

THE BASIS FOR AN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY
OF PRESIDENT JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 28, 2023

Serial No. 118-69

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2024

53-720 PDF

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	KATIE PORTER, California
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	CORI BUSH, Missouri
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	GREG CASAR, Texas
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LISA MCCLAIN, Michigan	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

MARGARET HARKER, Deputy Chief Counsel

JAKE GREENBERG, Chief Counsel for Investigations

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

Hearing held on September 28, 2023	Page 1
--	-----------

WITNESSES

Mr. Bruce Dubinsky, Founder, Dubinsky Consulting Oral Statement	18
Ms. Eileen O'Connor, Former Assistant Attorney General, United States Department of Justice (DOJ-Tax) Oral Statement	16
Prof. Jonathan Turley, Shapiro Chair for Public Interest Law, George Washington University Law School Oral Statement	15
Prof. Michael J. Gerhardt (Minority Witness), Burton Craig Distinguished Professor of Jurisprudence, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Law Oral Statement	20
<i>Opening statements and the prepared statements for the witnesses are available in the U.S. House of Representatives Repository at: docs.house.gov.</i>	

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below are available at: docs.house.gov.

- * Statement for the Record; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- * Notice and Witness list, Committee on the Judiciary hearing, December 4, 2019; submitted by Rep. Armstrong.
- * Notice and Witness List, Committee on the Judiciary hearing, June 10, 2019; submitted by Rep. Armstrong.
- * Webster Dictionary definition of “hypocrisy”; submitted by Rep. Armstrong.
- * Article, *CNN Politics*, “Majority of Americans believe Joe Biden, as VP, was involved with son’s business dealings”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Devon Archer transcript; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Third Bank Records Memo; submitted by Rep. Boebert.
- * Briefing, The White House, by Press Secretary Jean-Pierre and Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack; submitted by Rep. Brown.
- * Email from Bedingfield to Schwerin; submitted by Rep. Burlison.
- * Email from Flynn to Peters, cc’d to Hunter Biden, submitted by Rep. Burlison.
- * Devon-Archer-Transcript; submitted by Rep. Casar.
- * Press Release, U.S. Attorney’s Office, Southern District of New York, “Lev Parnas Sentenced to 20 Months in Prison”; submitted by Rep. Comer.
- * Hunter Text to Naomi; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- * T20 Exhibit 402-WhatsApp Message; submitted by Rep. Donalds.

CONTINUED INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * T69 Exhibit 508A-Business Structure 2014-RHB-Redacted; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- * T70 Exhibit 508B-Business Structure 2018-RHB-Redacted; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- * Text, re: Protecting Dad; submitted by Rep. Donalds.
- * Article, *New York Post*, “House GOP focus on Biden hosted breakfast with Hunter partners”; submitted by Rep. Edwards.
- * FD 1023, obtained by Senator Grassley, re: Biden; submitted by Rep. Fallon.
- * Indictment Georgia *v.* Donald Trump; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * Indictment of Donald Trump - Four Counts; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * Indictment US *v.* Donald Trump; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * Indictments NY *v.* Donald Trump; submitted by Rep. Garcia.
- * Archer Transcript, re: HB not involved in Baturina deal; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Archer Transcript, re: Illusion of Access; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Archer Transcript re: Weather; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Article, *Politico*, “Former Giuliani associate raises questions about Hunter Biden’s ‘hard drive from hell’”; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Letter by Senators, re: Ukraine; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Order from Supreme Court of the State of New York; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Rep. McClain Chart; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Press Release, U.S. Attorney’s Office, Southern District of New York, “Devon Archer Sentenced To A Year And A Day In Prison”; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * T51-Exhibit-312B-Contact-with-Ukrain-GP-Attachment; submitted by Rep. Goldman.
- * Article, *The Washington Post*, “How Republicans Overhype Hunter Biden Probe”; submitted by Rep. Gomez.
- * Article, *Yahoo News*, “NBC Reporter Destroys GOP Lawmaker’s ‘Evidence’ Against Joe Biden”; submitted by Rep. Gomez.
- * Email from Hunter Biden, September 21, 2017; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Article, *The Hill*, “Dems split in response to ‘impeach the motherf-er’ comment”; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * FBI Memo, re: Interview with Tony Bobulinski; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Text Message, Between Hunter Biden and Gongwen Dong; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Second Bank Records Memorandum, May 10, 2023; submitted by Rep. McClain.
- * Article, “Giuliani Is Drawing Attention to Hunter Biden’s Work in Romania. But There’s a Problem”; submitted by Rep. Mfume.
- * Article, *The Washington Post*, “How Republicans overhype the findings of their Hunter Biden probe”; submitted by Rep. Ocasio-Cortez.
- * Joint Democratic Memorandum, re: IRS and FBI Witnesses Debunk Political Interference Claims; submitted by Rep. Ocasio-Cortez.
- * Email from Hunter Biden, September 23, 2011; submitted by Rep. Perry.
- * First Bank Records Memo, March 16, 2023; submitted by Rep. Perry.

CONTINUED INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Letter, July 18 2023, from Parnas Letter to Ranking Member and Chair; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *ABC News*, “Trump Signs 1.4 Trillion Spending Bill to Avert Gov Shutdown”; submitted by Rep. Sessions.
- * Article, First Impeachment of Donald Trump; submitted by Rep. Sessions.
- * Article, *The Washington Post*, “The Republican Case Against Biden Takes a Body Blow From Fox News”; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Article, *Augusta Chronicle*, “Government shutdown—Georgia military service members will see no pay”; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.
- * Article, *The Washington Post*, “Looming government shutdown, FEMA is rationing disaster aid funds”; submitted by Rep. Tlaib.
- * Questions for the Record: to Ms. O’Connor; submitted by Rep. Gossar.
- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Turley; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Dubinsky; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Article, “Hunter Biden’s Ex-Business Partner Alleges Father Knew About Venture”; submitted by Rep. Casar.
- * Additional Views; submitted by Rep. Porter.

THE BASIS FOR AN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY OF PRESIDENT JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

Thursday, September 28, 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Jordan, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, LaTurner, Fallon, Donalds, Armstrong, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, McClain, Boebert, Fry, Edwards, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Norton, Lynch, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Porter, Bush, Gomez, Brown, Stansbury, Robert Garcia of California, Frost, Lee of Pennsylvania, Casar, Crockett, Goldman, Moskowitz, and Tlaib.

Also present: Representatives Smith of Missouri and Ivey.

Chairman COMER. The Committee on Oversight and Accountability will come to order.

I want to welcome everyone here today.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

The first order of business is to welcome the return of a Member to the Committee. We want to welcome Ms. Rashida Tlaib from Michigan to the Committee.

[Applause.]

Chairman COMER. Congresswoman Tlaib has been a Member of the House since 2019, and before that she served 15 years in the Michigan House of Representatives.

Ms. Tlaib is a familiar face to this Committee, as she spent her first two terms on the Oversight Committee. Congresswoman Tlaib replaces Congresswoman Balint of Vermont. And I want to welcome back Congresswoman Tlaib.

I now recognize Ranking Member Raskin to welcome Congresswoman Tlaib.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you, Chairman Comer, for that very warm welcome extended to our colleague, Rashida Tlaib, the favorite daughter of Michigan and a veteran of this Committee. And we are so thrilled and delighted that she is back to join us.

I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

I ask unanimous consent for Representative Jason Smith of the House Ways and Means Committee to be waived on the Committee for today's hearing for the purposes of asking questions.

Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. And, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague, Congressman Glenn Ivey from Maryland, be permitted to join the Committee and ask questions of the witnesses today.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

I now recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Since assuming our Republican majority in January, the House Oversight and Accountability Committee has uncovered a mountain of evidence revealing how Joe Biden abused his public office for his family's financial gain.

For years, President Biden has lied to the American people about his knowledge of and participation in his family's corrupt business schemes. At least 10 times, Joe Biden lied to the American people that he never spoke to his family about their business dealings. He lied by telling the American people that there was an absolute wall between his official government duties and his personal life.

Let us be clear: There was no wall. The door was wide open to those who purchased what a business associate described as "the Biden brand."

Evidence reveals that then-Vice President Joe Biden spoke, dined, and developed relationships with his family's foreign business targets. These business targets include foreign oligarchs who sent millions of dollars to his family. It also includes a Chinese national who wired a quarter of a million dollars to his son.

Joe Biden also lied to the American people about his family making money in China. He continued to lie about it even when the House Oversight Committee uncovered bank wires revealing how the Bidens received millions from Chinese companies with significant ties to Chinese intelligence and the Chinese Communist Party.

Just this week we uncovered two additional wires sent to Hunter Biden that originated in Beijing from Chinese nationals. This happened when Joe Biden was running for President of the United States, and Joe Biden's home is listed as the beneficiary address.

To date, the House Oversight Committee has uncovered how the Bidens, and their associates created over 20 shell companies, most of which were created when Joe Biden was Vice President, and raked in over \$20 million between 2014 and 2019. We have also identified nine Biden family members who have participated in or benefited from these shady business schemes.

Now, what were the Bidens selling to make all this money? Joe Biden himself. Joe Biden is the brand. And Joe Biden showed up at least two dozen times with business targets and associates sending signals of access, influence, and power to those prepared to pay for it.

The American people demand accountability for this culture of corruption. They demand to know how these schemes have compromised President Biden and threatened our national security.

They demand safeguards to be put in place to prevent public officials from selling access to their public office for private gain.

Under the leadership of Speaker Kevin McCarthy, House Republicans have now opened an impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden. By opening an impeachment inquiry, our investigation is now focused on whether President Biden engaged in impeachable offenses under the U.S. Constitution. It empowers Congress, elected by the people, to continue providing the answers, transparency, and accountability that the American people demand and deserve.

In recent history, Democrats inflicted much damage on the credibility of congressional investigations by peddling the Russian collusion hoax. But this Committee, under this Majority, will not pursue such witch hunts based on manufactured allegations, innuendo, and no real evidence.

Today, the House Oversight Committee will examine over two dozen pieces of evidence revealing Joe Biden's corruption and abuse of public office. This includes emails, text messages, bank records, and testimony of Biden business associates. We will hear from legal and financial experts about this evidence and crimes that may have been committed as Joe Biden was sold around the world.

The House Oversight Committee, along with the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means, will continue to follow the money and the evidence to provide accountability so that Americans know their public offices are not for sale.

I now yield to Jason Smith, the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, for his opening statement.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. Thank you, Chairman Comer.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee released new documents showing President Biden was not just aware of his son's business dealings, but he was connected to them.

In a newly released message to a Chinese business executive, Hunter Biden mentions preserving the, quote, "keys to my family's only asset."

That asset? Joe Biden.

New evidence released in response to questions raised by Members of the Committee on both sides when Gary Shapley and Joseph Ziegler, the two IRS whistleblowers, testified in July paints a disturbing picture of a revolving door between Joe Biden's office and Hunter Biden's business partners.

According to a worksheet provided by IRS whistleblower Ziegler, then-Vice President Biden's April 2014 official visit to Ukraine occurred only days after a series of White House meetings with Hunter Biden and his business associates regarding Ukraine. Shortly after Joe Biden returned stateside, the Ukrainian company Burisma announced Hunter Biden's appointment to its board.

New evidence provided shows Hunter Biden using his father's position to gain favor with billionaire Miguel Aleman, including having Joe Biden host them at the White House in February 2014 at the Vice President's residence, alongside Mexican billionaire Carlos Slim in November 2015, and then in 2016 using Air Force 2 to shuttle Hunter Biden and his business associate to Mexico City.

Whether it was lunches, phone calls, White House meetings, or official foreign trips, Hunter Biden cashed in by arranging access to Joe Biden, the family brand.

The Biden family and their associates received millions in payments from foreign sources, including from Russia, China, Ukraine, Romania. In one email, Hunter Biden even bragged that he cut a deal for 10 million from just one company for, quote, “introductions alone.” And yet, the DOJ wanted to keep the spotlight as far from Joe Biden as possible.

One of the items we released yesterday was an IRS interview with James Biden, the President’s brother, in September 2022. The agency was barred in the interview from asking him about Joe Biden and about whether Joe Biden was involved in Hunter Biden’s deal with a Chinese energy company.

And when Hunter Biden had his tax liability of over 2 million mysteriously paid for by a Democrat Party donor named Kevin Morris, who he barely knew, something IRS investigators saw as a possible campaign finance violation, Assistant U.S. Attorney Lesley Wolf said she did not want any of the agents to look into the allegation.

Behind on the board are notes Agent Shapley took from that meeting. He notes that Wolf told investigators that she was not, quote, “personally interested” in pursuing it. This is the same Attorney Wolf who, in an email we released yesterday, responded to IRS investigators seeking approval for a search warrant with, quote, “There should be nothing about Political Figure 1 in here”—that being a reference, by definition, of Joe Biden.

The Biden family sold access to Joe Biden’s power, and the Biden Justice Department protected the Biden brand. We must continue to follow the facts.

I yield to Jim—I yield to Representative Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a tale as old as time: Politician takes action that makes money for his family, and then he tries to conceal it.

Never forget four fundamental facts.

Hunter Biden gets put on the board of Burisma. Gets paid a lot of money.

Hunter Biden is not qualified—fact No. 2—to sit on the board. Not my words, his words. He said he got on the board because of the brand, because of the name.

Fact No. 3: The executives at Burisma asked Hunter Biden to weigh in and help them with the pressure they are under from the prosecutor in Ukraine.

Fact No. 4: Joe Biden goes to Ukraine on December 9, 2015, gives the speech attacking the prosecutor that starts the process of getting that guy fired.

Those facts, by the way, are consistent with what the confidential human source told the FBI and the FBI recorded in the 1023 form, the same form that the Justice Department did not want to let this Committee see.

And all of those facts, all of that was further confirmed yesterday with the information that the Ways and Means Committee released from the whistleblowers Shapley and Ziegler.

Here is a communication from Hunter Biden to an executive with Burisma: “Devon and I do feel comfortable with Blue Star Strategies and the ability of Sally and Karen to deliver.”

Hunter Biden put Burisma in touch with Blue Star Strategies. What were they going to deliver? Well, that was in a communication released yesterday as well.

“U.S. officials in Ukraine and in the United States need to express support for Burisma and Mykola Zlochevsky to the highest-level decision-makers: the President of Ukraine, the President’s Chief of Staff, and the Prosecutor General.”

That is what they were going to deliver.

And were they successful?

“The Interior Minister confirmed that Zlochevsky is no longer wanted. We won, in less than a year, communications between the folks at Blue Star and Eric Schwerin,”—who was Hunter Biden’s business partner—“Awesome work. Congratulations to you guys.”

Those are the communications. That is what they got done. And remember, when this happens in October 2016, when the pressure is taken off, the case is dropped against Zlochevsky. This is the second prosecutor. Joe Biden fired the first one. The second prosecutor comes in, drops the charges. That is exactly what they wanted done.

And the final step—the final step—is the Biden Justice Department tries to sweep it all under the rug. They slow-walk the investigation. They let the statute of limitations lapse for the most important years, 1914 and 1915, the Burisma years when all that income is coming in. They try to put together this sweetheart deal and get it past the judge.

And we learned yesterday, in the search warrant examining Hunter Biden’s electronic communications, they were not allowed to ask about Political Figure 1. Political Figure Number 1 is the Big Guy, is Joe Biden.

And they would have gotten away with it all, they would have gotten away with it all except for two brave whistleblowers who sat in those seats 2 months ago and told their story. And their story has stood up. Two brave whistleblowers and a judge in Delaware who said: We are not going to let this happen.

That is why we are here today. That is why this inquiry is so darn important. It is the oldest story in the world, and those are the facts.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair now recognizes Ranking Member Raskin of Maryland for his opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Before I give my opening statement, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Given that the Committee has not been authorized by the full House to conduct an impeachment inquiry, am I correct in assuming that we are obligated to follow the rules of the House, including Section 370 of the rules and manual, which proscribe engaging in personalities toward the President?

Chairman COMER. Well, considering this is an investigation of Joe Biden, I assume that his name is going to come up.

Mr. RASKIN. Right. But the House is not authorized. This is an impeachment inquiry, so we are just operating with the general rules. And I think saying that the President lied is considered engaging in a personality.

In fact, Section 370 says: "Accusations that the President has committed a crime, or even that the President has done something illegal, are unparliamentary."

And we are operating with the general rules of the House because the House has not authorized—

Chairman COMER. The Speaker of the House has authorized the impeachment inquiry. It has been authorized.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. All right.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. Does Ranking Member—who wants to be recognized?

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. I believe changing of the rules must require a vote from the full House of Representatives. The rules of the Committee.

