Sheila Jackson-Lee:
Important article for anyone concerned about the rule of law. It reveals that @realDonaldTrump reached out to @MattWhitaker46 to replace the top prosecutor in #SDNY - part of a sustained pattern of possible #obstructionofjustice #trumprussia #collusion
2/20/19
Twitter: https://twitter.com/JacksonLeeTX18/status/1098233974084812801

Retweeted The Hill
#RogerStones arrest is more proof that
@realdonaldTrump campaign & associates colluded with Russia to subvert our elections & then lied to Congress. The House must investigate to ascertain what he know, why he lied & who hes protecting. America deserve answers! #trumprussia
1/25/19
Twitter: https://twitter.com/JacksonLeeTX18/status/1088831866411671552

Incredible. @realdonaldTrump suborned #perjury so that @MichaelCohen212 would lie to #Congress and obstruct its investigation into whether a hostile foreign power subverted our democracy-oh, and his campaign may have colluded, too #trumprussia #Collusion
1/17/19
Twitter: https://twitter.com/JacksonLeeTX18/status/1086116555287601152

Retweeted Jon Favreau
Hey @GOPLeader - kinda how you investigated @HillaryClinton's emails for years, & actually went on TV to say you created a panel to politicize the deaths of Americans for the purpose of affecting Secretary Clinton's chances at being elected @POTUS? #trumprussia #Collusion
Twitter: https://twitter.com/JacksonLeeTX18/status/1072195105707175939

Jerry Nadler:
"We know there was collusion with people in the campaign with Russians."
3.24.19
Newsweek: https://www.newsweek.com/collusion-trump-russia-nadler-mueller-1373358

Nadler:
The following is a transcript of the interview with Democratic Rep. Jerry Nadler of New York that aired Sunday, April 7, 2019, on "Face the Nation."
MARGARET BRENNAAN: MARGARET BRENNAAN: So do you actually then reject the entire summary? Do you believe there is possible criminal collusion?
REP. NADLER: Well, the attorney general said there was no there was no- there was no obstruction of justice. He decided that. Mueller did not say that.
MARGARET BRENNAAN: Right- and you're dismissing what he has said.
REP. NADLER: I dismiss what he said. He's a- he's a biased defender of the administration and he's entitled to be defending the administration but he is not entitled to withhold the evidence from Congress and by the way let me repeat one other thing. When you say there's no- no when he says there's no collusion there may very well not have been evidence beyond a reasonable doubt which is a very high judicial standard of criminal conspiracy with
the Russians. But there was in plain sight open collusion with the Russians when the president’s son and campaign manager and son in law go to a meeting with the Russians to receive quote dirt on Hillary as part of the Russian government’s attempt to help the Trump campaign. And that was in the email inviting them to the meeting.

MARGARET BRENNAKaren: Right.

REP. NADLER: They go to the meeting. They said--

MARGARET BRENNAKaren: But- but that didn’t--

REP. NADLER: --they didn’t want that information. That is collusion. whether it’s criminal conspiracy is another question--

MARGARET BRENNAKaren: Right.

REP. NADLER: But certainly--

MARGARET BRENNAKaren: And it was that- it was on that question--

REP. NADLER: --the moral collusion--

MARGARET BRENNAKaren: --of criminality whether it could be prosecuted that the report was turned in. Those were the conclusions there made. I mean it- it sounds like when you are referencing what was the reporting from the New York Times and The Washington Post about some of Mueller’s investigators feeling that their- their impressions and their conclusions were not accurately portrayed in the attorney general’s summary. Are you going to call those investigators before the committee. Are you going to talk to any of them?

REP. NADLER: After we read the information in the- in the report we’ll make the decision as to whether that is necessary. After we read the- the information in the report we’ll probably want to call Mueller to discuss it. We’ll be having Barr in front of the committee before that but certainly reading the- the report and the underlying evidence will give us more information as to what questions we should ask Mueller or any of the other people who worked with him.

4.7.2019


https://app.criticalmention.com/app/#clip/view/bce183ba-2773-4ebc-ac02-c21ed3f0a133?token=3e99af18-cbb9-47d2-b208-ee3b9d5631a5

Nadler:

We do know, remember, in plain sight, of a lot of collusion," Nadler said. "We know, for example, that the president’s son and his campaign manager were present at a meeting with the Russians to receive information which they were told in the invitation was part of the Russian government’s attempt to help them in the election."

