no attempt to try to negotiate. And that is really something that, in the past—even last April, with the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with Chairman Cummings, there was a dispute about that. We wouldn’t allow a witness to go without agency counsel, and then we had a meeting with Chairman Cummings, and it got worked out. And it was turned into a transcribed interview. And then the—but agency counsel was permitted to be there. But the committee got the interview. They got to talk to the person. They got the information they wanted. But the executive branch got to have agency counsel there to protect executive branch interests. That is the way it is supposed to work, but there was no attempt at anything like that from the House in this case.

Thank you.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

MR. MARKLEY. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for the House managers.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Senator MARKKEY’s question for the House managers reads as follows:

It has recently been reported that the Russians have hacked the Ukrainian natural gas company Burisma, presumably looking for information on Hunter Biden. Our intelligence community has warned us that the Russians will be interfering in the upcoming election. Donald Trump Jr. has been part of these discussions but is later found to have invited Russian or other foreign interference
in our 2020 election, what recourse will there be for Congress under the Dershowitz standard for impeachment, which requires a president to have committed a statutory crime?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senator, absolutely no recourse ever. If, in fact, it were later to be shown that not only did the Russians hack Burisma to try to get dirt on the Bidens and drip, drip, drip it out as they did in the 2016 election—let’s say it were found that they did so at the request of the President of the United States; that in one of these meetings that the President had with Vladimir Putin, whose contents is unknown, that the President of the United States asked the President of Russia to hack Burisma because he couldn’t get the Ukrainians to do what he wanted, so now he was turning to the Russians to do it. Under the Dershowitz theory of the case, under the President’s theory of the case, that is perfectly fine.

But still, that is not how bad it is because it goes further than that. If the President went further and said to Putin in that secret meeting: I want you to hack Burisma. I couldn’t get the Ukrainians in it to do it, and I will tell you what I want Burisma and you give me some good stuff, then I am going to stop sending money to Ukraine. And I will go a step further. I am going to stop sending money to Ukraine so that they can’t fight you in Donbass. And that is more, those sanctions that we imposed on you for your intervention on my behalf in the last election, I am going to make those go away. I am going to simply refuse to enforce them. I am going to call it a policy difference.

That is perfectly fine under their standard. That is not an abuse of power. You can’t say that is criminal. Yet it is akin to crime—or maybe it is not, but that is what an acquittal here means. It means that the President is free to engage in all the rest of that conduct, and it is perfectly fine.

And what is the remedy that my colleagues representing the President say that you have to that abuse? Well, you can hold up a nominee. That seems wholly out of scale with the magnitude of the problem. That process of the appropriations or nominations is not sufficient for a Chief Executive Officer of the United States who will betray the national security for his own personal interest, even if the President is free to call the rest of that conduct, and it is perfectly fine.

He got on the phone with Zelensky asking for this favor the day after Bob Mueller testifies. What do you think he will be capable of doing the day after he is acquitted here, the day after he feels: I have dodged another bullet. I really am beyond the reach of the law. My Attorney General says I can’t be indicted; I can’t even be investigated. He closed the investigation into this matter before he even opened it. And I can’t be impeached either. I have got the best of both worlds. I have got Bill Barr saying I can’t be investigated. I can’t be prosecuted. I can be impeached, however. That is what Bill Barr says. But I have got other lawyers who say I can’t be impeached.

That is a recipe for a President who is above the law. Not only is it not required by the Constitution—quite the contrary. The Founders knew, coming from a monarchy, that if they were going to give extraordinary powers to their new Executive, they needed an extraordinary constraint. They needed a constraint commensurate with the evil which they sought to contain. That remedy is not holding up a nomination. The remedy they gave for an Executive that would abuse their power and endanger the country, that would endanger the integrity of our elections, was the power of impeachment.

As one of the experts said in the House, if this conduct isn’t an impeachable offense, then nothing is.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators ALEXANDER, CRUZ, PORTMAN, TOOMEY, SULLIVAN, and MURkowski to the counsel for the President:

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator GRAHAM and the other Senators is for the counsel for the President:

Assuming for argument’s sake that Bolton were to testify in the light most favorable to the allegations contained in the Articles of Impeachment, that there was no quid pro quo, there was no connection, even if John Bolton would call the reaction to a charge like this a demurrer. You demur and simply say, even if everything you say is true, that is not an impeachable offense under the law. And that is an appropriate response here. Even if everything you allege is true, even if John Bolton would say it is true, that is not an impeachable offense under the constitutional standard because the way you have to define that standard, this theory of abuse of power is far too malleable. It goes purely to subjective intent. It can’t be relied upon.