Chairman COMER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

While articles of impeachment are not directly before this Committee, we are looking into the potential wrongdoing of the President. Given the unique nature and subject matter of today's hearing topic, these words will not be ruled out of order.

Mr. RASKIN. OK.

Chairman COMER. So, Ranking Member Raskin, please proceed.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you for clarifying, Mr. Chairman. We obviously have an honest disagreement about that.

All right. So, let us get it straight. We are 62 hours away from shutting down the Government of the United States of America, and Republicans are launching an impeachment drive based on a long debunked and discredited lie.

No foreign enemy has ever been able to shut down the Government of the United States, but now MAGA Republicans are about to do just that.

But they do not want to cutoff public services to the people and deny paychecks to more than a million servicemembers without first launching an impeachment drive, even when they do not have a shred of evidence against President Biden for an impeachable offense.

And you think I am being harsh? Here is what some Republicans have had to say over the last week about the actions of the Republicans, as they watch up close, quote, "the dysfunction caucus at work," in the words of our GOP colleague from Nebraska, Don Bacon.

Clown show. Foolishness. Terribly misguided. Stupidity. Failure to lead. Lunatics. Disgraceful. New low. Pathetic. Enabling Chairman Xi. People that have serious issues. Those folks do not have a plan. Shows just how broken they are. And individuals that just want to burn the whole place down.

Now, if I said any of these things, they would probably take my words down. But these are Republicans talking about Republicans.

So, let us be clear. This is not partisan warfare America is seeing today. It is chaotic infighting between Republicans and Repub-

licans. It is MAGA versus extreme MAGA, as if anybody in the real world could tell the difference between the two. What a staggering failure of leadership.

Speaker McCarthy's invertebrate appeasement of the most fanatical elements of his conference now threatens the well-being of every American.

Now, some people think the members of the GOP caucus are not interested in anything logical. They just want to see the world burn, as Alfred Pennyworth put it in "The Dark Knight." But I see a method in the madness.

A week ago, Donald Trump posted a comment saying that a government shutdown, quote, "is the last chance to defund these political prosecutions against me and other patriots."

You get it? To delay justice, Donald Trump would cutoff paychecks to a couple million servicemembers and Federal workers and furlough more than a million workers and pay them later for having not worked. They would halt food assistance to millions of moms and kids and keep NIH, in my district, from enrolling any more patients in life-and-death clinical research trials.

Trump is convinced that if we shut the government down, his four criminal prosecutions on 91 different felony and misdemeanor charges will be defunded and delayed long enough to keep him from having to go before a jury of his peers before the 2024 election.

And like flying monkeys on a mission for the Wicked Witch of the West, Trump's followers in the House now carry his messages out to the world: Shut down the government. Shut down the prosecutions.

But the cult master has another command for his followers, which brings us here today. On August 27, he posted this edict: "Either impeach the bum, or fade into oblivion. They did it to us!"

Of course, the standard for impeachment is not whether "they did it to us," but whether the President committed treason or bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors. But the Constitution is irrelevant to them. What counts is what Donald Trump wants.

As Republican Representative Ken Buck, a Freedom Caucus member, told CNN the other day: President Trump has gone on his social media account and said we should be impeaching President Biden. Kevin McCarthy said: We have an impeachment inquiry.

You draw the conclusion. Directly or indirectly, this impeachment inquiry was a result of President Trump's pressure.

So, we move from a Trump-ordered government shutdown to a Trump-ordered impeachment process. And yet back in the reality-based world, the Majority sits completely empty-handed, with no evidence of any Presidential wrongdoing. No smoking gun, no gun, no smoke.

In fact, we have had to slide awkwardly into a House impeachment process without the benefit of the Floor vote that Speaker McCarthy insisted was absolutely imperative and necessary when Donald Trump was impeached.

In fact, they went to the Department of Justice and they got an OLC opinion saying, quote, "No committee may undertake the momentous move from legislative oversight to impeachment without

the delegation by the full House of such authority.” OLC opinion, January 19, 2020.

And that is why the House voted in the case of Donald Trump, but that is exactly what has not happened here, because they do not have the votes, because dozens of Republicans recognize what a futile and absurd process this is.

Now, the title of the hearing is “The Basis for an Impeachment Inquiry of President Joseph Biden.” And yet, they present us no basis at all today, even after 8 months of investigation.

They have invited three witnesses to testify. Not one of them is an eyewitness to a presidential crime of any kind. Not one of them is a direct fact witness about any of the events related to Ukraine and Burisma. Not one of them has participated in the 8 months of investigation in which our distinguished Chairman has publicly boasted that he received 100 percent of everything he asked for.

And I quote: “Every subpoena that I have signed as Chairman of the House Oversight Committee over the last 5 months, we have gotten 100 percent of what we have requested, whether it is with the FBI, with the banks, or with Treasury. That means we are the real witnesses here.”

In fact, the Committee has received 12,000 pages of bank records—here they are right in front of us, printed double-sided—and not a single page shows a dime going to President Joe Biden.

We have received 2,000 pages of SARs reports the Chairman has subpoenaed. We have held hearings and conducted interviews with everybody from Hunter Biden’s business partners to a Federal agent assigned to that investigation, and still we have found no evidence of wrongdoing by President Biden.

If the Republicans had a smoking gun—or even a dripping water pistol—they would be presenting it today, but they have got nothing on Joe Biden.

All they can do is return to the thoroughly demolished lie that Rudy Giuliani and Donald Trump launched 5 years ago, the Burisma conspiracy theory, a fairytale so preposterous that one of its main authors, Lev Parnas, has now disowned and repudiated it.

This is the theory that Vice President Biden, global anticorruption groups, and most Western governments targeted Ukraine Prosecutor General Shokin for removal because he was threatening the Burisma corporation, whose board Hunter Biden served on.

Trump synthesized the lie in his August 27 post about President Biden, saying: “Look, the guy got bribed. He paid people off. And he would not give \$1 billion to Ukraine unless they, quote, ‘got rid of the prosecutor’.”

Trump’s story is the opposite of the truth. When Biden was VP, he worked as a key player in the Obama Administration and global community’s efforts to combat corruption in Ukraine.

In late 2015, as part of a coordinated global effort, Biden called for the removal of Viktor Shokin, a corrupt Ukrainian Prosecutor General who did nothing about corruption in Ukraine other than to participate in it. Rather than assist British authorities who were actually investigating Burisma and its owner, Shokin consistently frustrated their efforts.

The leadership provided by Biden was part of a broad bipartisan campaign to oppose corruption in Ukraine. In early 2016, Republican Senators Ron Johnson, Rob Portman, and Mark Kirk wrote to the Ukrainian President, assailing corruption in his country and urging him, quote, “to press ahead with urgent reforms to the Prosecutor General’s Office.”

Yet, years later, in 2018, as President Trump saw Biden as a strong rival in the 2020 election, he worked with Giuliani to twist all the facts around and to suddenly accuse Biden of corruption in calling for the dismissal of a corrupt prosecutor.

A few months ago, Chairman Comer and the Committee received an insider’s account of the plan to concoct and spread this lie from an extraordinary letter sent to us by Lev Parnas, who was Rudy Giuliani’s right-hand man. Giuliani and Parnas searched high and low to find anyone who would endorse their contortions about Biden.

Their failing crusade culminated in the infamous phone call that then-President Trump made to Ukrainian President Zelenskyy, in which Trump threatened to withhold hundreds of billions of dollars in economic, strategic, and military security assistance to Ukraine unless Zelenskyy embraced their ridiculous fabrication and falsely advertised to the world that Ukraine was investigating Joe Biden.

This shakedown became the basis for the first House impeachment of President Trump.

Giuliani’s big lie has been thoroughly debunked by multiple sources. As Congressman Buck, a former chief of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Colorado and a member of the House Freedom Caucus, said, and I quote, “There is, in fact, no evidence that Shokin was engaged in an investigation of Burisma or that Joe Biden’s role in his firing was in any way connected to Burisma.”

He continued, “What is missing, despite years of investigation, is the smoking gun that connects Joe Biden to his ne’er-do-well son’s corruption.”

It is scandalous to use impeachment to establish a counterfeit moral equivalence between President Biden, an honorable public servant who has never been indicted or convicted of anything in his career of more than 50 years in public life, and Donald Trump, a twice-impeached President who has recently been found in court to have sexually abused and defamed a woman and fraudulently inflated the value of his real estate properties, while facing 91 criminal charges in four separate indictments on everything from conspiring to overthrow an election and defraud the American people, to making criminal hush money payoffs, to stealing classified government documents and hiding them while obstructing justice.

Impeachment is the people’s final weapon of constitutional self-defense against a President who behaves like a king and violates the public trust by committing treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors equivalent to them. It is reserved for extraordinary public offenses like inciting a violent insurrection against the American Government and trying to overthrow our Presidential election.

That offense in 2021, whose related crimes have resulted in hundreds of criminal convictions and hundreds more being prosecuted,

led to Donald Trump's second impeachment in the House on a massive bipartisan vote of 232 to 197 and a similarly lopsided bipartisan vote of 57 to 43 in the Senate.

I wonder how many of my esteemed Republican colleagues here, who all voted against impeaching Donald Trump if they were in the House at that point, can reconcile their votes against impeaching Trump for the grave crime of inciting a violent insurrection against the government with their calls supporting impeachment of Joe Biden for allegedly committing a high crime and misdemeanor that has not even been defined yet, much less proven.

Mr. Chairman, if this dysfunction caucus is going to insist on going forward, we must receive the testimony of Rudy Giuliani and Lev Parnas, the insiders who know the origins of the lie upon which this sham impeachment is based and who worked to spread it.

We know that Mr. Parnas is ready and willing to testify. And as a former U.S. Attorney and Mayor, Mr. Giuliani will surely agree to enlighten us on everything.

Mr. RASKIN. Pursuant to clause 2(k)(6) of Rule XI, I move that the Committee subpoena Rudy Giuliani and Lev Parnas to come and testify in these hearings.

And I would like to ask for a vote on that, or debate, as you would please, Mr. Chairman.

I did not hear a motion to table.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I move to table the motion.

Chairman COMER. There is a motion to table Mr. Raskin's motion. Is there a second?

Mr. RASKIN. I would like to ask for a recorded vote on that, Mr. Chairman. This is on the subpoena of the two key figures, Rudy Giuliani and Lev Parnas.

Chairman COMER. Key figures for what?

Mr. RASKIN. In your theory about why President Biden should be impeached.

Chairman COMER. This is going to be an informative hearing for you, Mr. Raskin, because we are going to present evidence.

Mr. RASKIN. What evidence? There is no evidence witnesses—or no fact witnesses.

Chairman COMER. Well, just sit back and let the American people hear the—see the hearing and let the American people decide.

Mr. RASKIN. All right.

Chairman COMER. Now, look, you have gone over your time. We are going to have a—we are going to go by the rules here, OK?

And I am glad you brought the box of bank statements. If we had a box of all the foreign money the Bidens took, it would have reached to the ceiling.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

Chairman COMER. So, let us just have this hearing—

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. A point of parliamentary inquiry.

Chairman COMER. No, listen. Everybody is going to get 5 minutes. I am going to present the witnesses. Everyone is going to get a chance, 5 minutes. I let the Ranking Member go way over time

in his opening statement, but we are going to abide by the 5 minutes. We have 40—

Mr. RASKIN. There is a motion to table on the Floor.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There is a motion on the Floor.

Mr. MFUME. There is a motion on the Floor.

Mr. JORDAN. Roll call.

Mr. RASKIN. There is a nondebatable motion on the Floor.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk—will the Clerk get prepared for the roll call?

Mr. Raskin's made a motion, and then Mr. Jordan made a motion to table, and it was seconded. So, the vote will now be on the motion to table Mr. Raskin's motion to subpoena Rudy Giuliani.

Mr. RASKIN. And Lev Parnas.

Chairman COMER. And Lev Parnas.

All right. Will the Clerk take the roll?

Mr. RASKIN. Neither Mr. Giuliani nor Mr. Parnas is in jail now.

Chairman COMER. This is the motion to table Mr. Raskin's motion.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes aye.

Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.

Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes yes.

Ms. Greene?

Ms. GREENE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.

Mrs. McClain?

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.

Ms. Boebert?

Ms. BOEBERT. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Boebert votes aye.

Mr. Fry?

Mr. FRY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.

Mrs. Luna?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?

Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.

Mr. Langworthy?

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.

Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.

Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.

Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.

Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.

Mr. Connolly?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Nay.

The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.

Mr. Khanna?

Mr. KHANNA. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.

Mr. MFUME?

Mr. MFUME. MFUME votes no.

The CLERK. Mr. MFUME votes no.

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.

The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.

Ms. Porter?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Bush?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
 Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez votes no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
 Ms. Brown?
 Ms. BROWN. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
 Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Nay.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes nay.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.
 Ms. Tlaib?
 Ms. TLAIB. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. I vote yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Gosar recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar is not recorded.
 Mr. GOSAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. How has Mr. Fallon been recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon is not recorded.
 Mr. FALLON. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. OK. Hold for 1 second. Let us see.
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Regular order. Mr. Chairman, a request for regular order.
 Mr. RASKIN. We are seeking regular order, Mr. Chairman.
 Chairman COMER. We have Members enroute to vote.
 How is Mr. Palmer recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer is not yet recorded.

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Motion to close the vote.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MFUME. Second.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Chairman, how is my vote recorded?

Chairman COMER. Has Ms. Greene been recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Greene has voted aye.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. How am I recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons has voted aye.

Ms. BOEBERT. Madam Clerk, how am I recorded?

The CLERK. Ms. Boebert has voted aye.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes. The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. How am I recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon has voted aye.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Chairman, there is a motion to close the vote, and it was properly seconded.

Chairman COMER. There is—will the Clerk call the roll?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20. The nays are 19.

Chairman COMER. The motion passes to table the Raskin motion.

Now I am pleased to welcome an expert panel of witnesses who each bring experience and expertise to today's hearing.

I would first like to welcome Professor Jonathan Turley, who is the Shapiro Chair for Public Interest Law at George Washington University Law School. Professor Turley is a nationally recognized legal scholar who has published work in areas ranging from constitutional law to legal theory.

Next, we have Ms. Eileen O'Connor, who is a former Assistant Attorney General at the United States Department of Justice Tax Division. As former Assistant Attorney General for DOJ Tax for 6 years, Ms. O'Connor supervised DOJ litigation of civil, criminal, trial, and appellate tax cases.

Next, we have Mr. Bruce Dubinsky, who is the founder of Dubinsky Consulting, a forensic accountant. Mr. Dubinsky has accumulated over 40 years of financial, investigative, and dispute consulting experience, served as an expert witness over a hundred times, and has testified in over 80 trials, including trials involving criminal and civil financial fraud.

Last, we have Professor Michael Gerhardt, who serves as the Burton Craige Distinguished Professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Professor Gerhardt has been a law professor for than 30 years. He is the author of seven books and has written more than a hundred law review articles and dozens of op-eds in the Nation's leading news publications.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Do you all solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Let the record show that the witnesses all answered in the affirmative.

Thank you all. You may be seated.

We appreciate you all being here today and look forward to your testimony.

Let me remind the witnesses, we have read your written statements, and they will appear in full in the hearing record.

Please limit your oral statements to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on, and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes has expired, and we would ask that you please wrap up your testimony.

I now recognize Professor Turley to begin his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF JONATHAN TURLEY
SHAPIRO CHAIR FOR PUBLIC INTEREST LAW
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL**

Mr. TURLEY. Thank you, Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Raskin, Members of the Committee. It is an honor to appear before you today to talk about what is undoubtedly the most weighty constitutional decision that you have under Article I other than the declaration of war, and that is the potential impeachment of a President of the United States.

It was roughly 25 years ago that I appeared in the impeachment proceedings with other experts in the impeachment of President William Clinton. It was 4 years ago that I appeared in the impeachment proceedings for President Donald Trump. And then it was just 3 years ago that another impeachment occurred without any hearings at all.

The shortening intervals between impeachments should be a cause of concern and circumspection for all the Members on both sides.

And I want to emphasize what it is that we are here today for. This is a question of an impeachment inquiry. It is not a vote on articles of impeachment.

In fact, I do not believe that the current evidence would support articles of impeachment. That is something that an inquiry has to establish.

But I also do believe that the House has passed the threshold for an impeachment inquiry into the conduct of President Biden.

Having said that, I want to just address three inescapable facts that led me to that conclusion.

First, President Biden has indeed spoken falsely about these foreign deals. The *Washington Post* and other newspapers have noted that some of his past comments are demonstrably untrue.

Second, President Biden was the focus of a multimillion-dollar influence-peddling scheme.

And then, finally, President Biden may have benefited from millions of dollars as a part of that scheme.

Now, those facts should not be taken out of context. They are merely allegations, and they should not become presumptions of impeachable conduct.