3.24.19

The Hill: https://thehill.com/homenews/media/435486-foxs-chris-wallace-challenges-nadler-on-if-no-more-indictments-means-no

Nadler:

"We know there was collusion. Why there’s been no indictments we don’t know," he said, pointing to the president’s son Donald Trump Jr. and Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort meeting with Russians during Trump’s presidential campaign.

The Justice Department confirmed that there are no additional indictments recommended in Mueller’s report. However, Nadler said there have “clearly” been obstructions of justice in Mueller’s investigation.

“We know that the president pressured the FBI to go easy, to stop investigating Flynn and various other people, we know he fired the FBI director to, as he put it to NBC, to take care of the Russian thing in order to stop the investigation of various people associated with him, we know he concocted the lie about the purpose of that Russian meeting” in Trump Tower in summer of 2016, Nadler said.

3.24.19
Nadler:
"way too early" to talk about impeachment and that Congress needs to investigate "all the evidence" before it can move forward.
"Our mandate is not to impeach the president," "We have to look into abuses of power. Obstruction of justice." Regardless of the special counsel's findings, wrongdoing had already been made public," "Maybe it's not indictable, but we know there is collusion. And the question is to what degree and for what purpose."
3.24.19

Nadler:
The congressman also said his committee won't wait for Mr. Mueller to finish his probe and can start to investigate whether the 2016 election was rigged or compromised, specifically referencing potential Russian collusion and hush payments made by then-candidate Donald Trump to women alleging affairs.
1/4/19

Nadler:
John Harwood: Is that an argument that you can make the American people see and understand and accept?

Jerry Nadler: I think so. I mean, we have to hold hearings, and we have to get people to testify. And not just on the collusion with the Russians and obstruction of justice, but in all kinds of issues where they're refusing to -- we can't get information about the family separation policy at the border about carrying kids out of people's arms.

John Harwood: If there's a larger issue about him and his conduct, what is it?

Jerry Nadler: Well, you've got three issues, really. There was tons of evidence that they knew the Russians were interfering with the election on their behalf. They welcomed it, they wanted it, and they coordinated with it. And the second clear conclusion is there are 12 episodes of obstruction of justice. Beyond all that, is the basic question because the administration does not want this information because they want all information kept. They are refusing all subpoenas, they are telling private parties don't give information to Congress. They are trying to say that Congress representing the American people, can't get information, and therefore, can't function. The effect of that, whether the President realizes that or not I don't know, but the effect of that is to make the President a monarch, to make him a dictator. That is the biggest constitutional crisis and that's what we've got to fight.

Jerry Nadler: If you read the Mueller report, maybe there wasn't the evidence sufficient to prove beyond reasonable doubt, criminal conspiracy, but there was tons of evidence that they knew the Russians were interfering in the election on their behalf, they welcomed it, they wanted it and they coordinated with it. Colluded in a word. There's no question about that. Colluding with a foreign power to rig an American election. There's no question.

John Harwood: Despite Bill Barr saying over and over, "no collusion."
Jerry Nadler: Bill Barr is just a liar. And, he’s just representing the President. I mean, when he put out his interpretation of the report, and then kept it from everybody for four weeks so that it could come into effect, you saw that.

John Harwood: You actually think Bill Barr is just lying, as opposed to being a defender of the person who put him in the Attorney General’s job?

Jerry Nadler: I’m not sure what his motive is. You could have two interpretations of Bill Barr’s motives. One, the less charitable interpretation is he’s doing whatever he has to do, to protect the President personally. And he’ll hide whatever he has to hide. He will misrepresent – we know he misrepresented. Lied may be too strong a word, but he certainly misrepresented very strongly what was in the report. And one interpretation is that he is doing it to protect the President, that is why he is there. Different interpretation – and that is why he wrote that 19-page memo auditioning for the job. The more charitable interpretation is that he simply believes in the so-called unitary theory of government, and this tyrannical theory that the President can never – any President cannot obstruct justice, that as long as he believes that he didn’t do anything wrong, he can stop an investigation. Which is a terrible doctrine because it would mean that you can’t investigate any President for doing anything. And that he wrote this 19-page memo to vindicate that point of view. And that he is acting now to protect that point of view. Basically, the point of view being that the President should be a monarch. Which is very dangerous.