The third level of my answer is this. We have demonstrated that there is a legitimate public policy interest in both of the matters that were raised on that telephone call: the 2016 election interference and the Biden Burisma affair. Because there is a legitimate public policy interest in those issues, even if it were true that there was some connection, even if it were true that the President had suggested or thought that, well, maybe I should hold up this aid until they do something, that is perfectly permissible where there is that legitimate public policy interest.

It is just the same as if there is an investigation going on. The President would have foreign policy provide some assistance. It is a legitimate foreign policy interest to get that assistance. It is legitimate to use the levers of foreign policy to secure that assistance. So because there is a legitimate foreign policy interest in those issues—and I think we have demonstrated that clearly—it would be permissible for there to be that linkage.

But again, I will close where I began, which is there was no such linkage here. I just want to make that clear. But taking for the sake of argument the question as phrased, even if Ambassador Bolton would testify to that,
even if you assumed it were true, there is no impeachable offense stated in the Articles of Impeachment.

Thank you. 

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. 

The Senator from Illinois. 

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk. 

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. 

The question from Senator DURBIN for the House managers: 

Would you please respond to the answer that was just given by the President’s counsel? 

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senators, it has been a long couple of days, so let me be blunt about where I think we are. I think we all know what happened here. I think we all understand what the President did here. I don’t think there is really much question about why the military aid was withheld or why President Zelensky couldn’t get in the door of the Oval Office. That is not impeachable. 

I think they would be aghast that anyone would make that argument on the floor of the Senate. I think they would be aghast, having come out of a monarchy, having literally risked their lives, having taken this great gamble that people could be entrusted to govern a country and choose their own leaders, recognizing that we are not angels, setting up a system that would have ambition, counterambition, that we would so willingly abdicate that responsibility and say that now has been handed to the full power to coerce our ally—a foreign power to intervene in our election—because they think it is in the national interest that they get re-elected. 

Is that really what we think the Founders would have condoned or do we think that this is precisely the kind of character of conduct that they provided a remedy for? I think we know the answer to that. 

They wrote a beautiful Constitution. They understood a lot about human nature. They understood, as we do, that absolute power corrupts absolutely. And they provided a constraint, but it will only be as good and as strong as the men and women of this institution’s willingness to uphold it, to not look away from the truth. 

The truth is staring us in the eyes. We know why they don’t want John Bolton to testify. It is not because we don’t really know what happened here. They just don’t want the American people to hear it in all of its ugly, graphic detail. They don’t want the President’s National Security Advisor on live TV or even a nonlive deposition to say: I talked with the President, and he told me in no uncertain terms: John—

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager. 

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. To be continued. 

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Georgia. 

Mrs. LOEFFLER. I send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators HAWLEY, CRUZ, PERDUE, GARDNER, LANKFORD, HOEVEN, TOOMEY, SCOTT of Florida, PORTMAN, and FISCHER. 

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you. 

The question from Senator LOEFFLER and the other Senators is for the counsel of the President: 

As reported by Politico, “in January 1999, then-Sen Joe Biden argued strongly against deposing additional witnesses or seeking new evidence in a memo sent to fellow Democrats ahead of Bill Clinton’s impeachment trial.” Politico reports that Sen SCHUMER agreed with Biden. Why should the Biden rule not apply here? 

Mr. Counsel SEKULOW. Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Senate, in a memorandum dated January 5, 1999, that is captioned “Arguments in Support of a Chief Executive Trial,” Senator Biden discussed some history first regarding two Senate impeachment proceedings that were put forward in the Senate that were summarily decided. This is what he said: 

These two cases demonstrate that the Senate may dismiss articles of impeachment without holding a full trial or taking any evidence. Put another way, the disposition does not impose on the Senate the duty to hold a trial. In fact, the Senate need not hold a trial even though the House wishes to present evidence and hold a full trial (Blount and the elements of jurisdiction are present (English). 

He went on to say:

In a number of previous impeachment trials, the Senate has declined to hold a judgment in its constitutional role as sole trier of impeachments does not require it to take new evidence or hear live witness testimony. 

This follows from the Senate’s consideration of motions for summary disposition in at least three trials [and it listed the three trials of Judges Ritter, Clasborne, and Nixon]. In each, the Senate considered a motion for summary disposition on the merits and in no case did the Senate decline to consider a hearing for summary disposition as beyond the Senate’s authority or as forbidden by the Constitution. 