Indeed, as I have said in past impeachments, self-dealing is a difficult issue under the Impeachment Clause. The Framers sought to avoid ambiguous standards. That is one of the reasons that perfidy was rejected.

While it may not sit well with many, President Biden and other Presidents can be dishonest, can even lie to the American people, and that would not constitute an impeachable offense. Indeed, most Presidents have lied to the American people. That is why I have not liked any President since James Madison.

Now, dishonesty alone is not impeachable, and so what I lay out in my testimony are what I call guardrails or best practices. Those are designed to protect this process.

Frankly, a number of the things I lay out benefit President Biden, as I say in my testimony, because Presidential impeachment should not be a closed question, it should not be a rush to judgment, and you should avoid the type of confirmation bias that can occur in this process. This is, as people say, a political process, but it is also a constitutional process.

Influence peddling is a form of corruption. The United States has signed treaties to combat this form of corruption around the world. And that is also an inescapable fact. We need to find answers as to some of these questions.

I am running out of time, so I would like to make one last observation, if I may.

These are constitutional moments that demand the best from each of us to transcend the politics and passions of our time. It calls for something that is difficult. It calls for solemnity and clarity from Members. We have become a Nation addicted to rage, and we can fuel that.

This body is a powerful teacher, as Brandeis said, and you can teach that, or you can teach a respect for this process. It begins here and now. We can disagree with each other without hating each other.

These are important issues, and I think they are close issues. And I think some of these issues really do gravitate in favor of the President.

So, I would simply say that this is a moment where Members and citizens can stand together without prejudging the evidence. And I thank you for the honor of appearing before you today.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Professor Turley.

Ms. O'Connor.

**STATEMENT OF EILEEN O'CONNOR
FORMER ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (TAX)**

Ms. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, Members of the Committee, the Chairman invited me to share my thoughts on the conduct of the tax investigation into Hunter Biden. I make my comments on my own behalf as a private citizen and not on behalf of any person with whom or group with which I might be or have been affiliated.

When I learned that experienced IRS special agents had felt compelled to report to Congress about the obstruction of their criminal tax investigation, I felt compelled, too, to share my understanding of how things are supposed to work with people who have no reason to appreciate how disturbing the whistleblowers' allegations are.

Without context and a frame of reference, it is difficult to know sometimes how seriously to take things. In an October 2022 meeting of the Hunter Biden prosecution team, U.S. Attorney Weiss admitted it was not his decision whether to bring charges the investigation had proven should be brought. This directly contradicted Attorney General Garland's sworn testimony 6 months earlier.

This was the final straw. After more than 3 years of having his investigation stymied but nonetheless having proven substantial criminal charges, Supervisory Special Agent Shapley realized he had to come forward.

In fact, he had come forward before internally within the IRS using the procedures developed for that purpose. He had complained up his chain of command as early as June 2020 about the obstruction he was encountering, but there had been no response.

Once Shapley had taken steps to come forward to Congress, Special Agent Joseph Ziegler did the same.

It was not the whistleblowers' testimony, however, but what followed that compelled me to write. My first *Wall Street Journal* article was called, "Throw Hunter Biden's Plea Deal in the Trash." Given the substance of the whistleblowers' testimony, the plea deal Weiss had worked out with Biden was a miscarriage of justice.

After that commentary was published, I heard from many people who were similarly appalled at the unfolding injustice. Many were knowledgeable and experienced tax professionals.

Perhaps the most commonly commented on aspect of the handling of the Hunter Biden matter was that Weiss had permitted the statute of limitations to expire on prosecuting provable offenses. This was appalling.

It is not insignificant that the plea agreement was announced on June 20. Let us review what came just before.

On August 19, it became known that IRS employees were going to let Congress know about the obstruction they were encountering. Later, Shapley and Ziegler sat for hours of sworn and subscribed testimony with the House Ways and Means Committee staff. It was expected that the Committee would make the testimony public. It did on June 22.

U.S. Attorney Weiss, with his June 20 announcement of a plea deal, beat the publication of the whistleblowers' testimony by the skin of his teeth, 2 days.

If the whistleblowers had not come forward, would Weiss have brought any charges at all?

My second *Wall Street Journal* commentary was published on July 25. It was called, "You'd Go to Prison for What Biden Did."

Given what Shapley and Ziegler testified they had proven and the charges the Tax Division reportedly had authorized, the plea deal represented serious injustice not only to law enforcement, but also to people who have been caught up in this system and have suffered the consequences the law provides.

I received a great deal of positive feedback on this commentary, too. People understand that for laws to be respected, they must be enforced.

The nature of any investigation is the following of leads. That did not happen here. This team was not permitted to search the guest house of Joe Biden's Delaware mansion and Hunter Biden's storage facility in Virginia, to interview family members and business associates, to examine Hunter Biden's abandoned laptop.

By November 2019, the FBI had confirmed the devices were Hunter's and the contents were authentic.

But the Hunter Biden investigation must not be viewed in isolation, rather as part of a broad landscape of corruption. Do not forget that a full year after that, in October 2020, FBI officials were telling Twitter that the laptop was Russian disinformation.

The whistleblowers tell us that the tax investigation of Hunter Biden was an offshoot of an investigation already underway into an online pornography platform. That is how investigations develop. Agents follow wherever the leads take them. And when they take them in the direction of a new investigation, they open one.

Question: If U.S. Attorney Weiss had been in charge of that pornography investigation, would he have blocked the investigation into Hunter Biden's tax crimes?

I thank the Committee.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Ms. O'Connor.

Mr. Dubinsky.

**STATEMENT OF BRUCE DUBINSKY
FOUNDER
DUBINSKY CONSULTING**

Mr. DUBINSKY. Good morning, Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Raskin, distinguished Members of this Committee, guests, and my fellow citizens. Thank you for this opportunity to testify today.

First, at the outset, let me state unequivocally and in no uncertain terms that I agreed to testify today not because I have a political agenda or axe to grind, because I do not.

Rather, I agreed to testify in this proceeding in order to help this Committee and the American people gain a better understanding of how frauds are committed, how complex business arrangements sometimes, using limited liability companies—sometimes those being shell companies—are used in frauds, and how money is moved by fraudsters to facilitate the conduct of illicit activity.

Let me be clear. I am not prejudging the facts that have emerged to date with regard to the Biden family and associates' businesses and the money they received that had its origins from foreign sources. I am not here today to even suggest that there was corruption, fraud, or any wrongdoing. In my opinion, more information needs to be gathered and assessed before I would make such an assessment.

I am here today to lend my expertise to answer questions that this Committee may have while they advance this investigation and gather more facts about the business dealings surrounding the Biden family and associates' businesses.

Throughout my 40-year career as a certified public accountant, a forensic accountant, and a certified fraud examiner, I have

worked tirelessly to uncover the truth when it comes to cases involving allegations of fraud, corruption, and wrongdoing.

I have investigated some of the world's largest frauds, including having investigated and testified in the criminal case for the United States Department of Justice on the Bernie Madoff Ponzi, the world's largest Ponzi. I have worked on cases like the Enron case, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters election corruption cases, as well as some of the United States' largest cases of tax fraud, to name a few.

As the age-old proverb goes, where there is smoke, there is fire. As a fraud investigator, when I see smoke, I immediately look for the fire.

The critical question facing the American people today is whether, behind the smokescreen clouding the Biden family and associates' businesses, was there or is there a fire? And if there was or is a fire, how big is that fire?

Why were members of the Biden family and close business associates receiving millions of dollars of payments from foreign entities and individuals? What services, if any, were being provided? What was the substance of the alleged services being provided? Was the money being paid for a fair amount commensurate with those services? Were political favors being traded and disguised as services?

These are the questions that, as a forensic accountant, I routinely am asked to answer when I am hired to investigate allegations of corruption and fraud.

There is a great deal of evidence that has been collected to date by this Committee and others trying to answer these very questions.

However, much more information is still needed in order to be able to answer these questions and make a final determination as to whether or not the Biden family and its associates' businesses were involved in any improper or illicit activities, and importantly, whether those activities, if any, were connected to President Joe Biden or then-Vice President Biden.

In my experience, fraudsters purposely create a labyrinth of limited liability companies to create an opaque network of entities that are then used to hide improper conduct. In many instances, these complex business arrangements are typically centered around illicit activities and involve moving money around the globe in a manner designed to avoid the detection of the underlying illegal activity as well as the movement of the money tied to that illegal activity.

Gone are the days—for the most part—when suitcases full of currency or gold bars are exchanged as payment in the conduct of illegal activities. Today, more sophisticated methods are employed to obfuscate the true nature of such illegal activities and to hide the movement of money.

The importance of following the trail of money is a critical component of any fraud investigation. The term "shell company" has its origins in the world of business and finance. The term "shell," as you would note, implies that the company is like an empty shell, lacking substance or real activity.

Shell companies typically have no employees, no offices, no real operating businesses. They use P.O. boxes for mailing addresses.

While I will note shell companies can be used for legitimate business activities, more often than not they are associated with fraudulent activities like tax evasion, money laundering, hiding of assets, and other illicit practices.

It takes a heavy lift to pull the covers back on these shell companies to determine who the true beneficial owners are, where the money went, and to expose the true sham nature of their existence.

However, through the use of legal subpoenas and proper investigative methods and a great deal of persistence, fraud investigations can and do expose the identity of the wizards behind these curtains and the extent of their illicit activities.

In closing, let me underscore the importance of conducting a thorough, independent, and unbiased investigation of the matter before us today before you reach any conclusions.

The American people deserve to know the truth. The rigor and discipline of a well-planned and executed investigation should not be subverted by political motivations or aspirations. To do so would critically undermine the integrity of any such investigation and any conclusions reached.

Thank you again for this opportunity to be here today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Chairman COMER. Thank you very much.

Professor Gerhardt.

(MINORITY WITNESS)
STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. GERHARDT
BURTON CRAIGE DISTINGUISHED
PROFESSOR OF JURISPRUDENCE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

Mr. GERHARDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the Ranking Member as well and distinguished Members of this Committee.

I appreciate the honor and the privilege to be able to appear before you today to talk about the basis for an impeachment inquiry of President Biden.

I think a good place to begin is with The Federalist Papers. And in The Federalist Papers, Alexander Hamilton warned of the dangers of trivializing impeachment through petty partisanship.

He foresaw that impeachment may, and now I quote, “agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with pre-existing factions, and will enlist all their animosities, partialities, influence, and interest on one side or on the other; and in such cases, there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the relative strength of the parties, than by demonstrations of innocence or guilt.”

I think Alexander Hamilton knew what he was talking about, and I think what he said may well describe the current set of proceedings.

One thing I might add to all of that is that the Framers designed an impeachment process to follow or comply with several safeguards, and it is important that we keep these safeguards in mind as these proceedings go on.

The first is the necessity for credible evidence of the commission of treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. There is not—at least not that I’ve yet heard—such credible evidence.

Let me give you an example of what I fear is similar to the current proceedings. Hunter Biden is arrested for speeding in a car owned by his father, and the police go after the father.

I do not think that is how the law should work. I do not think that is how impeachment should work.

I respect Members of this Committee enormously. Believe me, I am just a law professor and citizen, and I come here with great awe when I speak to an important body like this.

But I listened to Congressman Jordan—whom I respect a great deal—when he said there are four facts.

Hunter Biden was on the board of Burisma.

Hunter Biden was not qualified.

So far, by the way, nothing about President Biden.

Third, there were executives who asked Hunter Biden for help.

Again, not yet any proof about any kind of complicity of President Biden.

And last, Joe Biden gave a speech.

If that is what exists as a basis for this inquiry, it is not sufficient.

I say that with all respect. And I think that that is part of the problem, I think and many Americans think, may exist with respect to these proceedings.

A second safeguard is the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause. It requires fundamental fairness. And I think in these proceedings something has happened to President Biden that was said to have happened to President Trump in 2019, and that is, the burden has flipped to President Biden to prove his innocence.

Any further investigation is being done to ensure that Mr. Biden has to prove his innocence rather than the Committee being able to connect the dots in a convincing and persuasive way.

It is not me you have to persuade. It is the American people, whose trust you deserve, and whose trust you have to maintain.

A third principle is judicial review. And here, I would just remind the Committee about the Supreme Court’s decision in *Trump v. Mazars*. The Court said—about this Committee—that, in fact, it has to conduct an investigation for a legitimate purpose. A fishing expedition is not a legitimate purpose.

Moreover, the Court in *Trump v. Mazars* said that it is not a legitimate purpose for the House or a House Committee to be conducting the function of law enforcement. And I heard many references here to criminal misbehavior, to whether or not somebody should be thrown in jail, criticisms of a prosecutor, Mr. Weiss. That sounds to me like an attempt to really substitute for the proper, legitimate proceedings of the House.

Two other safeguards real quickly.

One is that these proceedings should be based on principle, not partisanship. And I fear that what we are hearing today—which can be traced all the way back to 2019 and accusations made against Mr. Biden as far back as then—are really driven by partisan animus more than they are by principle.

And a final safeguard is for the House—the full House—to authorize an impeachment inquiry. That does not come from me. That comes from Speaker McCarthy. He said there should be the full House's approval.

It also comes from Mr. Trump's Justice Department, who said a committee must be authorized by the full House. That has not happened here.

My concern is with the Constitution. That is what my devotion is to. And I hope all of us understand that there's nothing more serious than honoring our Constitution and following the design the Framers gave us.

Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

I do want to state the fact, in 2019, the D.C. District Court judge ruled a vote of the full House was not required to commence an impeachment inquiry.

Now we are going to begin the question-and-answer phase. We have 47 Members here today that are going to ask questions, so we are going to abide by the 5 minutes.

I will begin, followed by Ranking Member Raskin.

Chairman COMER. This week, the Oversight Committee issued another bank subpoena targeting specific wires originating from Beijing. Most of our bank subpoenas have been for Biden family associates' accounts, resulting in thousands of pages of bank records.

We have identified these bank accounts based on suspicious activity reports filed with the Treasury Department after being flagged by the banks.

The bank records obtained this week showed that, on August 2, 2019, Jonathan Li and Ms. Tan Ling in Beijing sent Hunter Biden \$250,000, listing Joe Biden's home address in Wilmington, Delaware. The wire stated it was for a personal investment.

A second wire showed that, on July 26, 2019, Ms. Wang Xin sent \$10,000, listing Joe Biden's home address in Wilmington, Delaware. The \$10,000 wire said it was a loan to beneficiary.

Now, let us talk about the \$250,000 personal investment. It sure looks like Jonathan Li was making a substantial investment in the Bidens months after Joe Biden announced his run for the Presidency in April 2019.

Now, who is Jonathan Li? During Devon Archer's interview with the Oversight Committee, he explained how Vice President Biden developed a relationship with Jonathan Li. Vice President Biden had coffee with Jonathan Li in Beijing. He talked with him on the phone and even wrote a college recommendation letter for Mr. Li's children. Hunter Biden even met with Jonathan Li after flying on Air Force Two to Beijing with Joe Biden.

The Beijing Bidens cultivated a relationship with Jonathan Li and other Chinese nationals for one reason and one reason only: to access their wealth. As we all know, the Bidens had nothing to sell except the brand, which was Joe Biden. Hunter Biden sold the brand well, making the Biden family millions from China and elsewhere.

While Joe Biden was Vice President, Hunter Biden became an investor in a Chinese investment fund with Jonathan Li and owned a percentage of BHR Partners through one of his many LLCs. This

was a political problem for his dad, the big guy, who was running for President.

In October 2019, 2 months after the Beijing wires, Hunter Biden's lawyer claimed he served only as a member of the board of directors in an unpaid position. This was Hunter Biden's lawyer, said he was in an unpaid position. Abbe Lowell now claims the money is a documented loan from a private individual.

Now, these wire statements are very concerning. The Bidens' defenders' justification for the money is not consistent with what we know from the suspicious activity reports from Treasury.

Mr. Dubinsky, I am very skeptical of Abbe Lowell's statement that the quarter-million-dollar payment from Jonathan Li and another woman was a loan, because the wire states it was a personal investment. We have also reviewed documents at Treasury that do not support Mr. Lowell's theory.

In your experience, are international loans of this amount supported by documentation such as loan terms, interest rates, and repayment schedule?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, they typically would be. You would see that. You would see documents setting forth the interest rates, terms of repayment—

Chairman COMER. Absolutely.

Mr. DUBINSKY [continuing]. All of those things.

Chairman COMER. Absolutely.

So, would it be important to review Hunter Biden's bank records and see if Hunter Biden paid back the money to Jonathan Li or if he sent the money to someone else—I do not know—using a cashier's check, for example?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, as somebody mentioned earlier, it is very important to follow the money.

Chairman COMER. Absolutely.