John Harwood: Which of those two outcomes do you believe?

Jerry Nadler: I don’t know. But they’re both dangerous. One would have him being very dishonest, the other would have him being honest but very dangerous to the republic. I mean, to accept that view, assuming he holds it and he is pushing that view – whether he holds it sincerely or not, I don’t – I assume he does. But to accept that view no matter how sincerely held, is to accept a President as a dictator and to change the form of government in this country.

5/15/19


Nadler:
all we know is that the special counsel -- what we think we know is that the special counsel is not bringing criminal indictments for collusion. there are other investigations going on which he has farmed out to the southern district of new york, eastern district of virginia and they may or may not. we do know, remember, in plain sight of a lot of collusion. we know, for example, that the president’s son and his campaign manager were present in the meeting with the russians to receive information which they were told in the invitation was part of the russian government’s attempt to help them in the election. we know that the campaign manager give targeting data, political targeting data to an agent of the russian government. we know a lot of things and maybe it’s not indictable, but we know there was collusion. the question is to what degree and for a purpose -- >> chris: excuse me, that’s the point i was going to make. jared kushner was not charged for that, paul manafort wasn’t charged. don jr. wasn’t charged. so it would seem that there was no criminal collusion among them, so it would seem to clear the president, wouldn’t it on that issue? >> representative nadler: know it would not. ”the washington post” has story today which says that in counterintelligence investigations, because of the way they are done and because of way counterintelligence works, very often they do not lead to criminal prosecutions, but these are additional reasons we have to see the report. the entire country, the public needs to see the entire report so we can see what the special prosecutor says about these questions. right now is very speculative. >

3.24.19

Fox News Sunday https://app.criticalmention.com/app/#clip/view/ec1a7d52-3ad8-41e9-81d4-284f74e98f6f?token=3e99af18-cbb9-47d2-b208-ee3b9d631a6

Nadler:
"We would like to thank Special Counsel Robert Mueller for his service to our nation over the past two years. In his statement this morning, Special Counsel Mueller reaffirmed his report, which found substantial evidence that Russia attacked our political system and that the President sought to obstruct Mueller's investigation over and over again. He also confirmed three central points: he did not exonerate the President of the United States of obstruction of justice, obstruction of justice is a serious crime that strikes at the core of our justice system, and the Constitution points to Congress to take action to hold the President accountable.

"Although Department of Justice policy prevented the Special Counsel from bringing criminal charges against the President, the Special Counsel has clearly demonstrated that President Trump is lying about the Special Counsel's findings, lying about the testimony of key witnesses in the Special Counsel's report, and is lying in saying that the Special Counsel found no obstruction and no collusion. Given that Special Counsel Mueller was unable to pursue criminal charges against the President, it falls to Congress to respond to the crimes, lies and other wrongdoing of President Trump -- and we will do so. No one, not even the President of the United States, is above the law."  
5/29/19  

Nadler:

you just heard sarah sanders. she said the white house reading of the mueller report and the attorney general's reader of the mueller report is that he left the decision of obstruction to the attorney general who made it rightly. >> that's just wrong. it's another one of the lies that sarah sanders and the -- lots of people in the administration have been making. mueller, the special prosecutor, made very clear that he couldn't reach a determination on obstruction of justice basically because of certain justice department guidelines which didn't allow him to do that but that he laid it out for congress -- for congress to do, not to the attorney general. the attorney general has revealed himself, barr has revealed himself as an agent of the president. he's a defense attorney for the people. he kept -- he clearly misled over a period of four weeks from march 24th right through his press conference yesterday, he consistently misled the american people as to what was in the report. he said that they found no collusion whereas the special prosecutor specifically said collusion is not a legal term and he didn't make any findings that we hadn't reached a finding on criminal conspiracy. >> do you accept that finding from robert mueller that there was no criminal conspiracy? >> well, he wasn't able to prove a criminal conspiracy and one of the reasons he said he wasn't able to do it was that lots of people destroyed evidence, perjured themselves, so i accept his conclusion that he couldn't prove it. >> based on the reading, 188 pages of evidence or so on obstruction of justice, do you believe the president committed obstruction of justice? >> i believe he committed obstruction of justice, yes, but it's not up to me. it's up to -- >> you're the chairman of the judiciary committee. you can open impeachment proceedings. >> well, we're not there. we have to be there now, because the special -- because barr misled the country, we have to hear from barr which we will on may 2nd. we have to hear from mueller and ask him a lot of questions. we have to hold hearings and hear from other people both on the question of obstruction of justice, whereas i said the special prosecutor invited congress to look into that, not the attorney general. we have to look into all that. we need the entire report unredacted and the underlying documents in order to make informed decisions. after we get that -- and we will subpoena that entire report today. >> that subpoena is coming today? >> that subpoena will come in the next couple of hours. >> including the grand jury evidence? >> including the grand jury evidence, yes. because we have to see the entire report. by the way, in every previous instance, congress has seen all the evidence. the attorney general in previous instances both with clinton, with nixon, went to court with the -- >> but that's not going to happen here and a lot of legal experts believe you would be on much stronger ground to get that grand jury evidence if you actually opened an official impeachment proceedings. >> yes, some people believe that. i believe that one of the things that we need that evidence for is to determine whether to do that or not. we have to determine what the proper course of action is to deal with a president who's been shown in this report, very clearly shown, to lie all the time, a culture of lying, to have it not colluded -- well, in the plain meaning of the term colluded with the russians, not the criminal conspiracy. one of the things that the special prosecutor finds is that the russians were clearly out to help trump, that the trump campaign knew about it and welcomed their assistance and in some cases now about what they were going to do, what wikileaks was going to do in advance. they couldn't prove criminal conspiracy but there's certainly
Apr 19, 2019
Good Morning America
https://app.criticalmention.com/app/#clip/view/fddfd7559-67e7-4fb1-a6f3-73984a918624?token=3e99af18-cbb9-47d2-b208-ee3b9d5631a6

Eric Swalwell:
In our investigation, we saw strong evidence of collusion.

Swallwell:
"I have seen the Trump campaign for myself and others and to that, I would say the only person who has made false statements about Russia is Donald Trump," Swalwell told MSNBC. "I stand by what I said about seeing evidence of collusion. If he has a problem with that, he can sue me. And I promise you I would win in court."
3.26.19

Swallwell:
Swallwell claimed in 2017 that he personally had seen "things on the classified side that" are "even stronger evidence" the Trump campaign colluded with Russia. The congressman claimed later in November 2018 that "we are seeing the evidence that there was a conspiracy to cover up" Russian collusion. He also alleged in January, without evidence, that "it's pretty clear" and that it's "almost hiding in plain sight" that the president is a foreign agent working on the behalf of Russia.
3.26.19

Swallwell:
Obviously, we know there was some collusion." After the report's release, Nadler tweeted he wanted Barr to quickly testify before Congress to explain what the lawmaker called "very concerning discrepancies and final decision-making at the Justice Department following the Special Counsel report."
3/25/19

Mary Gay Scanlon:
"If you think there is no collusion and no obstruction, you have not read the Mueller Report. I am not afraid, I am profoundly saddened," said Scanlon. "We have an administration acting not just in contempt of Congress and the rule of law but the American people."

Madeleine Dean:
the "new york times" reporting that bill barr had numerous conversations with the white house. briefing them on some level, the white house lawyers, about what will be released today. what do you think? >> wholly inappropriate. can you imagine i read that reporting as well and the committee has seen the reporting. over the course of the last week, maybe
more the white house and attorney general barr have been cooperating, dare i say cocolludico collu -- colluding? t this is a lot of distraction and a lot of division in order for us -- maybe this day before a couple of important holy days in this country to hope that the american people won't want to focus on the report. but the judiciary committee will do its job. we're going to get the full report >> let's talk about that. what are democrats' plans after today, after the report comes out. nancy pelosi and chuck schumer said they want to hear directly from robert mueller. what's your next move? >> we are in the majority. chairman nadler has the gavel and subpoena power. i'm confident that we will be subpoenaing barr and mueller. we want -- mueller, we may not need a subpoena >> do you think he'll voluntarily come? >> i hope he will. i think he might. he's probably confident in his work and knows the role congress has to play in terms of oversight. i feel confident that mr. mueller and he'll be the more important person to hear from. barr just came to the party recently and is in it to protect the

CNN