The Framers did not mean that this political process was to be a partisan game. Instead, they wanted to be political in the higher sense. The process was to be conducted in the way that would best secure the public interest or, in their phrase, the “general welfare.” That was the Biden doctrine of impeachment proceedings. 

Now, some Members in this Chamber agreed with that. Some Members that serve on the—as managers also agreed with that. But now the rules are different. The rules are different because Majority Leader SCHUMER just moments ago did what he is now famous for and created a conversation, purportedly from the President of the United States, regarding Russia hacking of Burisma. And it is the same thing he did when he started a hearing for summary disposition. 

So this is a common practice. But if we want to look at common practice and common procedures, the Biden rule is one. I would like to address something that became another thing in the last 4 days and time and time again about these judges have decided this issue of executive privilege. I want to address two things very quickly. 

My very first case at the Supreme Court of the United States—and it was a long time ago, over 30—over 30 years ago, 33 years ago. My client lost in the district court. They said: Well, we will appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. We went to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and filed a petition for certiorari. The petition was successful and did not win there either. My client said: Well, what do we do? I said: We have one option. We can file a petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States. Counsel are they going to take the case. But at this point, it is an important issue to you, so why don’t we proceed. My client agreed to proceed. 

A petition for certiorari was granted, and the Court reversed it to 0. And that is why we continue to utilize courts when appropriate. That is why you do it. And you don’t rely on what a district court judge says.
The last thing I want to say, they are asking you, as a Senate body, to waive executive privilege on the President of the United States. Think about that for a moment. They are asking you to vote to determine or have the Chief Justice in his individual capacity as a President to waive executive privilege as it relates to the President of the United States. And that is what they think is the appropriate role for this proceeding to continue. I think you should adopt the Biden rule.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chief Justice, thank you. I would like to send a question to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator WARNER.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators BENNET and WARNER is to the House managers:

Mr. Sekulow said that if the Senate votes for witnesses, he will call a long chain of witnesses that will greatly lengthen the trial. Isn’t that what we will establish by majority vote which, and how many witnesses there will be? Isn’t it also true that prior impeachment trials in the Senate commonly had a witness. Did not testify in the House?

Mr. Manager JEFFRIES. I thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. I thank the distinguished Senators for their questions.

It certainly is the case that all we are asking the Senate to do is to hold a full and fair trial consistent with the Senate’s responsibility—article I, section 3 of this Constitution: “The Senate shall have the sole Power” with respect to an impeachment trial. And this great institution has interpreted that, during the 15 different impeachment trials that have taken place during our Nation’s history, that a full and fair trial means witnesses, because this institution, every time it has held a trial, has heard witnesses all 15 times, including in several instances where there were witnesses who did not testify in the House who testified in the Senate.

Now, the point was raised earlier about Benghazi. And Trey Gowdy—he is a good man. I served with him. He is a very talented lawyer. I am sure he is pleased—the distinguished gentleman from the Palmetto State—that his name has been brought into this proceeding.

Mr. Gowdy, according to one of the questions, said that the administration didn’t cooperate. The White House, in that instance, and the State Department turned over tens of thousands of documents pursuant to a House subpoena. That is cooperation.

Several witnesses appeared voluntarily in Benghazi, including GEN David Petraeus, former CIA Director; Susan Rice, who at the time was the National Security Advisor; Ben Rhodes, the Deputy National Security Advisor; ADM Mike Mullen, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; GEN Carter Ham, former commander of AFRICOM; Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, who also showed up; GEN Michael Flynn, former DIA Director. Who else showed up? The former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton. She testified publicly under oath for 11 hours. That is cooperation.

What happened in this particular instance? No documents, no witnesses, no information, no cooperation, no negotiation, no reasonable accommodation—blanket defiance. That is what resulted in the obstruction of Congress article.

So all we are asking for is the Senate to hold a fair trial consistent with past practice. At every single trial this Senate has held, the average number of witnesses was 33. We cannot normalize lawlessness. We cannot normalize corruption. We cannot normalize abuse of power—a fair trial.

Lastly, of the witnesses that did testify, voluntarily showed up, what did they have to say? These were Trump administration witnesses.

Ambassador Sondland, how did he characterize the shakedown scheme, the geopolitical shakedown at the heart of these allegations? Ambassador Sondland, “quid pro quo”; Ambassador Taylor, “Mutual gain” “a domestic political errand” Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, “improper”; John Bolton, “drug deal.”

What would the Framers have said? The highest of high crimes against the Constitution.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. I have a question to send to the desk.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senator ROMNEY is for both parties, and I believe the House manager will go first.