Mr. DUBINSKY. And that is very important in this situation.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Professor Turley, we all know what this payment is really for. It is for influence-peddling and selling the Biden brand.

Now, to date, we have shown that the Biden family and their companies received more than \$15 million without providing any known legitimate services between 2014 and 2019. If you include the business associates and their companies, they have received over \$24 million.

Based on evidence we have developed so far, what are some of the potential laws we should be analyzing during our impeachment inquiry?

Mr. TURLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I actually lay out what are the most obvious potential articles of impeachment, without saying that those have been established, but the ones that I recommend for the Committee to focus on.

And one of the things I recommend is that the Committee actually start by looking at potential crimes. Because I have said that in the past two impeachments, that it is an important thing to front-load criminal acts for the reasons I laid out. It gives a very high standard for impeachment, quite frankly, higher than is binding. I said in the last two impeachments, you can impeach for non-criminal conduct.

So, I suggest starting there. But as I talk about in my testimony, bribery, obstruction, conspiracy, abuse of power—those have all been raised in past impeachments.

Abuse of power is the article that is very, very common; it tends to be a catchall. And it is the one that I have always been a little bit uncomfortable with. That is why I suggest you end there rather than start there. Because that is the article that brings in a lot of noncriminal conduct, and, frankly, I think that you need to focus as much as you can on the evidence and whether you can establish these connections.

Chairman COMER. Very good. Thank you.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Raskin of Maryland for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Professor Gerhardt, has there ever been an impeachment process launched in the middle of a government shutdown?

Mr. GERHARDT. No.

Mr. RASKIN. Why did the Office of Legal Counsel opine that there must be a vote of the full House before a committee launches into an impeachment investigation? Why did Speaker McCarthy insist on it and, in fact, say that there would be one in this case?

Mr. GERHARDT. I think the Office of Legal Counsel said that, at least in part, because an impeachment inquiry is deadly serious. It is, again, just about the most serious thing any House committee ever undertakes. And one safeguard against a committee acting on the basis of just, let us say, the party membership, is to ensure that the full House is behind the impeachment inquiry.

Mr. RASKIN. A dozen of our colleagues on the Republican side have already called for impeachment. I am struck by the fact that, of the four expert witnesses brought together today, not a single one of them argued that a sufficient quantum of evidence exists today to justify the impeachment of President Biden.

Is there any precedent in our country for launching an impeachment inquiry absent evidence of wrongdoing by the President?

Mr. GERHARDT. No. And, in fact, I would just point out that with Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton and President Trump in 2019, the full House authorized those impeachment inquiries.

Mr. RASKIN. Lev Parnas sent us a letter in which he said—it was addressed to Chairman Comer—in which he said, “The narrative you are seeking for this investigation has been proven false many times over by a wide array of respected sources. There is simply no merit to investigating this matter any further.” And he says, “Please abandon this effort to investigate the Bidens, which is nothing more than a wild goose chase.”

And he was Rudy Giuliani’s right-hand man, gallivanting all over the world to try to put together a case back in 2019 that Joe Biden had done something wrong.

Do you agree that, given that the evidence we have looked at over the 8 months comes down to this discredited Burisma conspiracy theory, we should hear from those responsible for concocting the story in the first place, specifically Lev Parnas and Rudy Giuliani?

Mr. GERHARDT. Absolutely.

Mr. RASKIN. What do you think about the fact that the very first act of the Committee in its impeachment investigation was to reject

the idea of subpoenaing Lev Parnas and Rudy Giuliani, who are at the heart of the story that is the basis for impeachment?

Mr. GERHARDT. I think, if there is going to be an investigation into the President, all the evidence—that is to say, all the participants, anyone that has knowledge, should be spoken to.

Mr. RASKIN. We have lots of colleagues, on this Committee and off the Committee, who have called for the impeachment of Joe Biden, who also voted against impeaching Donald Trump for inciting a violent insurrection against the Union. And hundreds of people have gone to jail in subsidiary acts under the umbrella of that insurrectionary process.

Now, can you come up with a theory that would allow someone to say, “I am going to vote to impeach Joe Biden for offenses unstated and evidence unknown, but I will oppose and vote against the impeachment of Donald Trump for inciting a violent insurrection against the Union,” which is something that concurrent bipartisan majorities voted for in the House and the Senate?

Mr. GERHARDT. I cannot.

And I might just add, as a law professor, that one of the things I suggest to my students in trying to assess the constitutionality of any governmental action is to take the names out, switch the names or switch the political parties, and see if the outcome is the same.

Mr. RASKIN. So, if Joe Biden had incited a violent insurrection against the Union and said, “You go and fight, and fight like hell, and if you do not, you will not have a country anymore,” would you consider that, in the ensuing mayhem and chaos—

Mr. GERHARDT. Absolutely.

Mr. RASKIN. [continuing] To be an impeachable event—

Mr. GERHARDT. Absolutely.

Mr. RASKIN. [continuing] Or not?

To your mind, in applying the law to the facts, have you seen any evidence that Joe Biden has done anything remotely comparable to what Donald Trump did which earned him his impeachment in the bipartisan vote of the House?

Mr. GERHARDT. I have not.

And I also just might add, and with all due respect, I have heard the phrase “Biden family” many, many times, but that is—I do not know who the Biden family is. I do not know who is being referenced when people talk about the Biden family.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Professor Gerhardt.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move for unanimous consent to introduce Lev Parnas’s July 18, 2023, letter to you and to me and to the rest of the Committee into the official record of this proceeding.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Jason Smith from Missouri, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is amazing to be sitting in your Committee. It is a pleasure to be here.

Yesterday, we had a Committee to release over 700 pages of documents that came from the 2 IRS whistleblowers based on the last Oversight hearing when they presented before this Committee,

where Members, both Republican and Democrat, asked for additional information, and they provided it, and we brought it forward.

What was interesting is, the other side of the aisle actually mentioned Trump a whole lot more than they ever mentioned Biden. And it is happening over here too. So, I think it is kind of consistent both in the Ways and Means Committee and in the Oversight Committee.

But, Ms. O'Connor, my question is: Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee voted to release additional information provided, like I said, by Gary Shapley and Mr. Ziegler. One of the documents shows that Assistant U.S. Attorney Lesley Wolf ordered investigators not to pursue leads into possible campaign finance violations.

We know that over \$2 million of Hunter Biden's tax liabilities were paid off by a big Democrat Party donor and Hollywood lawyer who is named Kevin Morris.

James Biden, the President's brother, told investigators he did not know how Hunter Biden even knew this individual, but was later asked to thank him for the payment, quote, "on behalf of the family"—the Biden family. The family.

So, how would such payments that essentially pushed under the rug the President's son's tax problems at least for 1 year be considered a campaign finance violation on the part of the Biden campaign?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Thank you for the question.

I have no idea.

I thought you were going to ask me, why would Lesley Wolf say, "Do not look into that"? And I think the answer to that probably is that, if it is a campaign contribution, then it implicates Political Person No. 1, and that apparently is a big barrier that had been created throughout this entire investigation.

And as far as it being a campaign contribution, that \$2 million actually was intended to satisfy the liabilities for 2 years of Hunter Biden's late-filed and unpaid taxes.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. Is it unusual for an assistant prosecutor to say, "Do not look at this individual; this person is off-limits"?

Ms. O'CONNOR. As I mentioned in my opening statement, that is how investigations develop. The agents follow the leads wherever they take them. And, in this case, a legitimate investigation was being done of money that was being paid. And for the Assistant U.S. Attorney who is orchestrating the investigation to say, "Do not look at that anymore," I think the reason is related to another instruction of hers—that she did not want to get Public Integrity involved. And that tells us that she was looking beyond Hunter Biden and into a person whose activities would be subject to Public Integrity at DOJ.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. So, one thing that I want to ask, since you worked Tax Division for DOJ: If Kevin Morris gave a gift of \$2 million to help pay off Hunter Biden's debts, who has to report that on their taxes? Does Mr. Morris have to report it, or does Hunter Biden?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, as I understand it, the parties are claiming that it is a loan and that Hunter Biden will pay it back between 2025 and 2027.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. Would that have to be reported on any tax records?

Ms. O'CONNOR. If it is a loan, no. But I have not seen any of the documentation of that loan.

And that is one—I am sure Mr. Dubinsky can tell you that calling something a loan is one way to claim that it is not taxable income.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. So, one quick question. You know, we uncovered yesterday that the Biden family and associates received over \$20 million from 23 different countries that they had business ties to or communications with, and they also had over 20 shell LLCs where they would transfer money in and out.

If you were still sitting in your office in DOJ's Tax Division, would this web of entities and activities concern you?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I would make sure that my prosecutors were concerned about it.

Mr. SMITH OF MISSOURI. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The Chair now recognizes Ms. Norton from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Professor Gerhardt, we are pleased to have you with us today.

In your testimony, you referenced Alexander Hamilton's warning about the dangers of trivializing impeachment through petty partisanship.

Let me ask you, Mr. Gerhardt, do you think that initiating an impeachment inquiry against President Biden without any evidence of wrongdoing by the President meets any basic standard of proof?

Mr. GERHARDT. Not credible proof at all, in my opinion.

And, in fact, I think one thing to keep in mind in a hearing like this or anything that calls itself an impeachment inquiry is the critical importance of building public trust. And that gets built, in part, on the basis of credible evidence.

Ms. NORTON. Well, Professor Gerhardt, what is the risk to our Constitution and even for the rule of law if impeachments are initiated without any evidence of wrongdoing by a President?

Mr. GERHARDT. They trivialize impeachment, they trivialize the Constitution, and they ride roughshod over the rule of law. Nothing good comes from abusing a power, whether it is done by a President or by Congress.

Ms. NORTON. Professor Gerhardt, do you believe that initiating an impeachment inquiry without any evidence of wrongdoing by the President is consistent with the view that impeachment is a grave and solemn duty?

Mr. GERHARDT. Impeachment is a grave and solemn duty. All the more reason why all evidence, for example, relating to Burisma ought to be heard and considered. That would actually add credibility to what the Committee is doing.

Ms. NORTON. I would be remiss if I did not add that it is incredible that we are holding this sham hearing 2 days before the government will shut down.

Instead of this hearing, we could be discussing how to fund the government; or we could discuss my bill to exempt from Federal

Government shutdowns the Federal and independent agencies that are exclusively or primarily federally funded but have jurisdiction over local D.C. civil and criminal justice matters; or we could be discussing how we are going to provide back pay to Federal contract workers if Republicans unfortunately do push us into a shutdown.

Instead, we are holding this sham hearing.

I yield the remainder of my time to Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you kindly, Ms. Norton, for that.

Mr. Comer referred to a 2019 wire to Hunter Biden while President Biden was not in office. He was a private citizen. So, of course, was Hunter Biden. Hunter Biden has never held public office.

Mr. Smith referenced a DOJ email from 2020 during the Trump Administration.

So, Professor Gerhardt, I mean, what do you make of the idea of impeaching a President while he is in office for something that his son did or may have received when the President was not in office?

Mr. GERHARDT. It is not consistent with the American legal system. Just imagine if the names are switched. Just imagine if this was Jared Kushner——

Mr. RASKIN. Well——

Mr. GERHARDT [continuing]. Or one of President Trump's sons.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Mr. Smith talked about \$20 million that he thought Hunter Biden had received and put in the names of different family members. I think *The Washington Post* has debunked that as recently as this weekend, saying it was, like, \$8 million or \$9 million.

But let us say it were \$20 million. That is 1 percent of the \$2 billion that was brought back by Jared Kushner from Saudi Arabia to a company that Jared Kushner created the day after the Trump Administration ended.

But, assuming there were no other evidence, would it be fair to attribute that \$2 billion that Jared Kushner pocketed, with the \$25 million management fee every year that Jared Kushner pocketed——would it be fair to attribute all of that to Donald Trump because it is his son-in-law?

Mr. GERHARDT. No, not without any evidence actually showing the President knew it.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. So——

Mr. GERHARDT. Or approved it.

Mr. RASKIN. Because the principle of American law is that people are responsible for their own conduct and not the conduct of their adult children. Is that right?

Mr. GERHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you and to the gentlelady for yielding.

And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Jordan from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you.

Professor Gerhardt, it was not just a speech; he leveraged \$1 billion of American tax money. And he did so at a time when our government was supportive of the prosecutor.

Here is what our government said, the Assistant Secretary of State: “We have been impressed with the ambitious reform and anti-corruption agenda of your government,” written to the Prosecutor General who Joe Biden leverages our money to get fired. “The United States fully supports your efforts to fight corruption,” she further wrote.

The Interagency Policy Committee said this on October 1, 2015: “The IPC recommends moving forward with a third loan guarantee to Ukraine in the near term.”

And even after Joe Biden gives the speech on December 9th, the European Commission said—their report said, “The anti-corruption benchmark is deemed to have been achieved for Ukraine.”

But the most telling evidence is what his business partner said. Devon Archer, when we deposed him under oath just 2 months ago, said this:

Here is the question: “The request was help from the U.S. Government to deal with the pressure they were under from their prosecutor?” You know what Mr. Archer’s response was? “That is correct.”

Next question: “What did Hunter Biden do after he was given that request?” “He called his dad.”

That is what we are investigating. That is one of the three things Professor Turley talked about, the influence-peddling scheme.

I want to go to those three things, Professor Turley: false statements, influence-peddling scheme, and Joe Biden might have benefited.

Let us do the third one first. Is a benefit to your family—can a benefit to your family be a benefit to you?

Mr. TURLEY. It is. There has been a—repeated statements that you need to show that President Biden accepted direct money in order for this to constitute a benefit. Even under criminal cases that deal with bribery, extortion, and the Hobbs Act, the courts actually have rejected that. They have said that money going to family members is, in fact, a benefit.

And I do not really see any legal basis for that. Obviously, the strongest case is if you have a direct payment. But this idea that you can have millions going to a politician’s family and that is not a benefit, I think, is pretty fallacious.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

How about the false claims thing?

In your written testimony, you said, “To the extent that the President has used the White House”—I think this is a little broader. “To the extent the President used the White House staff to maintain false claims or resist disclosures, it can fit into the type of Nixonian abuse of power model.”

We know all kinds of false statements have been made by the White House. Joe Biden has made them. He said it was a lousy question when they asked him, have you ever been involved—talked to any one of your son’s business partners? We know that was false.

Ron Klain said, “The President is confident his son did not break the law.” Press Secretary Jen Psaki said, never spoke to his son about his overseas business dealings.

What do you think about all those false statements from the White House and this abuse of power issue?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, the involvement of White House staff and executive branch staff has been really one of the tripwires that we saw in Nixon and, to some extent, even in Clinton. The degree to which you enlist support for a false narrative or to obstruct Congress can go into things like abuse of power.

One of the things that I suggested is that, if you look at past impeachment inquiries—and, once again, this is an inquiry to find evidence, not—we are not—you are not voting on Articles of Impeachment—those allegations tend to develop last, and you look at—

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. What you have found.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

How about the Attorney General? I am concerned about statements he made.

March 1, 2023, in front of the Senate, he was asked a question about Mr. Weiss's investigation. He said this in response to Senator Grassley: "Mr. Weiss has full authority to bring cases in other jurisdictions if he feels it is necessary."

Last week, the Attorney General told us that Weiss had the authority because "I promised him he would have the authority if he asked it." That seems to me to be something different.

So, he said to the Senate: He is got full authority, no problem. Last week, he told the House Judiciary Committee: He had authority because I promised, if he would come talk to me, I would give him the authority that I already told the Senate he had.

Do you see a concern there with false statements coming from the Biden Justice Department?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, there is a concern. You do not have to prejudge the evidence to say that obviously this is part of the inquiry.

And what I do not understand is the opposition to the inquiry itself. It seems to me the test is: Would the alleged conduct, if proven, establish impeachable offenses? And is there a credible basis for those allegations?

I think the answer is clearly yes, that there is a basis to look at the President's conduct, without prejudging whether that qualifies at the beginning of that inquiry as an Article of Impeachment.

Mr. JORDAN. And let us be clear. You do not need a full vote of the House to proceed in an impeachment inquiry phase of our constitutional duty to do oversight.

In fact, the Democrats did it. Four years ago, I was in an impeachment deposition run by Adam Schiff in the bunker in the basement of the Capitol, and I went to the Floor—so I am in an impeachment deposition, and I went to the Floor to vote on opening an impeachment inquiry.

They did the same darn thing. Because you have that authority as a Congress when the Speaker of the House makes that designation.

Mr. TURLEY. The Speaker, Nancy Pelosi, did, in fact, initiate the impeachment; in some cases, then you have a later vote. I have said in my testimony, I consider that the best practice, to have a vote of the House.

But the court that was referenced earlier looked at this and said that the Constitution does not require a resolution. It actually said, if you look at all the impeachments——

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. Often there was not a resolution. That does not mean it is not a good practice, but the Constitution itself does not require such a resolution.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Lynch from Massachusetts for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I do want to agree with the Chairman that the witnesses we have here today do bring an awful lot of experience and expertise to the issue. But what they do not bring is facts, right? They do not bring evidence.

None of you are able to really elucidate or illustrate actions by the President with respect to this inquiry.

Ms. O'Connor, I do want to ask one clarification. You mentioned in your oral testimony that you had written a commentary entitled "You'd Go to Prison for What Biden Did."

That was, "You'd Go to Prison for What Hunter Biden Did"; isn't that——

Ms. O'CONNOR. That is exactly right.

Mr. LYNCH. OK.

Ms. O'CONNOR. I was cutting down words——

Mr. LYNCH. Oh.

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] To stay within my 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. But you realize—you realize—yes. Yes. That is an important word, though, that you left out, though, right?

Ms. O'CONNOR. It is. I regretted it immediately.

Mr. LYNCH. So, the article, just for the record, just for the record—and I would like to enter it into the record, unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH. The article, Ms. O'Connor, is "You'd Go to Prison for What Hunter Biden Did."

Ms. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. LYNCH. I think that is an important word, yes.

Ms. O'CONNOR. It is.

Mr. LYNCH. OK. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Ms. O'CONNOR. I did not delete it intentionally, only in——

Mr. LYNCH. Reclaiming my time.

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] Service of time.

Mr. LYNCH. Reclaiming my time.

So, when I walked into this hearing room, my first question was, where is Rudy? Where is Rudy? Where is Rudy Giuliani?

You know, this is supposed to be an inquiry on the facts against the President for potentially an impeachment, Articles of Impeachment. And the one person—the one person—who was an agent of President Trump was sent—sent—to Ukraine to dig up some dirt, find some dirt on Joe Biden—just like he said to the election officials in Georgia, find me 11,780 votes; find me some dirt on Joe

Biden—and we do not have him here. We are not allowed to ask him questions.

And, Professor Gerhardt, would it not be helpful to have a factual witness here, who was—and let me just read from—this is an excerpt of the call between Mr. Trump and President Zelenskyy.

He says, “Rudy very much knows what is happening, and he is a very capable guy. If you could speak to him, that would be great. The other thing, there is a lot of talk about Biden’s son, that Biden stopped the prosecution, and a lot of people want to find out about that. So, whatever you can do with the Attorney General and Rudy would be great.”

So, he is actually placing Rudy Giuliani in Ukraine with the imprimatur of authority for the President. Wouldn’t that be a useful witness to—

Mr. GERHARDT. It seems obvious that he should be brought before the Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes. You would think so.

What we have here is a lot of allegations. I have heard about, you know, emails from Hunter Biden from China, Hunter Biden cashed in, you know, the IRS interview with James Biden, and I hear a lot about the Biden family. But, look, this is an impeachment inquiry about President Biden. And I would try to discern what the allegations are for the President, because they are non-existent at this point.

Is there a reason—the other question is, why has not Rudy Giuliani—if he is such a key witness and was on the ground on this and had direct authority from the President, why isn’t he here?

And I think—and, Professor Gerhardt, maybe you could elucidate on this—Rudy Giuliani also lost 60 cases. He brought 60 cases across the United States with respect to the Big Lie. And he was the midwife for the Big Lie. He brought 60 cases and lost them all, for lack of evidence.

Then—so that, I believe, hurts his credibility, does it not?

Mr. GERHARDT. It does. His credibility has been hurt in a number of different ways, yes.

Mr. LYNCH. Right.

He also made allegations against Dominion Voting machines, and now he is being sued by them because he falsely declared that those machines were unfairly helping President Biden. Isn’t that right?

Mr. GERHARDT. That is right.

Mr. LYNCH. Wouldn’t that also lead to a drop in credibility on behalf of Mr. Giuliani’s testimony?

Mr. GERHARDT. I mean, I agree with you. And I would just add that, because Mr. Giuliani is a lawyer, he has to abide by and comply with the rules of professional conduct, and he is in trouble because he has not.

Mr. LYNCH. All right.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman’s time—

Mr. LYNCH. I think my time has expired. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman’s time has expired.

The Chair now recognizes the Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, Mr. Turner from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER. Professor Turley, thank you so much for the materials that you provided to this Committee. Your legal analysis is, first off, incredible in its historic foundations but also its legal descriptions of the aspects of how do you conduct an impeachment investigation and what are the standards for an impeachment investigation, and taking, as you relate in that memo, some of the public facts that you are aware of and comparing them to congressional authority and oversight responsibilities. I think it really does help the overall discussion. And I think it gives validity to the need for this Committee to move forward on an investigation, as you look to, historically, what has happened before.

Now, you made some comments in your opening statement about your description that I think are important to focus on in trying to guide our investigation. You said that it is not criminal for a President or Vice President to lie.

Mr. TURLEY. That is correct.

Mr. TURNER. You also said that it is not criminal that Hunter Biden received—someone paying the child of a Vice President for doing nothing is not necessarily criminal. Those are my words, not yours.

But you did take that next leap, that using your office, taking official actions to benefit individuals or third parties, to induce them to financially benefit your family, would be a crime, would it not, Professor?

Mr. TURLEY. It is. That is—if you take a look at some of the treaties, the sources that I cited, the United States has for years combated influence-peddling as a prototypical form of public corruption. And much influence-peddling follows that pattern.

Many people now accept that what Hunter Biden did was rather raw and open influence-peddling. So, the only question is, was the President involved in that? And I am not prejudging that, but there is an argument now that you hear that they were just selling the illusion of access.

The fact is, you have to ask yourself one question: How do you know? Even if you accept that selling the illusion of access is not misconduct, how do you know it was an illusion?

Mr. TURNER. Well, and that is where I am going to go next. Because there is also another concerning aspect of President Joe Biden's actions as Vice President for which there is currently an active criminal investigation, and that is his misuse of classified documents.

There has been appointed by the Department of Justice, by the Attorney General, a special prosecutor for the purposes of investigating the Federal crimes that could have arisen as a result from this President's misuse of classified documents, the fact that he had them at the Penn Biden Center for Diplomacy and Global Engagement and the Wilmington, Delaware private residence of President Joe Biden, as well as other matters that might arise from it—places where there were other people. One of those other people happens to be Hunter Biden.

Now, this Committee, in its scope of this investigation, indicates that these classified materials are also relevant because—for example, the Oversight Committee has requested information regarding the classified materials discovered in the President's home, where

his son has resided during the time period relevant to the investigation and personal office. The White House has not provided this information.

Obviously, his son was receiving payments from Romania, Russia, Ukraine, China. If there are, in those documents, documents that relate to, for example, the prosecutor in Ukraine, or Burisma itself, or other aspects of Ukraine, or any of the parties or individuals, obviously, that were making payments to Hunter Biden, that would be relevant, wouldn't it?

Mr. TURLEY. It would be relevant.

One of the things I address in my testimony is, I say that the most concerning line for me in this inquiry is pre-office conduct. And what I say is that there should be a type of rebuttable presumption against bringing in pre-office conduct, but there is precedent for it when it forms—

Mr. TURNER. Well, and this—he was in office—

Mr. TURLEY. Right.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. At the time, because he would not have had access to the classified documents. These are not things that he did as a private citizen. He had these documents given to him.

And I want to ask you, in his scope as both Senator and as Vice President—there has been a lot of talk that perhaps the President inadvertently ended up with these documents. Now, first off, there is an unbelievable number of documents. He is clearly a classified-document hoarder. And he clearly was mishandling them.

Can't you infer intent by knowledge of the law? Here, President Biden knows how to handle classified documents and what mishandling is. Wouldn't that be attributed to his intent?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, that can all go to a question of establishing intent. And, in all these cases, you obviously do not have a confession.

I am not too sure if the documents matter will become relevant to an impeachment inquiry. I have said earlier that the issue that concerned me about the documents is that they ended up being distributed to different sources, it appears, that they went to different locations, and there are accounts of being in the President's home. And the question is, were they divided and why?

But it is not clear to me whether that would amount to an impeachable offense or not, because—

Mr. TURNER. Right. You have to make that nexus, which I think—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TURNER. I have seen some of these documents, as the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and I can tell you, they are of the highest level of concern and threat to national security. I think we do have to get to the bottom of, why was he taking these, and what was he doing with them?

I will yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent motion.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Connolly of Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman? Unanimous consent motion?

I ask unanimous consent to introduce page 131 of the transcript of Devon Archer's testimony, where the question is asked, "But he did not provide the Burisma executives with actual access to his father. The access to his father was an illusion of access."

Chairman COMER. The gentleman is out of order. You will have time in your 5 minutes.

[Cross-talk.]

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Connolly from Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is it admitted?

VOICE. I object.

VOICE. I object too.

VOICE. It should all be admitted.

Chairman COMER. The clock is ticking, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. GOLDMAN. What is the objection based on?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman is taking your time, Mr. Connolly. You have—it is your turn to speak.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Distract—yes, you are taking time away from me unfairly.

Distract, deflect, dissemble. Hold on to those two words, "distract" and "deflect." Because I think this hearing is all about, "Look over here, not over there."

So, Professor Gerhardt, I have heard concern about branding. So, shouldn't we be concerned about all those Biden towers all over the world, where foreign partnerships were formed and influence was used here in the United States? I have seen these towers in Indonesia, in the Philippines, in Turkey. I even saw one in Chicago.

Shouldn't that be a source of concern to this Committee in terms of influence, both foreign and domestic, when, you know, President Biden became President?

Mr. GERHARDT. If there were such things as Biden buildings.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, was there anyone who did have them?

Mr. GERHARDT. I think we all know who—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, could you tell us? Because—you know.

Mr. GERHARDT. Well, I think—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Just give me the name, Professor Gerhardt.

Mr. GERHARDT. I think you are talking about Mr. Trump.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Ah, thank you.

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So, when President Biden appointed his son to manage U.S. foreign policy both in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East peace—by the way, his son who could not qualify for getting a security clearance, but President Biden apparently granted it to Hunter anyhow—and then, after leaving the White House, getting a \$2 billion deal—because we are told by Mr. Dubinsky, follow the money, especially foreign money.

Shouldn't that be of concern to us, that maybe a sweetheart deal occurred, with the blessing of the President, with foreign money? And shouldn't we look into Hunter Biden for that, given the fact that he handled Middle East peace in the White House?

Mr. GERHARDT. It should have been a concern with President Trump and his son-in-law.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Oh, Trump. I got that wrong again. I am sorry.

Well, let us see. I am looking at—I heard again, I think it was Professor Turley talking about—you know, because he is not prejudging, of course, but he is just suggesting that maybe we want to look into criminal activity, like obstruction, fraud, and abuse of power.

So, let us take fraud. So, shouldn't we be concerned that a New York judge just found President Biden's organization committed fraud every year for the last 10 or 15 years and that, under the Martin Law in New York, that Biden organization is now subject to dismemberment and dismantlement because of the fraudulent activity? Shouldn't that be of concern to us?

Mr. GERHARDT. That should be of concern with respect to Mr. Trump.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Trump again. And, in this case, we are not speculating. A judge actually made that ruling?

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Hmm.

Should we be concerned about the personal—I mean, while we are at it, since we are loading on—shouldn't we be concerned about the personal behavior of the President? For example, President Trump—or, President Biden being found guilty of sexual assault and defamation associated with that activity, again, in a civil court, in this case in New York?

Mr. GERHARDT. We should be concerned as it relates to Mr. Trump, yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. With Mr. Trump again.

I just think that one of the reasons we are here is because somebody has been indicted in four different locales, on four different sets of concerns, with, I think, 81, 91 actual counts, and has been found guilty in two civil proceedings, one involving sexual behavior and one on actual corporate fraudulent activity, and we do not want to talk about any of that.

We want to speculate about discredited testimony from discredited witnesses, like Rudy Giuliani, whom we are afraid to subpoena. That is what this is all about.

This is not about our need to defend Joe Biden. This is about their need to make sure we get off-topic, that we no longer talk about the pending criminal trials of the former President of the United States.

And if anything is worthy of examination, that is, not this.

I yield back.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Donalds for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, point of order. Point of order. Down here, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. You will have 5 minutes—

Mr. GOLDMAN. It is not my 5 minutes. It is—

Chairman COMER. You will have your 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. A point of order.

Chairman COMER. Nope. You are out of order. You are out of order, Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have a point of order.

Chairman COMER. When your time is, you will be recognized.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I ask to introduce something by unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. I recognize Mr. Donalds for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is it being introduced?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds for 5 minutes.

Byron, it is your time.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, the rules require you to recognize me.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And——

Chairman COMER. No.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes, for a point of order, they absolutely do.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Donalds.

Mr. GOLDMAN. And you have to rule on the motion——

Mr. CONNOLLY. And is Mr. Donalds' time ticking too?

Chairman COMER. You have already made two points of order.

The Chair recognizes——

Mr. DONALDS. No, Mr. Donalds' time is not going to tick. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I request his clock be set back to 5 minutes.

Chairman COMER. Set the clock back to 5 minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, can I just make a parliamentary inquiry then?

Are we not to make points of order on either side during the questioning?

Chairman COMER. You keep speaking about “no evidence.” Why don't you all just listen and learn?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am trying to introduce evidence.

Chairman COMER. You have already intro—you have already had your share of evidence.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is it in? Are you admitting it?

Chairman COMER. Now, Mr. Donalds, 5 minutes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dubinsky, I want to come to you quickly.

A lot of talk about evidence. On the screens in the room we have an organizational chart from the IRS investigative team that was looking into the business practices of Hunter Biden and his associates. This org chart is from 2014.

Now, Mr. Dubinsky, in my former life, I was in community banking, and I am comfortable with looking at organizational charts. When I first saw this chart, the first thing I thought about was a real estate holding company or a developer—and this is not to demean developers in the great states of America—but developers typically have multiple companies that float with various business interests and business lines.

But the funny thing is that, in the business dealings of Hunter Biden, there is no real estate. None at all.

So, Mr. Dubinsky, in your professional experience, looking at this organizational chart of business structure, what do you see here?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I see a very complicated structure of entities that are interrelated and would give me concern. If I were an investigator, I would want to know what is going on in these entities, who is behind them, how is the money moving between them, and what is the substance of the transactions, what is really going on here.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Dubinsky, do you think it is in the interest of this Committee, that is now in an inquiry phase, to actually find out all of the flow of money between these entities and what the purpose was?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Absolutely.

Mr. DONALDS. Next slide, please.

For my colleagues on the other side, we are going to start talking evidence now.

This is now a slide of the organizational chart of the Hunter Biden business companies, and with associates, from 2018 from the same IRS investigators who broke down the business structure in 2014.

Does this slide cause you the same concern, Mr. Dubinsky?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Yes, it does.

Mr. DONALDS. OK.

Now, let us talk about some more—actually, one point I want to make on this. Ladies and gentlemen, if—and I know it is kind of small, so I would love to submit—I will submit all this for the record. I would love for my colleagues on the other side to see this.

Mr. DONALDS. In 2014, one of the key owners was Devon Archer, who did testify and who did—was under deposition under oath by the Oversight Committee. In 2018, Devon Archer is no longer listed, but his wife, Krista Archer, is now listed.

Mr. Dubinsky, when you see a situation where ownership interest moves from one spouse to the other, is that a concern of some level of fraud potentially?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I would call it a red flag. That is something I would look at and, again, try to get to the bottom of what happened there. Was it just transferred? Was there money behind it? What was going on?

Mr. DONALDS. OK. Thank you.

Next slide.

Now, this is a text message. This is a text message between—it is going to Naomi Biden. That is what this one is.

Hold on, let me get my stuff back.

There we go. Sorry.

This is the WhatsApp text message between Jim Biden and Hunter Biden. In this text message, it clearly says, “Anyway, we can talk later but you have been drawn into something purely for the purpose of protecting Dad.”

This is between Hunter Biden and Jim Biden. Last time I checked, the father of Jim Biden and Joe Biden has now passed away. So, I am assuming this is Hunter Biden saying to Jim Biden, the President’s brother, that you have been brought in this for the sole purpose of protecting Dad.

Ms. O’Connor, do you think that this text message would lead this Committee to get further information about the business dealings of Hunter Biden and how that actually links to Jim Biden, the

President's brother, and why they are so concerned with protecting Dad, a.k.a. Joe Biden, a.k.a. the President of the United States?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you.

Next slide, please.

This is a text message between Hunter Biden and Naomi Biden. And this one is a famous one; everybody knows this one. This is the famous one that says, "I hope you all can do what I did and pay for everything for this entire family for 30 years. It is really hard. But do not worry, unlike pop, I will not make you give me half your salary."