Do you have any evidence that anyone was directed by President Trump to tell the Ukrainians that security assistance was being held upon the condition of an investigation into the Bidens?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senator, the answer was: “We do that all the time; get over it.”

So Ambassador Sondland has acknowledged the tie between the two. So did Mick Mulvaney. And I think that video is now etched in our minds for all of history. Trying to walk that back as he may, he was quite adamant about what he does, and the reporter even followed up when he said that part of the reason why they held up the aid was the desire for this investigation into 2016. And the reporter said: Well, what you are saying is a quid pro quo. You don’t get the money unless you do the investigation, and the reporter even followed up when he said that part of the reason why they held up the aid was the desire for this investigation into 2016. And the reporter said: Well, what you are saying is a quid pro quo. You don’t get the money unless you do the investigation.

So you have it from the President’s own Chief of Staff. You have it from one of the three amigos, the President’s point people. And bear in mind, Ambassador Sondland—of course, not a Never Trumper; a million-dollar donor to the Trump inaugural; someone the President deputized to have a significant part of the story; someone who, given he is an EU Ambassador, if this was about burden-sharing, would have said this was about burden-sharing, but he didn’t, of course. He said it was about the investigations.

The third direct witness would be John Bolton if we are allowed to bring him before you.

But there already are witnesses and evidence in the record of people who spoke directly to the President about this and to which the conditionality was made clear.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

Mr. Counsel PURPURA. Mr. Chief Justice, Senator, thank you for your question.

I believe the question was, is there any evidence that anyone told—that President Trump had anyone tell the Ukrainians directly that the aid was linked to investigations into the Bidens?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Senator, thank you for that question, and the answer in the House record is no. I described this on Saturday when I walked through it at length, and so I refer back to that presentation.

Ambassador Sondland and Senator JOHNSON. Ambassador Sondland and Senator JOHNSON. Ambassador Sondland indicated in approximately the September 9 timeframe—as we all heard his statement, he asked the President. The President said: “I want nothing. I want nothing. I want no quid pro quo.”

And you heard a lot from the House managers about, go out to the microphones or make this—do the right thing. But I believe the statement was, he needs to do the right thing. He needs to do what he campaigned on.

Even early, Senator JOHNSON—again, because Ambassador Sondland told Senator JOHNSON that there was a linkage. So Senator JOHNSON asked the President directly, and we know the answer to that. The President said: Was there any connection—when Senate was asked about the possible connection between security assistance and investigations, the President answered: “No way. I would never do...
that. Who told you that?" And the answer was Sondland. And Ambassador Sondland had come to that presumption prior to speaking to the President. And we saw the montage from Ambassador Sondland about presumptions and assumptions and guessing and speculating between the President and Claudio Sondland. So we begin to remember the montage in which Ambassador Sondland was asked: Did anyone on the planet tell you that the aid was linked to the investigations? And his answer was no.

So the House report before us, there is no evidence that the President told anyone to tell the Ukrainians that the aid was linked. And, in fact, the article from the Daily Beast yesterday—

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. Counsel PURPURA. Thank you, Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. Chief Justice, I send a question to the desk for Senator SCHATS, for Senator CARPER, and for myself.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question is for the House managers from Senators MERKLEY, SCHATS, and CARPER.

Yesterday, Alan Dershowitz stated that a President cannot be impeached for soliciting foreign interference in his re-election campaign if he thinks it’s in the public interest. The President himself has said “I have the right to do whatever I want as President.” Aren’t these views exactly what our Framers warned about: an imperial President escaping accountability? If these arguments prevail, won’t future Presidents have the unchecked ability to use their office to manipulate future elections like corrupt foreign leaders in Russia and Venezuela?

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Thank you for the question, Senator. Before I address it, I just want to complete my answer to the last question.

On September 7, the President has a conversation with Gordon Sondland, and the President says: No quid pro quo, but Zelensky has got to go to the mic, and he should want to do so.

This is in the context of whether the aid is being withheld in order to secure the investigations. After that call on the same day, Sondland calls Zelensky, the President of Ukraine, and says: You are not going to get the money unless you do the investigations.

So you have got the communication between the President and Sondland and Sondland conveying the message to the Ukrainians in short succession. And so I think you see that the message the President gave to Sondland was, in fact, communicated immediately to the Ukrainians.