Mr. Dubinsky, if you saw a text message like this in a potential money-laundering operation or a potential pay-for-play operation, would you be looking for information related to money going from son to father?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Absolutely, without a doubt.

Mr. DONALDS. Thank you.

Next slide.

Oh, this is a fun one. Ladies and gentlemen, this one is from 2018. This is about 4 months before Joe Biden launched his campaign for President of the United States. December 2018.

The highlight is—this is a text message between Jim Biden and Hunter Biden. Hunter Biden was in a bad way, by the way. He was really strung out. He lost a bunch of money. He needed help.

Jim Biden says, "This can work, you need a safe harbor. I can work with your father alone!!

[It will probably take] several months"—and everybody can read the text.

Ms. O'Connor, Mr. Dubinsky, if you saw a text message like this between the President's brother and the President's son, wouldn't you be concerned about them trying to give plausible deniability for the President of the United States to not have any knowledge of said business dealings?

Ms. O'CONNOR. It is worth—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired, but please answer the question.

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] It is worth investigating.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Dubinsky?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I would agree. I would investigate this.

Mr. DONALDS. I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

Before I recognize Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Goldman, I will give you an opportunity to quickly recognize—recognize you for your point of order.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I just want to make sure that page 131 of the transcript of the Devon Archer interview is entered into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Krishnamoorthi from Illinois for 5 minutes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Professor Turley, Hunter Biden is a private citizen, not a Federal official, right?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. A special counsel investigating Hunter Biden recently indicted him for various illegal acts. I am sure you are aware of this indictment. I have it in my hands.

But nowhere in Hunter Biden's indictment is there any allegation of Joe Biden having committed any wrongdoing, right?

Mr. TURLEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Not a parking ticket, not a moving violation, not a library fine, not a high crime or misdemeanor.

In fact, on page 19 of your witness statement that you submitted, you said, quote, "The current record does not establish any crime, let alone an impeachable offense."

Now, let us further explore what has been established about Joe Biden.

The Hill reports Senator Marco Rubio, quote, "noted that House Republicans are discussing a special impeachment inquiry to obtain evidence of criminal behavior that they have not been able to dig up through the House Oversight Committee." And Rubio warned that setting up a special impeachment counsel without strong evidence of a crime could "trivialize" the process.

Now, sir, Senator Rubio is a Republican, right?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Let us talk about whether this evidence that Mr. Rubio was referring to exists.

Our colleague Ken Buck, a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, said the following regarding evidence linking President Biden to an alleged crime, quote, "That does not exist right now."

Now, sir, Ken Buck is a Republican, correct?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Senator Mitt Romney of Utah said, quote, "There has not been any allegation yet, any conduct which reaches the constitutional standard for impeachment."

And, sir, Mitt Romney is a Republican as well, correct?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Now, let me turn to another topic here.

Ms. O'Connor, here, I have a poster of an entry from your professional LinkedIn account. There is your picture, and it says, "Law Office of Eileen J. O'Connor."

We printed here what you posted roughly 1 week ago. It says, quote, "The Biden Administration is promoting and enabling the invasion."

That is what your post says, right?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Yes, it does.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And it further goes on to say, "If this does not stop QUICKLY, then the ENTIRE USA will be INVADDED with MILLIONS of military aged men from MANY different countries who are ready to cause total HAVOC while getting paid \$2200 a month in welfare to do so."

Ms. O'CONNOR. Did I write that?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. You reposted it. And it says, "It is an Engineered DEATH SPIRAL."

Now, let me show you another posting that you put up on your professional——

Ms. O'CONNOR. May I respond?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY [continuing]. LinkedIn account.

Ms. O'CONNOR. May I respond? If there is an impeachment inquiry, I think it——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. You can respond when I am done with my question.

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] Should be for the deliberate——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Ma'am——

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] Demolition of the United States of America.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Ma'am, this is another posting from your professional LinkedIn account. This says, "ANNOUNCING Michigan Telethon to Raise Funds for 16 Alternate Electors Who Crooked Dana Nessel Wants to Jail."

Now, ma'am, that is your professional LinkedIn account, right?

Ms. O'CONNOR. It is.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Now let me turn to you, Mr. Turley.

Professor Turley, in 2006, you wrote an op-ed in *The Guardian* entitled, quote, "Stop Persecuting Polygamists." There, you likened polygamists to, quote, "persecuted minorities," and you said polygamy is, quote, "a practice with deep and good-faith religious meaning."

Isn't that what you said?

Mr. TURLEY. I represented the "Sister Wives" family in challenging a polygamy prosecution.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. The answer is "yes." You have been crusading for legalizing polygamy for years.

In fact, in an op-ed in the *USA Today*, you said that a Utah polygamist named Tom Green, who was also convicted of pedophilia for raping his 13-year-old stepdaughter, should not have been charged with polygamy.

Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TURLEY. Can I respond, sir?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. [continuing] We are counting——

Mr. TURLEY. Because that is not—can I respond? Because that is not entirely accurate.

I actually criticized him. What I was dealing with was the constitutionality of what is called "morals legislation." And I admit, I am pretty libertarian, but the idea is whether——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Was Tom Green convicted of pedophilia and rape?

Mr. TURLEY. The idea is whether the government——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Was he convicted of pedophilia and rape?

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. Can impose a moral code——

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Was he convicted of pedophilia and rape? The answer is "yes."

Mr. Chairman—Mr. Chairman, we are counting down the hours until a government shutdown, and here we have a hearing where we have one witness who defended a polygamist who was convicted of pedophilia and rape and we have another witness with LinkedIn accounts with extreme views posted. I think that unfortunately this speaks to the credibility of the witnesses and the credibility of this impeachment inquiry.

I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order. Point of order. Right over here.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs. What is your point?

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, when a Member of the Committee impugns the integrity of the witness, is it against the rules to allow those witnesses to respond to that malicious statement?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I am quoting the article.

Mr. BIGGS. I am asking—I am not asking you. I am asking the Chairman. I have asked for a ruling on that.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, he can use his own time to question any witness he wants.

Mr. BIGGS. I was recognized on a point of order.

Mr. RASKIN. Point of order.

Chairman COMER. What is your point?

Mr. BIGGS. I mean——

Mr. RASKIN. My point is that the way we have——

Mr. BIGGS. [continuing] I would ask for a ruling on my point of order first.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. The way we have always proceeded, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BIGGS. I would ask for a ruling on my point of order first.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, in order to——

Mr. BIGGS. I would ask for a ruling on my point of order first.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman——

Chairman COMER. OK, here is the ruling. Here is the ruling. The witnesses have the opportunity to address that during a line of questioning. If Mr. Turley wants to address that during another Member's line of questioning, then he is more than welcome to do that.

I remind everyone we are under a 5-minute clock.

And now, the Chair recognizes Ms. Mace from South Carolina for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In 2019, Representative Raskin did not think a House vote was needed for an actual impeachment inquiry. And, to quote Representative Raskin, he said in 2019, "There is no formal constitutional or statutory or even the House rule for how an impeachment inquiry is to begin, and so it means different things to different people."

I do not want to hear another word from the left or anyone across the other side of the aisle about impeachment inquiry. This is complete and total hypocrisy this morning.

Today, we are going to bring the facts. Today, we are going to bring the evidence.

In 2017, the Joe Biden family teamed up with Chinese company CEFC to make millions off of granting access to Joe Biden. Hunter even arranged for Joe Biden to share office space with the CCP-aligned company CEFC.

My Democratic colleagues say, none of this is relevant because Joe Biden was not Vice President while his family did these shady deals. Turns out that is complete and total bullshit. It is a lie. Hunter Biden referred to access to his father as the "keys" to his "family's only asset." Those words are going to come back and haunt Hunter Biden and his family forever.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee released an FBI memo on the interview they had with Tony Bobulinski, a former Biden partner in crime. I will read a bit of that right now:

“The work conducted by CEFC, GILLIAR, WALKER, HUNTER BIDEN, JAMES BIDEN, and YE over the preceding 2 years was discussed in detail. . . . In particular, CEFC was closing significant investment deals in Poland, Kazakhstan, Romania, Oman, and the Middle East during this period of time.”

“Period of time” is in reference to the years 2015 and 2016, when—guess what—Joe Biden was Vice President.

As an aside, Rob Walker, in previous testimony, also confirmed that Joe Biden attended a meeting with the head of CEFC.

So, now we know CEFC was working with the Biden family while Joe Biden was Vice President.

And I will continue reading from Tony Bobulinski’s report, which says, and I quote Bobulinski: “HUNTER BIDEN and JAMES BIDEN did not receive any compensation because JOSEPH BIDEN was still VPOTUS during this time period. There was a concern it would be improper for payments to be made to HUNTER BIDEN and JAMES BIDEN by CEFC due to its close affiliation with the Chinese government.”

“HUNTER BIDEN and JAMES BIDEN both wanted to be compensated for the assistance they had provided to CEFC’s ventures; in particular, they believed CEFC owed them money for the benefits that accrued to CEFC through its use of the BIDEN family name to advance their business dealings.”

The Bidens, coincidentally, were paid over a million dollars by CCP-affiliated Chinese company CEFC shortly after Joe Biden left office as Vice President. Now we know why: because it was back pay.

I am going to show another image. This is a text message between Hunter Biden and Gongwen Dong, an agent of CEFC.

Hunter says, “My uncle will be here with his BROTHER”—in all caps—“who would like to say hello to the Chairman.” He goes on, “Jim’s brother, if he’s coming, wants to say hello.”

His uncle’s brother. Hmm. I wonder who that could be. I cannot quite figure it out.

Hunter puts “brother” in all caps, and it does not take a genius to figure this out, but since I am not always dealing with geniuses in Washington, DC, as has been illustrated today, I will spell it out: The brother of Hunter—Hunter’s uncle, Jim, is Joe Biden.

Why was Hunter so secretive about his father? I am going to tell you why. It is because Joe Biden did not want the American people to know he and his family were getting paid millions and millions of dollars from a company closely tied to the Chinese Communist Party.

CEFC knew paying Biden family members was bad, so they covered it up. Hunter knew Joe Biden hanging out with CCP businessmen would be a bad look, so he tried to pull a genius move on us with this whole “my uncle’s brother” bullshit.

We already know the President took bribes from Burisma. I also want to add: betraying your country is treason.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record this text message between Hunter Biden and Gongwen Dong and

the FBI memo regarding their interview with Tony Bobulinski showing Joe Biden's connections to CFC during his Vice Presidency.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. Professor Turley, we have got 30 seconds.

In your experience in reviewing cases of fraud, do people who are conducting legitimate business usually go through these efforts and hoops to keep their foreign entanglements hidden?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes. The issue with influence peddling is that it can, in some circumstances, be legal, but it is not something that necessarily is made public. The public does not buy into the idea that you can sell your family brand if it is influence peddling.

So, what happens with influence peddling is that you often have the commission of crimes that conceal it and to take steps so that it is not public. That may include, but is not necessarily the reason in this case, but it may include the failure to pay taxes, the failure to register as a foreign agent.

And part of the purpose of an inquiry is to see if there is a linkage between those acts, and more importantly, a linkage to the President.

Can I briefly respond to the earlier attack? You may have additional questions. I do not want to take your time.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. I am sorry, the gentlelady is over time.

Mr. TURLEY. OK.

Chairman COMER. But we will work with you on that, because I do think you need to respond to that ridiculous statement.

Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Khanna for 5 minutes.

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Turley, you testified—or in your written statement—about best practices for the House, and you say that it is not legally required for the House to vote to have an impeachment inquiry, but it is a best practice.

Could you explain why you think it is a best practice for the House to have that vote?

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly. I think that what the courts have said is it is not required, as you noted, so it is not a condition for the initiation of an inquiry.

I just think it is a good practice, whether it occurs after the initiation. I think still a vote of the entire House brings the solemnity and the weight to the decision, and I do think it is one of the best practices that I suggested in my testimony.

Mr. KHANNA. And what would it mean if the votes were not there? I mean, hypothetically, if they had a vote and 10 or 20 people voted for it, I mean, you are a student of constitutional history, what would that say? I mean, why is it important, in your view, as a best practice to have majority support for something like this?

Mr. TURLEY. I think that the public expects Members to take this process seriously, and part of that is to go on the record about whether you believe there are grounds for an inquiry.

So, I think that, in terms of the best practices, that gives, I think, the weight of the House to the efforts. And so that is the reason I criticized the move of Speaker Pelosi when she did it.

Mr. KHANNA. And it would give you pause if there was a vote which said that the House did not think that there should be an inquiry, right? I mean, you would give that weight as a constitutional scholar, correct? I mean, if there—

Mr. TURLEY. If the House as a body said that there should not be an inquiry, then clearly that has, you know, on the merits of the inquiry that has some weight.

Mr. KHANNA. So, it would be your recommendation to Speaker McCarthy today to bring up that vote, correct, for a House inquiry?

Mr. TURLEY. I have always said that I thought it was a best practice.

Mr. KHANNA. And your recommendation to him today—I mean, he is listening, I am sure his staff are—would be bring that vote to the House Floor?

Mr. TURLEY. I always think it is a good idea to bring it to the House Floor.

Mr. KHANNA. And it would be your testimony, based on what you have said, that if that vote failed, that should have some real consideration in whether we go forward with this. I mean, let us put Members on the rope.

My view is they do not have the votes. I think it is going to be a very lopsided vote against it, and that is why they are not bringing it to the Floor.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, I cannot speak to that.

Mr. KHANNA. Let me ask you this. You also said that, “I do not believe that the current evidence would support Articles of Impeachment.” And I want to be careful because you have said you think it supports an inquiry but not the Articles of Impeachment themselves. I want to be precise in what you have said.

Can you explain to the Committee and the country why you believe that the current evidence does not support the Articles of Impeachment today?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, at the moment these are allegations, and there is some credible evidence there that is the basis of the allegations.

Mr. KHANNA. But I understand that, and I am not questioning that. I am questioning what—you do not think—today, if you were going to vote, if this was the case, you would vote no, correct?

Mr. TURLEY. On this evidence, certainly, because the inquiry just began.

Mr. KHANNA. OK. And my question is, if someone said to you, “OK, Mr. Turley, why are you voting not to impeach President Biden based on this evidence?” Where do you think the evidence is lacking? Where does it not rise to the level where you think it needs to be? What are the places that you think is missing?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I said in my testimony that the key here that the Committee has to drill down on is whether they can establish a linkage with the influence peddling, which is a form of corruption, and the President, whether he acknowledged, whether he participated, whether he encouraged it.

We simply do not know, and we do not even know if this was an illusion or not. But you can find the answers to that. I mean, the back end of these financial transactions, which I have read is

where the Committee is going, may shed light on that. But without that type of nexus, then, no, I do not.

Mr. KHANNA. And, currently, it is your testimony that that nexus has not been established, correct?

Mr. TURLEY. No, I think that is the purpose of the inquiry, yes, that is correct.

Mr. KHANNA. Would you agree with—have you read Ken Buck's op-ed in *The Washington Post* where he basically was one of the Republicans—which is why I think it would be a lopsided vote against an inquiry—saying that that evidence does not exist?

Mr. TURLEY. I did. And I respect Members of both parties that, you know, can stand alone. He has his reasons for that.

I personally think that the threshold for an inquiry has been surpassed, that you have a duty to inquire as to these allegations, but that is not presupposing what you are going to find.

Mr. KHANNA. Now, just to summarize that, it is your formal recommendation to the Speaker to have a vote on the inquiry, and it is also your testimony today that today you would vote no on impeachment on the current evidence?

Mr. TURLEY. My sense—when Speaker Pelosi took this step I gave the same advice, that I think it is a best practice to go to the Floor.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair now recognizes Mrs. McClain from Michigan for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And before I start with my line of questioning, I just want to make two comments.

First, to Professor Gerhardt. I love the analogy that you used about the speeding ticket with Hunter Biden. Let me also see if you would agree with this analogy.

If a criminal pulls a trigger for a murder, he is guilty, right, and we can prove it. But don't you also agree with me, if somebody ordered that hit, we would charge him too? It is interesting that you do not use that analogy. That is No. 1.

No. 2—

Mr. GERHARDT. I have a reason for not using it, but yes.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes, because it does not fit the narrative is the reason.

Mr. GERHARDT. No. No, because there is no evidence of—

Mrs. MCCLAIN. No. 2, I am amazed at—and I love the fact that Trump lives rent free in the Democrats' heads every day. That is a beautiful thing, even though we are here talking about the impeachment inquiry of Joe Biden.

With that said, I want to talk about the damning evidence of Joe Biden's role in his family's business schemes in Romania.

While Joe Biden was President, he was directly involved in the United States policy and anti-corruption efforts in Romania. That is a fact.