Of course, Sondland went on to explain to Ambassador Taylor and to Tim Morrison that the President wanted Zelensky to say that he had investigation. What was meant by that is he wanted him to have to go out and announce publicly these investigations if he were going to get the money. Remember, Sondland explained that the President is a businessman, and before he gives away something, he wants to—before he signs the check, he wants to get the deliverable. Ambassador Taylor says: That does not make any sense. Ukraine does not owe him anything.

So it was clear to everyone, including the Ukrainians, that they were not going to get the money unless they did the investigations that the President wanted. That is the connection on September 7 that makes it crystal clear.

In terms of the Dershowitz argument, when coupled with a President who believes that, under article II, he can do whatever he wants, yes, I mean, this is the description of a President, not just of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power because, if a President can take this action and extort one country, he can extort any country. If he can make a deal with the President of Venezuela or take an action that is antagonistic to what Congress has legislated with respect to that country and can violate the law in doing it to get help in his reelection—and I think that example is a perfect example of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power

That brings us to the question that I think Senator KING asked about is did the aid was linked. And, in fact, the answer was no.

In terms of the Dershowitz argument, when coupled with a President who believes that, under article II, he can do whatever he wants, yes, I mean, this is the description of a President, not just of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power because, if a President can take this action and extort one country, he can extort any country. If he can make a deal with the President of Venezuela or take an action that is antagonistic to what Congress has legislated with respect to that country and can violate the law in doing it to get help in his reelection—and I think that example is a perfect example of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power

That is the logical extension not just to what Professor Dershowitz said yesterday but to what the President’s counsel said today. You can accept every fact of the articles, and we still think it’s a totally legitimate and constitutional. The President can extort an ally by withholding military aid and withholding meetings. He can ask them to do sham investigations, even if you acknowledge the fact that they are sham investigations. In fact, they don’t even have to be done; they just have to be announced, and there is nothing Congress can do about it. That is a prescription for a President with no constraint.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, Mr. Manager.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. Chief Justice, I, along with Senator LEE, send to the desk a question for the President’s counsel.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you.

The question from Senators BRAUN and LEE is for the counsel for the President.

Under Professor Dershowitz’s theory, is what Joe Biden is alleged to have done potentially impeachable, in contrast to what has been alleged against President Trump?

Mr. Counsel PHILBIN. Mr. Chief Justice, Senators, thank you for the question. I believe that, under Professor Dershowitz’ theory, remember, he tried to categorize things into three buckets. One was of purely good motives. One was, well, you might have some motive for your personal political gain, as well as public interest motives for doing something or intent. Then there was the third bucket of purely private pecuniary gain, that is what the President is accused of.

I think that would be the distinguishing factor in what is potentially a problem. Vice President Biden in charge of Ukraine policy. His son is sitting on the board of a company that is known for corruption. The public reports are that, apparently, the prosecutor general was investigating that company at the time. Then Vice President Biden quite openly said that he leveraged $1 billion in U.S. loan guarantees to ensure that that particular prosecutor was fired at that time. Vice President Biden in charge of Ukraine policy. His son is sitting on the board of a company that is known for corruption. The public reports are that, apparently, the prosecutor general was investigating that company at the time. Then Vice President Biden quite openly said that he leveraged $1 billion in U.S. loan guarantees to ensure that that particular prosecutor was fired at that time.

One could put together fairly easily from those known facts the suggestion that there was a family financial benefit coming from the end of that investigation because it protected the position of the younger Biden on the board, and that would be a purely private pecuniary gain.

So it was clear to everyone, including the Ukrainians, that they were not going to get the money unless they did the investigations that the President wanted. That is the connection on September 7 that makes it crystal clear.

In terms of the Dershowitz argument, when coupled with a President who believes that, under article II, he can do whatever he wants, yes, I mean, this is the description of a President, not just of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power because, if a President can take this action and extort one country, he can extort any country. If he can make a deal with the President of Venezuela or take an action that is antagonistic to what Congress has legislated with respect to that country and can violate the law in doing it to get help in his reelection—and I think that example is a perfect example of an imperial President but of an absolute President with absolute power.
have witnesses. We are told we can’t have witnesses because, after all, the House says we proved our case, as we have. So why should we need witnesses? Well, that is like saying that, in a bank robbery, the DA announces that he has proved his case. He has had all the witnesses. Then an eyewitness shows up, and he shouldn’t be allowed to testify because, after all, the DA was sure he proved his case first. That is absurd, and any 10-year-old knows it is absurd.

Thus is the President’s case against witnesses, that we have had enough. There is always more. There aren’t too many more here. The fact is, when there are witnesses to be asked, they should be asked.

Second, there is only one real question in this trial. Everything else is a distraction—a three-card Monte game being played by the President’s counsel—distractions. Don’t look at the real question. Look at everything else. Everyone is irrelevant. Look at the whistleblower—who? Look at the House procedures—irrelevant. Look at the Steele dossier—irrelevant.

There is only one relevant question: Did the President abuse his power by violating the law to withhold military aid from a foreign country and extort that country into helping him—into helping his reelection campaign—by slandering his opponent? That is the only relevant question for the trial.

The House managers have proved that question beyond any doubt.

The one thing the House managers think the President’s counsel got right is quoting me as saying “beyond any doubt.” It is, indeed, beyond any doubt.

That is why all of these distractions are distractions—distractions. That is why the President’s people are telling you to avoid witnesses—because they are afraid of witnesses. They know the witnesses—they know Mr. Bolton and others will only strengthen the case.

And, yes, we hear: Well, if the House managers say their case is so strong, why do you need more witnesses? Because the truth can be bolstered.

I yield back.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Thank you, counsel.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES

In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, Mr. Blumenthal (for himself, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Durbin) hereby give notice in writing of his intention to move to suspend the following portions of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials during the impeachment trial in the Senate of President Donald John Trump:

(1) In Rule XXIV, the phrases “without debate”, “except when the doors shall be closed”, “and”, and “; to be had without debate”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUSPEND THE RULES

In accordance with Rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I (for myself, Mr. Blumenthal, and Mr. Durbin) hereby give notice in writing of my intention to move to suspend the following portions of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials during the impeachment trial in the Senate of President Donald John Trump:

(1) The phrase “without debate” in Rule VII.

(2) The following portion of Rule XX: “, unless the Senate shall direct the doors to be closed while deliberating upon its decisions. A motion to close the doors may be acted upon without objection, or, if objection is heard, the motion shall be voted on without debate by the yeas and nays, which shall be entered on the record.”

(3) In Rule XXIV, the phrases “without debate”, “except when the doors shall be closed for deliberation, and in that case”, and “; to be had without debate”.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will come to order. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. McConnel. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the trial adjourn until 1 p.m. Friday, January 31.

There being no objection, at 10:40 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, adjourned until Friday, January 31, 2020, at 1 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:41 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 3201. An act to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it renews the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2153. An act to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3621. An act to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3331. An act to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3338. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative partnerships, and research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold
FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(d), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Richard Shelby:</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>1,366.56</td>
<td>1,366.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>978.00</td>
<td>978.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,922.11</td>
<td>1,922.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator John Kennedy:</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>1,366.56</td>
<td>1,366.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>933.00</td>
<td>933.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,873.03</td>
<td>1,873.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Tommy Baldwin:</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Lira</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>6,114.60</td>
<td>6,114.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Chris Van Hollen:</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>709.12</td>
<td>709.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>70.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>18,934.23</td>
<td>18,934.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Sheldon Moore Capito:</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>389.01</td>
<td>389.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>44.10</td>
<td>44.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>286.30</td>
<td>286.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:
- H.R. 2153. An act to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
- H.R. 4331. An act to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5338. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.
## Delegation Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Exchange Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dollar</strong></td>
<td>$12,742.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,742.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bahrain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dinar</strong></td>
<td>775.80</td>
<td>0.006617</td>
<td>5,039.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qatar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Riyal</strong></td>
<td>775.80</td>
<td>0.001945</td>
<td>1,518.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 24, 1977.*

---

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

**S741**

**CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22**

### Authentication

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Jan. 29, 2020.

**CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22**

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Exchange Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dollar</strong></td>
<td>$13,199.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,199.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazil</strong></td>
<td><strong>Real</strong></td>
<td>772.07</td>
<td>0.000323</td>
<td>249.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**President of the Senate:**