On May 21, 2014, the then-Vice President Biden delivered an anti-corruption speech in Romania, right?

On September 28, 2015, the Romanian President visited with the then-Vice President Biden at the White House to discuss anti-corruption efforts, right?

Got a theme of corruption, anti-corruption, right?

Gabriel Popoviciu, a corrupt Romanian oligarch in the subject of a criminal probe—he is the subject of a criminal probe and prosecution for corruption and bribery in Romania. This Committee has reviewed transactions showing that the Biden family received money from a foreign company run by this Russian (sic) oligarch, corrupt Gabriel Popoviciu.

Five weeks after the Romanian President visited with Vice President Biden, Popoviciu begins paying Hunter Biden and his associates, Rob Walker, through his company, Bladon Enterprises.

The money from Bladon Enterprises is deposited directly into Robinson Walker, LLC. Now, this LLC is directly operated by Hunter's known business partner, Rob Walker.

These are all facts, right, that we found through the investigation.

In November 2015 and again in March 2016, Hunter Biden, who is not registered as a foreign agent under FARA, meets with the U.S. Ambassador to Romania. Red flag. Then, coincidentally, over \$1 million flows to the Bidens.

I am not much for coincidences, and I do not think the American people are either.

Let us run through the numbers together.

Between November 2015 and May 2017, Bladon Enterprises deposited over \$3 million into Robinson Walker's LLC business account. But then the Biden family accounts received more than \$1 million from Robinson Walker's accounts after these deposits were made. Ironically, 16 of those 17 payments occurred while Joe Biden was Vice President.

Now, I think most Americans would find it suspicious that, ironically, these payments ended shortly after Joe Biden left office. Another coincidence.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the Oversight Committee's May 10, 2023, second bank records memorandum showing Joe Biden's involvement in his family's business schemes in Romania.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. I see three problems here.

One, while Joe Biden is touting anti-corruption efforts in Romania, Hunter Biden is employed by a corrupt Romanian oligarch. Interesting.

In direct violation of FARA, Hunter Biden meets with the U.S. Ambassador to Romania while being paid by Gabriel Popoviciu.

What was Hunter Biden selling to the Romania oligarchs for millions of dollars? I would still like to see a contract of that.

Professor Turley, I know I am almost out of time, but you previously said that Hunter Biden could be charged under the Foreign Agent Registration Act. Can you explain why?

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time is expired, but please feel free to answer the question, Mr. Turley.

Mr. TURLEY. Much of the conduct described in these disclosures does seem to fit what we saw with the charges of Paul Manafort in terms of being a foreign agent. Some of this does appear to be that type of lobbying on the part of Hunter Biden.

The failure to register as an agent, of course, helped conceal that, but that is not necessarily the motivation behind it.

The question is, should he have registered as a foreign agent during the course of this conduct. And it just seems to me, looking at the Paul Manafort indictment, that there is considerable overlap in terms of the type of actions taken.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Perhaps there is a two-tier justice system.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent to enter Mrs. McClain's chart into the record?

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Mfume from Maryland for 5 minutes.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I did not plan to, but I would like to follow up on the gentleman's comments and assertions about Romania and Hunter Biden and the fact that he worked for a Romanian executive facing corruption charges.

The problem with that is that Rudy Giuliani also worked for that person and a former FBI Director.

And I would like to ask unanimous consent that a *New York Times* piece entitled, "Giuliani is Drawing Attention to Hunter Biden's Work in Romania. But There is a Problem," be entered into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to this Burisma theory, because it seems to me that that is what has triggered all of this, and we are sitting here now wasting precious time while the country is about to shut down, and it is also found its genesis with Rudy Giuliani, that we ought to have Rudy Giuliani here.

Now, I know there was a motion made earlier. I would like to disaggregate that motion without mentioning the other person's name and offer a motion again that Rudy Giuliani be required to come before this Committee.

Is there a second?

VOICE. Second.

Mr. MFUME. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the clock be paused while the—

Chairman COMER. Pause the clock.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Grothman.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Motion to table.

Chairman COMER. Motion made to table by Mr. Grothman. Is there a second?

Ms. FOXX. Second.

Chairman COMER. Second by Ms. Foxx.

So, I guess we will have a vote on Mr. Grothman's motion to table Mr. Mfume's motion.

Mr. RASKIN. This is about Giuliani, right?

Chairman COMER. We will do this by voice vote.

All those in favor, say aye.

Mr. MFUME. I would like a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Aye.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I requested a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. All those opposed, no.

Mr. RASKIN. He has requested a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion has it.

The ayes——

Mr. RASKIN. I would request a recorded vote now.

Mr. MFUME. I request a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please get ready to have a recorded vote, another motion by the Minority party?

The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Motion for a temporary recess.

Chairman COMER. There is a motion for a temporary recess. Is there a second?

Motion second. All those in favor signify——

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chairman, there is already a motion on the Floor. There is already a motion on the Floor.

Chairman COMER. I promised the witnesses at 12 o'clock we would give them a bathroom break.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There is already a motion on the Floor.

Mr. MFUME. There is a motion, and it is mine.

Chairman COMER. All right. Would the Clerk please report—call the roll? Will the Clerk call the roll?

Mr. RASKIN. To be clear, this is on the motion to table Mr. Mfume's motion for unanimous consent to call Rudy Giuliani as a witness before the Oversight Committee. Is that right?

Chairman COMER. That is correct.

Mr. RASKIN. OK.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes aye.

Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes aye.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, what are we voting on?

Chairman COMER. This is a motion by Mr. Grothman to table the motion by Mr. Mfume to subpoena Rudy Giuliani.

Ms. MACE. Got it. It does not seem to have a lot to do with this. I will vote aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Burchett?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Greene?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. McClain?

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.

Ms. Boebert?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Fry?

Mr. FRY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.

Mrs. Luna?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?

Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.

Mr. Langworthy?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.

Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.

Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.

Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.

Mr. Connolly?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?

[No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
 Mr. MFUME. Mfume votes no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.
 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
 Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.
 The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.
 Ms. Porter?
 Ms. PORTER. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
 Ms. Bush?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
 Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez votes no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
 Ms. Brown?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
 Mr. Goldman?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.
 Ms. Tlaib?
 Ms. TLAIB. Nope.
 The CLERK. Ms. Tlaib votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. The Chairman votes aye.
 How is Mr. Fallon from Texas recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes aye. Mr. Fallon is not yet recorded.
 Mr. FALLON. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Langworthy from New York recorded?

The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy is not recorded.
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Timmons from South Carolina recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons is not yet recorded.
 Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Gosar from Arizona recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar is not recorded.
 Mr. GOSAR. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.
 Mr. CONNOLLY. How is Mr. Connolly recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly is not yet recorded.
 Mr. CONNOLLY. I vote no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes no.
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. How is Krishnamoorthi recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi is not yet recorded.
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Armstrong recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong is voted aye.
 Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Mace is recorded as voting aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Donalds from Florida recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds is not yet recorded.
 Mr. DONALDS. I vote yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
 Mr. RASKIN. Madam Clerk, how am I recorded? Have I been recorded, Madam Clerk? It is Mr. Raskin.
 The CLERK. Mr. Raskin, you are recorded as voting no.
 Mr. GOMEZ. How am I recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez, you are recorded as voting no.
 Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. How am I recorded? Congresswoman Ocasio-Cortez. How am I recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez is recorded as voting no.
 Ms. BROWN. How is Brown recorded?
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown is not yet recorded.
 Ms. BROWN. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally the votes?
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 20, the nays are 18.
 Chairman COMER. The motion to table passes.
 Mr. MFUME, you are recognized for your final 3 and a half minutes.
 Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 I reclaim my time, and I ask the question, where in the world is Rudy Giuliani? That is how we got here, ladies and gentlemen. And this Committee is afraid to bring him before us and put him on the record. Shame. And the question was raised, what does this have to do with it? It has everything to do with it.
 Professor Gerhardt, in your testimony you said in every impeachment inquiry beforehand the House has identified some credible

evidence of wrongdoing committed by a targeted President. Is that correct?

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MFUME. Professor Gerhardt, are impeachment inquiries typically utilized as a frontline tool to go fishing or for the first time go seeking evidence?

Mr. GERHARDT. No, sir.

Mr. MFUME. Professor Gerhardt, would you say that House Republicans have made an unprecedented overreach of congressional power?

Mr. GERHARDT. It strikes me that it is, yes.

Mr. MFUME. And, Mr. Gerhardt, would you say it is fair to assume that the extreme MAGA Republicans in particular have misused if not abused Committee's resources and the taxpayer dollars in this prolonged investigation that has gone on for almost a year, subpoenaing documents, having hearings, providing boxes of evidence, and no wrongdoing?

Mr. GERHARDT. Sir, I appreciate the question. I am not sure who the MAGA Republicans are.

Mr. MFUME. I can point them out to you.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MFUME. Now, here is the——

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MFUME. Here is the——

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. I would ask that the gentleman please point out the Republicans he is referring to. He said he could.

Mr. MFUME. This is—I am reclaiming my time.

Ladies and gentlemen, this clock is showing what is happening to our country while we debate over and over and over again not any wrongdoing by President Biden but trying to link what his son may or may not have done to him.

People are going to be hurt when this time runs out. This is not "The Wizard of Oz" when all of a sudden she turns over the hour glass while the Wicked Witch is standing there.

These are children, these are women, these are military officers and soldiers and civilians, these are law enforcement officers, these are senior citizens looking for paychecks for Social Security.

Why in the hell are we playing this game? And why don't we be honest? If it were so important, it could wait.

This is what is important, protecting this government and protecting the people who pay taxes here. But we want to play games with all of this.

So, where is Rudy Giuliani right now? I would like to know. And I would like to know why we cannot bring him before this Committee like we have brought these witnesses and everybody else.

I yield back my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Baltimore for his passionate and lucid comments here. And I appreciate the fact that you introduced a motion to subpoena Giuliani before. I have introduced a motion to subpoena Giuliani and Lev Parnas.

Now, Lev Parnas wrote us a long letter saying that all of this is based on a fraud, a tissue of fraud. He went all over the world with Rudy Giuliani looking to find dirt.

Chairman COMER. Is he alleging the China money was a fraud?

Mr. RASKIN. Are you asking me to yield? Are you asking me to yield?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. I am happy to yield for a second. What is your question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. What fraud are you—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, you—I have introduced in the record, in case you have not read it yet, the letter that Lev Parnas wrote to you and to me. In it he called upon you to call off this wild goose chase.

Chairman COMER. Because of China money that the Bidens have received?

Mr. RASKIN. No, because all of this is based on the Burisma conspiracy that—

Chairman COMER. The China money is based on the Burisma scheme?

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I have seen a lot of China money that went to the Trump family, if that is what you are referring to.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Mfume's time is expired. You can—someone can yield.

Now it is Dr. Foxx from North Carolina for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This is not a game. This is very serious business. And I think at the end it will be proven to the American people that this is serious business. And we need to get on with it, and we need to have the other side to stop playing games.

Ms. O'Connor, in a column published in the *Wall Street Journal* you stated that the typical timidity of IRS criminal tax lawyers in recommending prosecution is, quote, "common knowledge in the tax enforcement community," end quote.

Can you explain where this timidity comes from?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I do not know the source of it. Thank you for the question. But it is common knowledge in the tax enforcement community.

The Tax Division is required to authorize any criminal tax charges that are going to be brought. In order to inform itself, the—well, the special agent report is provided to the Tax Division.

Before it gets to the Tax Division, IRS criminal tax attorneys review it. They are—because—I am sorry. I am having trouble answering this. But because—

Ms. FOXX. Let me give you some more guidance.

Ms. O'CONNOR. OK. I actually can.

Ms. FOXX. So, before bringing charges, IRS criminal lawyers, as you are alluding to, provide advisory views in the special agent report. Is that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Right.

Ms. FOXX. OK.

Ms. O'CONNOR. And they are advisory only. And the IRS, as any prosecutor is, is very determined to have a very high conviction rate. So, they want to be very, very careful that if they bring a case, they will win it.

Ms. FOXX. All right.

So, can you describe a typical special agent report and the special agent report specific to Hunter Biden's case?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Certainly. The whistleblowers have testified that nearly a thousand pages were provided in the special agent report to the Tax Division. That special agent report consisted not only of a discussion of what they had discovered, but also every bit of evidence that they found that supported each element of each crime for each year for which they were recommending charges.

Ms. FOXX. OK. Let me follow up again, please.

More than a year after DOJ's Tax Division received this report, the division created a 99-page memorandum supporting the recommended charges. Is that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I might be wrong about how long it took the Tax Division. I have seen other information suggesting it was a much shorter period of time.

Ms. FOXX. But they did do that?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I understand that the Tax Division did produce a 99-page memo authorizing all the charges the special agents had recommended.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you.

So, Ms. O'Connor, you said DOJ's Tax Division recommended six felonies and five misdemeanors. Is that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Ms. FOXX. Hunter Biden was only initially charged with two counts of willful failure to pay Federal income taxes as part of the plea deal. Is that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Right, for just 2 years.

Ms. FOXX. OK. And these are misdemeanors?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Right.

Ms. FOXX. OK. But the maximum penalty for these charges is a fine of \$25,000, as well as up to 1 year in Federal prison. Is that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Or both.

Ms. FOXX. Or both. Yet, Hunter Biden owed more than \$100,000 in both 2017 and 2018, correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. That is what the criminal information alleged. I think that is a ballpark figure.

Ms. FOXX. OK. Based on the answers you just provided, it is extremely difficult to believe that an individual who is not the son of the sitting U.S. President would be treated this way.

We are told the Department of Justice treats all citizens equally under the law. But based on the evidence this Committee has presented, that is not what happened in Delaware.

Based on your experience, would you agree that that is not what happened in Delaware?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Exactly. And it was particularly galling because just in the next state, in New Jersey, a mechanic was being sentenced to 2 years for having not paid like \$100,000 in taxes.

Ms. FOXX. So, in this case there was not equal justice under the law being proposed.

Ms. O'CONNOR. Absolutely not.

Ms. FOXX. It was totally unequal justice.

That is not what this country stands for. We want everybody being treated the same under the law, and my colleagues should feel the same way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Before I recognize Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter from Lev Parnas, who Mr. Raskin continues to refer to. It is actually a press release from the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Southern District of New York. It is "Lev Parnas Sentenced to 20 Months in Prison for Campaign Finance, Wire Fraud, and False Statement Offenses."

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, he worked with Rudy Giuliani.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Ocasio-Cortez for 5 minutes.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Now, it has been repeated and I would also like to repeat that the allegations being presented by the Majority are extremely serious. And the prospect of impeachment is also a gravely serious matter, which has been echoed by our witnesses today. And any serious impeachment investigation or inquiry relies on firsthand sworn testimony of witnesses to high crimes or misdemeanors.

Today, the Republican Majority has called in three witnesses to advance their case.

Mr. Turley, I have a simple question for you. In your testimony today, are you presenting any firsthand witness account of crimes committed by the President of the United States?

Mr. TURLEY. No, I'm not.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. No, you are not.

Ms. O'Connor, you are the second Republican witness here today. Have you, in your testimony, presented any firsthand witness account of crimes committed by the President of the United States?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I have not.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Dubinsky, as the third and final Republican witness in this hearing, have you, in your testimony presented, any firsthand witness account of crimes committed by the President of the United States?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I have not.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. And, Professor Gerhardt, given that you are the Minority witness, I assume the same, correct?

Mr. GERHARDT. I am not a fact witness, correct.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you.

And to clarify, two individuals presented today who do have firsthand accounts surrounding the progeny of these allegations are being blocked from testifying by the Republican Majority.

And I want to explain why this is important. Members of Congress, all of us in this hearing, are not under oath as we are presently covered by the Speech and Debate Clause. Isn't that correct, Professor Gerhardt?

Mr. GERHARDT. That is correct.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. And the Speech and Debate Clause covers all statements by a Member of Congress, whether they are factual or not.

There are only four people in this room that are presently under oath in their testimony, and those are the four witnesses here today. Is that correct, Professor Gerhardt?

Mr. GERHARDT. That is correct.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. And so, the direct testimony of the four individual witnesses here today are the bona fide words that this Committee must use in order to proceed or substantiate an investigation. And I want to emphasize why that is important.

Earlier today, one of our colleagues, a gentleman from Florida, presented up on this screen something that looked, appeared to be a screenshot of a text message containing or insinuating an explosive allegation.

That screenshot of what appeared to be a text message was a fabricated image. It was a fabricated image. I do not know where it came from. I do not know if it was the staff of the Committee. But it was not the actual direct screenshot from that phone.

And, in fact, I would like to submit to the Committee the actual full context from the Ziegler Affidavit Number 1, Exhibit 402, of the full text of that exchange. Do I have permission from the Chair?