January 30, 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>580.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Dilsbard</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>580.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>8,378.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,378.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvare Smith</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>580.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>8,378.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,378.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Pirkla</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>580.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>11,203.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,203.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>580.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,765.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>712.51</td>
<td>2,477.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Pashuck</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,725.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,725.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>457.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Walker</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,724.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,724.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>413.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>413.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Marsha Blackburn</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2,784.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,784.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Franc</td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,138.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,138.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Mastango</td>
<td>Franc</td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,138.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,138.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Franc</td>
<td>121.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Tammy Duckworth</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,030.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,030.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Ronder</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>772.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>772.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Nields</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>729.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>729.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Garmsen</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>987.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>987.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Herdajs</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Angus King, Jr.</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2,146.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>602.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>602.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen M. Smith</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>602.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>602.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Tim Kaine</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>601.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>601.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3,103.12</td>
<td>7,192.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,295.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Joni Ernst</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>417.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>2,77.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanhri</td>
<td>386.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>386.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>417.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Geswein</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2,09.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,09.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanhri</td>
<td>237.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>237.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Kristen E. Gillibrand</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>417.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>237.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>446.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>446.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elana Broitman</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanhri</td>
<td>237.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>237.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Faisten</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>446.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>446.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanhri</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>238.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>3,118.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,118.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Baxten</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>910.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>910.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>14,464.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,464.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>785.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>785.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariash McKeonan Cooper</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>14,465.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,465.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>805.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>805.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Epstein</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,394.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,394.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>518.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>518.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Salton</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,161.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,161.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>756.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>756.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Hryvnia</td>
<td>535.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>535.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>464.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>464.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Safir</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>12,143.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,143.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>722.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>722.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Hryvnia</td>
<td>583.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>487.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>487.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Talles</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>13,326.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,326.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>795.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>795.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Hryvnia</td>
<td>484.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>484.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and country</td>
<td>Name of currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Zloty</td>
<td>455.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Hryvnia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,094.31</td>
<td>1,350.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Zloty</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>311.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>9,647.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,647.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Dong</td>
<td>714.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>714.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thai Baht</td>
<td>870.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>870.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>9,647.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,647.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Dong</td>
<td>714.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>714.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thai Baht</td>
<td>870.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>870.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Dong</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thai Baht</td>
<td>256.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Rick Scott:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>337.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>705.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Arias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>282.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>744.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>744.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Deb Fischer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>486.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>486.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,069.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,069.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Leviner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>485.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,067.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,067.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>3,084.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>570.76</td>
<td>3,654.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,777.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,777.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Cardin</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12,367.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,367.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>694.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>694.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>246.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Winkler</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12,450.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,450.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>627.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>627.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>259.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>259.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus V. Wiley:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12,455.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,455.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>629.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>629.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>237.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>13,117.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,117.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>1,054.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,054.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Winkler</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>13,117.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,117.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>381.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>381.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>284.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>284.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,354.76</td>
<td>43,232.70</td>
<td>32,800.51</td>
<td>523,387.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JAMES INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Jan. 24, 2020.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>1,440.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,440.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,973.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,973.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>983.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>983.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorio Richter:</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1,191.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,191.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,724.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,724.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>734.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>734.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>2,343.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,343.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,796.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,796.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,046.48</td>
<td>6,071.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,117.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MIKE CRAPO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Jan. 14, 2020.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Exner:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>555.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>555.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>13,515.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,515.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22

#### U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>340.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>712.23</td>
<td>712.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>172.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>239.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>239.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>428.62</td>
<td>428.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>323.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>323.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>113.94</td>
<td>113.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>820.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>820.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>850.25</td>
<td>850.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,063.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,063.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,377.19</td>
<td>1,377.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,517.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

**Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Jan. 24, 2020.**

### CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22

#### U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Lisa Murkowski</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>5,973.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,973.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>924.89</td>
<td>924.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Krona</td>
<td>1,819.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,819.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses*</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,498.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,498.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,390.52</td>
<td>1,390.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,609.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,609.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hoerner:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>997.05</td>
<td>997.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Frede:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,014.25</td>
<td>1,014.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td>1,779.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Thomas:</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,423.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,390.52</td>
<td>1,390.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses*</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,423.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,423.48</td>
<td>1,423.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,326.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,326.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>851.11</td>
<td>851.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Krona</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses*</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td>1,473.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,517.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

**Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Jan. 21, 2020.**

### CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22

#### U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>5,973.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,973.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>924.89</td>
<td>924.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Krona</td>
<td>1,609.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,609.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses*</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,609.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td>1,677.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,571.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td>5,225.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,517.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

**Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Jan. 24, 2020.**
### Delegation Expenses:

*Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.*

#### Delegation Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CHF-Swiss Franc</td>
<td>1,899.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,364.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,899.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,364.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>22,144.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CHF-Swiss Franc</td>
<td>1,816.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,075.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,816.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,075.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,170.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CHF-Swiss Franc</td>
<td>1,694.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,075.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,694.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,075.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>12,144.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CHF-Swiss Franc</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>870.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>870.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canadian Dollar</td>
<td>1,874.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CHF-Swiss Franc</td>
<td>2,696.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,245.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,696.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,245.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,938.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,536.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,605.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,164.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,510.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delegation Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>190.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>190.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>15,045.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>175.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Peso</td>
<td>1,392.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>229.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>480.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,106.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>15,396.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>273.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>New Taiwan Dollar</td>
<td>191.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>539.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong Dollar</td>
<td>401.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>15,787.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>273.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>New Taiwan Dollar</td>
<td>191.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>539.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong Dollar</td>
<td>401.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>15,787.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>382.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
<td>296.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>16,532.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and country</td>
<td>Name of currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency amount</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Transportation currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Miscellaneous currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Total currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Saso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Crouch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Toulouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Mawiae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Akin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen Brink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Akin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Dougherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Candon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Hage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamn Schreiber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolfe Michael Schiffer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Currency amounts are listed in the currency of the country and the equivalent in U.S. dollars.
- The total amount is the sum of the foreign currency and its U.S. dollar equivalent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexican Peso</td>
<td>1,279.00</td>
<td>2,879.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,158.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2,879.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,879.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Olivia Moore</td>
<td>Mexican Peso</td>
<td>1,319.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,095.00</td>
<td>2,414.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1,095.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexican Peso</td>
<td>967.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>967.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,423.09</td>
<td>217,328.12</td>
<td>47,783.85</td>
<td>318,535.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE
S747

**U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Michael B. Enzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>677.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>677.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,341.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,341.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>612.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>612.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>2,434.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,434.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>2,796.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,796.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,030.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,030.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Maggie Hassan</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>10,705.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,705.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>10,705.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,705.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>301.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>535.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>535.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>717.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>717.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Jacky Rosen</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>716.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>978.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>978.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Richard Blumenthal</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>7,643.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,643.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>650.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>1,058.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,058.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>370.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>370.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>370.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Maggie Hassan</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>351.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>822.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>822.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>302.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>302.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Jacky Rosen</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>797.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>797.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>321.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>760.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>312.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>446.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>446.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,470.87</td>
<td>29,554.37</td>
<td>11,155.57</td>
<td>55,180.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE
S747

**U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Lindsey Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Rial</td>
<td>769.30</td>
<td>9,593.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,362.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Chuck Grassley</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>769.30</td>
<td>9,593.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,362.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>136.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td>136.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Rial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,691.90</td>
<td>28,780.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,142.37</td>
<td>1,142.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,578.97</td>
<td>1,578.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,751.67</td>
<td>23,751.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 503(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

## CONSERVATIY REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses: *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dirham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>944.56</td>
<td>944.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>944.56</td>
<td>944.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 503(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

## CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator John Boozman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Thad Cochran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McHugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bodie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDermott Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe Bartlett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses: *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,223.15</td>
<td>13,705.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 503(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

## CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Total Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Roy Blunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Estes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Ron Wyden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Akers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Rosenwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and country</td>
<td>Name of currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Clise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,292.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,292.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,292.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Wilig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Estridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>896.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>594.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Clise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>896.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>594.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Richard  Burr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,742.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>443.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,931.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>896.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>191.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>594.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Estridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,185.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,343.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,343.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,470.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,516.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,516.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Clise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael  Pezner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,594.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Mahler-Haug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,366.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,366.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,959.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Clise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Consolidated Report of Expenditure of Funds for Foreign Travel by Members and Employees of the U.S. Senate, Under Authority of Sec. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), Committee on Intelligence for Travel from July 1 to Sept. 30, 2019—Continued**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegation Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Massaro</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>873.04</td>
<td>3,255.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,128.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,412.00</td>
<td>32,672.62</td>
<td>3,951.92</td>
<td>47,036.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROGER WICKER,

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Parker</td>
<td>Tunisia Dinar</td>
<td>670.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>894.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>894.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,834.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,834.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>915.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>915.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>936.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>936.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Pesos</td>
<td>1,088.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,088.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,065.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,065.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENATOR ROGER WICKER,

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Bodian</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>181.32</td>
<td>1,099.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,352.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>1,088.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,088.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Pesos</td>
<td>1,089.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,089.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,754.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,754.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENATOR CHARLES SCHUMER,

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and country</th>
<th>Name of currency</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
<td>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert/sec.</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1,329.24</td>
<td>4,145.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,474.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>1,834.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,834.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>915.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>915.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Pesos</td>
<td>913.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>913.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,397.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,397.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Delegation expenses include official expenses reimbursed to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and may include S. Res. 179 funds agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Mr. McCONNEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 86, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:43 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 31, 2020, at 1 p.m.