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Importantly, what was brought out from that fabricated image excluded critical context that changed the underlying meaning and allegation that was presented up on that screen by this Committee and by Members of this Committee.

Now, they are well within their right to do that, because they are covered by the Speech and Debate Clause. This was not submitted by a material or fact witness under oath. That was not submitted by a material or fact witness under oath.

The impeachment inquiry, any impeachment inquiry, regardless of party, is an extremely serious matter.

Professor Gerhardt, in the impeachment inquiry under—into President Clinton, were there key fact witnesses that were presented during those proceedings?

Mr. GERHARDT. There were not in the House.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. In the Senate, were there any?

Mr. GERHARDT. There were.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There were in the Senate.

Now, in the impeachment—in the impeachment investigations with President—with respect to President Trump, were there key material fact witnesses in the House?

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There were. Are there any key material fact witnesses here today?

Mr. GERHARDT. No, ma'am.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. None. And so, we are wasting our time.

When we talk about a threshold of an impeachment inquiry, was there a House Floor vote that had a majority of Members of Congress that opened an impeachment inquiry into President Clinton?

Mr. GERHARDT. There was.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There was.

Was there a full House Floor vote opening an impeachment inquiry into President Trump?

Mr. GERHARDT. In 2019.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Is there one here for this one?

Mr. GERHARDT. Not for this one.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. There is not one here for this one.

This is an embarrassment, an embarrassment to the time and people of this country. And I would ask that the Chair and I would ask that this Committee elevate to the promise of our duties here and comport ourselves with the consistency and practice that is required of our seats and our duty and our oath to our responsibilities here.

And with that, I yield back. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Grothman for 5 minutes from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK.

I am concerned about the seriousness of these allegations. And what bothers me a little is that I am beginning to think Americans are beginning to think this behavior by the Biden family is normal. I am kind of afraid that they are going to say, "Well, President Biden is a politician," they are going to look at the news with regard to Senator Menendez the last couple weeks, and they are just going to say, "This is how it works."

I do not think it is the way it works. I think this is—this corruption that appears to be, we have all sorts of smoke, maybe not fire but all sorts of smoke, is almost an historic low for our country, and it deserves a strong response from this body.

Look at Senator Menendez's latest indictment. There is no tolerance for putting yourself before your constituents—unless, it seems, your last name is Biden.

I applaud my Democratic colleagues who have asked Senator Menendez to resign, but we know how that ends. There will be a new Democrat to replace him, no political risk.

But here we are talking about the Presidency. If the response is, "Well, Hunter Biden was not an elected politician," I have to know, just what was Hunter Biden selling? We cannot become numb to these facts.

The allegations are extraordinary. In fact, I am not aware of these type allegations where we have a sitting President accused of bribery, accused of taking payments, whether it be directly or through his family.

And these are not empty allegations. We continue to have evidence. Just look at what has come in just the past couple of days.

Is President Biden compromised? It is particularly relevant because of the interaction between our country and Ukraine, interaction between our country and China. It does not look good, and the facts demand we continue to investigate.

Mr. Turley, I want you to really discuss how historic this really is. What do you think is the most concerning piece of evidence that you heard of today?

Mr. TURLEY. I think the most concerning—obviously, you have to start with the bribery allegation that was a subject of the FD-1023.

Now, I say in the testimony that you have to only take that so far because you do not—you have a lot of information about a secondhand account.

But when you put it into the context of this labyrinth of accounts and companies used to transfer money and you have the statements of Hunter Biden, that is what makes this a credible inquiry.

And the question is, did the President know? Did he encourage this type of corruption?

And the key here, once again, which is what I stress in the testimony, is you have to begin with a recognition that what Hunter Biden and his associates were doing was corrupt. That is what influence peddling is. It is a form of corruption that our country, globally, has combated.

Now, the only question for an inquiry is whether that body of corruption, which it is, also encompassed the actions or the knowledge of the President of the United States. The only way you will be able to get that information is to follow this evidence.

And what I suggest is you do so without any prejudice, you do so without any assumptions. In fact, I hope that the President will be able to show that there is no such nexus. But you will not get those answers until you ask these questions.

Mr. GROTHMAN. So, we are really obligated to have this inquiry?

Mr. TURLEY. I believe it is your duty to determine if there is— if the President is involved in what is a known form of corruption, and that is what I believe has already been described. I believe many people have accepted that this was influence peddling in its rawest form.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. Could you elaborate for us the impact bribery of a public official can have on the execution of their duties? And how about if it was the President? Can you explain why the American public ought to care about this?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, you know, Alexander Hamilton talked about impeachment in Federalist 65 as a violation of the public trust, and that is really what this ultimately goes to. I am hoping that there is not much disagreement that public corruption falls within an impeachable offense, because if it does not then it makes a mockery of what the Framers were talking about.

You know, during the Clinton impeachment Michael and I testified, and there was a lot of, I think, good-faith discussion between us and the other experts as to the executive function theory and what constitutes an impeachable offense.

I would hope that it would be agreed that if a nexus was established with the President that he participated in the corruption of influence peddling, that it would be a potential impeachable offense or it would be the basis of an impeachment article.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. We have millions of dollars flowing to the Biden family. That has been proven overwhelmingly.

Are you aware of any precedent in this country where there has been any case of bribery and corruption of a public official or of a President of this magnitude? I mean, is there any historical precedent in this country—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired, but please answer the question, Mr. Turley.

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

This has the assumption, as the Ranking Member has contested, the degree to which all of this money went to the Biden family

members. That has to be, as the Ranking Member said, it has to be established.

But, no, in terms of the figures—I have been a critic of influence peddling by both Republicans and Democrats for three decades. I have been writing about this a long time.

Influence peddling is the favorite form of corruption in Washington, D.C., and this city is awash with it. But have I seen anything of this size and complexity? No. Just as an observer, no.

But we still need to know the scope of this and whether all of these financial transfers link the President in any regard, and I am not going to assume that it does.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent—

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr.——

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Unanimous consent motion, just to introduce an October 2020 article in *Politico* where Mykola Zlochevsky, who was the source of the FD-1023 that Mr. Turley just referenced, stated that neither he nor anyone else from Burisma ever had any contact with Vice President Biden or people working for him during Hunter Biden's engagement.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Brown from Ohio for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

While we sit here just 2 days away from a complete government shutdown, House Republicans want to distract the American public from their funding failure with a baseless impeachment inquiry lacking facts and foundation.

This preventable shutdown threatens the livelihood of millions of Federal workers, small business owners, seniors, and veterans, all of whom live in the districts of every Member on this Committee.

In my home state of Ohio, nearly 60,000 Federal workers will either be furloughed or forced to work without pay. I cannot overstate the impact this Republican shutdown will have on mothers and babies receiving WIC. In Ohio, there are 180,000 women, children, and infants whose benefits will be at risk.

And in case that statistic is not sinking in, let me just paint the picture for you. A new mother in Cleveland is trying to buy infant formula for her baby at the grocery store next week only to discover that she has no WIC benefits to access. She cannot pay.

If Speaker McCarthy and our Republican colleagues continue to value their egos over the well-being of American families, stories like this will become a terrifying reality for millions.

Yet, House Republicans continue to prioritize political warfare over people's welfare. The Speaker seems committed to promoting political gains than protecting people's benefits—over protecting people's benefits.

Americans and our economy are being held hostage to the demands of the most extreme members of his party. It is painfully clear that Speaker McCarthy has once again handed control of the people's House to MAGA extremists.

Rather than work with Democrats to get us out of the mess they created, Republicans are tripping over themselves trying to distract and deflect the American people with this shameful show.

The Department of Justice and the FBI under former President Trump spent 5—5 long years looking into these Republican conspiracy theories and debunked them repeatedly.

So now, in a vain attempt to deflect from the chaos and confusion they are causing, House Republicans want to dig them up yet again.

So, Professor Gerhardt, what would you say is the primary flaw in the House Republicans' claims about President Biden?

Mr. GERHARDT. Well, I suppose I could say a lot, but the problem is that the dots are not connected. The name that has been repeated most often in this hearing is Hunter Biden, not President Biden. And the point of an impeachment inquiry is not about a President's son, it has to be about the President himself, and I do not think those dots have been connected. There have been lots of assumptions, lots of accusations, but not evidence.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you.

These falsehoods about President Biden did not change the will of the people in November 2020. Yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are at it again, holding another hearing on baseless allegations, looking for facts that just do not exist. Instead of fulfilling our duty to govern, my colleagues threaten a government shutdown, dangerous for most and disastrous for our most vulnerable communities.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. BROWN [continuing]. I will yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. And I would urge you to yield to Mr. Goldman.

Ms. BROWN. I will yield to Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you very much. I thank my colleague.

Ms. O'Connor, I believe you testified before that the 99-page DOJ Tax memo gave a full authorization for the charges. Is that your testimony?

Ms. O'CONNOR. That is what the whistleblowers reported.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Actually, the whistleblowers reported that it was a discretion finding.

And since you worked in the DOJ Tax Division, I am sure you understand that there is full authorization, there is discretion, and there is declination.

And when they give a discretion determination, that is because there are serious holes and flaws, and they leave it to the discretion of the U.S. Attorney whether or not they want to charge it.

Isn't that correct?

Ms. O'CONNOR. No, not at all. Discretion is not based on holes and flaws; it is based on the ability of that particular district to prosecute that case. And, in fact, that 99-page memo—

Mr. GOLDMAN. The ability, what do you mean the ability?

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] Is the first in several times in the testimony—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Excuse me. Excuse me. What do you mean the ability?

Ms. O'CONNOR. [continuing] And only in one time did it mention discretion. All the other times it did not mention discretion at all.

Mr. GOLDMAN. So, you are disputing that it said—

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Are you disputing that it said discretion?

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am very disturbed about what I have heard here today. There is a saying among country lawyers that if you have the facts, you pound the facts; if you do not have the facts, you pound the table. When you cannot pound the table, I guess some of my Democratic colleagues choose to pound the witnesses. That was inexcusable.

What just happened in this Committee, attacking the witnesses personally instead of addressing the merits of the evidence being presented, indicates to me that my Democratic colleagues know the evidence is becoming increasingly conclusive. It reminds me of a line from a movie, "A Few Good Men," Jack Nicholson: "You can't handle the truth."

The evidence will either convict or acquit. In any criminal proceeding or civil proceeding, if there is no wrongdoing, the evidence or the lack of evidence will support that conclusion.

The problem of the suspicion of wrongdoing is compounded by the withholding of evidence, the misrepresentation of the evidence in hand, and the obstruction of an investigation, but not denying access to information that would be or could be evidence.

At this point, there is a growing public perception, and it's reflected in the polls, Mr. Chairman, that President Biden, his son Hunter, other family members, and business associates were engaged in some form of criminal activity.

It is the responsibility of this Committee to pursue the truth and report it to the American people. I am not sure that is what is happening on the other side with my colleagues.

It is vitally important that our efforts be conducted openly, without prejudice, with no other agenda other than arriving at the truth regardless of our politics. It is vitally important.

As Professor Turley has pointed out, you do not undertake an impeachment inquiry lightly. This has profound implications for the future of this country and our ability to govern ourselves.

We have seen repeatedly obstructive efforts—obstruction efforts to deny this Committee access to information that is material to this investigation.

Now, I want to ask Professor Turley a question.

In your view, could the promise of foreign access to any official, government official, whether it is the Vice President or anybody else, that only materially benefited a family member, could that be influence peddling?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes. And as I point out in the testimony, courts have found that various benefits to family members can be attributed as a benefit to the principal. That has included everything from throwing a golf contest in the favor of a son of a politician to paying for gifts.

In fact, I was lead counsel in the last Porteous trial, in the last impeachment trial for a judge, and that was the trial in the U.S. Senate. My client, Judge Porteous, was accused, among other things, of benefits going to his family.

And so, there is certainly precedent not only in criminal cases but in impeachment cases for making that nexus.

Mr. PALMER. OK. I want to be more specific.

If Vice President Biden used his office to influence domestic or foreign policy for the financial benefit of his son, even though Vice President Biden may never have received a dime, but it resulted in millions of dollars going to his son or his brother or other family members or business associates, and used his office to influence either domestic or foreign policy, for their benefit, could that be a violation of the public trust?

Mr. TURLEY. Absolutely. In fact, it is perhaps the most quintessential violation of the public trust because you are not acting in the public's interest. It is a form of public corruption that this government, this country has declared is corrupt in other countries around the world.

I do not want to jump on your time, because I know you all have important things to do, but I would like to respond to the attack that you mentioned.

Mr. PALMER. You may do so.

Mr. TURLEY. Thank you, sir.

I would like to explain what that attack dealt with, if nothing else, for Members of the Committee than for my three children here, who may be a little surprised by what they just heard.

As they I think know, I have spent my life challenging what is called morals legislation. What the Democratic Member attacked me for are laws that dictate to others how they should live their lives. Some of those laws have been used against gay and lesbian couples, they have been used against minorities.

The individual that the Member described, I condemned. I represented the Sister Wives in a case challenging that law on the basis of individual rights. The trial court ruled in our favor and struck down that law, the first time that type of law had ever been struck down. The Tenth Circuit later dismissed on technical grounds.

But I just want to end with one other thing, and that is, it is not going to make a difference, you know. This has become a pattern of witnesses, whistleblowers, FBI agents, journalists being attacked in Congress. It will not make any difference. It will not change the constitutional standard. It will not negate any evidence that you have.

But at some point you have got to say, enough, you know, that we have to have something, the public has to have something in Congress to look to to have faith.

And I have to tell you, it is not that I think that absurd attack meant any difference to my children or to the people that are watching. It makes a difference to our process.

Witnesses should not have to bring—

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I just—I hate to interrupt Professor Turley, but could our witness get equal time then, because we are over a minute over.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired. He responded to the false allegations by your Members.

And I apologize for how you all have been treated. I apologize to the American people watching this hearing for the parliamentary

stunts that the other side has pulled. I think people of America care about public corruption.

The title of this hearing is an impeachment inquiry. And I think that Mr. Turley has done a good job explaining the basis for why we need to take impeachment inquiry and move forward.

We have led this investigation, and now we need the impeachment inquiry status as we move forward to get the information that we have been obstructed by this Administration and by this family, and that is what the purpose of this hearing is. Do not create another false narrative.

With that, the Chair recognizes Mr. Gomez from California.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, well, what obstruction were you referring to there?

Chairman COMER. OK. Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico. Mr. Gomez was next on the thing, but Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to say thank you to Mr. Donald Trump for calling this hearing today as it demonstrates the House GOP and Donald Trump's continued attacks on our institutions and on our democracy and the House GOP's complete inability to govern in a serious manner.

As they are holding this hearing, as we see, just 2 days before a potential devastating government shutdown, and the fact that most Republican Members on this Committee did not even bother to show up for the hearing this morning. Their own star witness said right here in this Committee this morning that he does not even believe that there is enough evidence to meet the standards needed for impeachment.

And in doing this, our colleagues across the aisle are making a mockery of this institution and of our Constitution, peddling in conspiracy theories, peddling the conspiracy theories that Rudy Giuliani and Donald Trump themselves tried to get the American people to believe, and which Donald Trump's DOJ debunked. It is outrageous.

So, let us be clear about what this hearing actually is. It is an effort to undermine our democracy, to diminish Donald Trump's own two impeachments, his first impeachment for trying to illegally bribe a foreign government to help him with his campaign, and the second for a deadly insurrection in the Halls of this Capitol after he asked his followers to tear through the Halls of Congress, which they did with zip ties looking to execute the former Vice President.

And we know that Donald Trump has called for this impeachment inquiry, because we have the direct evidence from his own social. You can see it right here. He says, "Impeach the bum."

And we also know that he has been directly coordinating with Members of this Committee, as reported by the *New York Times*. Right here, a Member of this Committee has been briefing Donald Trump on this inquiry.

We also know that if Donald Trump does not get his way, he wants his loyalists to shut down the government. How do we know that? Because he posted it right here on his social media. And his loyalists in this Committee, who are doing his bidding for him today, retweeted it.

And, in fact, it actually says right here that the reason why they want to defund the government and impeach is because this is “the last chance to defund these political prosecutions against me.”

So, folks, this is not a serious inquiry. This is not a serious hearing. In fact, the witnesses here do not even believe there is enough evidence to impeach. Their own Members do not even believe there is enough evidence to impeach. In fact, they refused to hold a vote on the Floor of the House of Representatives because they did not have enough Republican Members who would vote for it. That is why we are here today. It is outrageous.

So, what is this hearing actually about? It is a campaign strategy. It is a misuse of official resources. It is this Committee and loyalists of Donald Trump doing his bidding to bolster his chances of winning back the White House and securing their majority in the next election, and in the process to diminish the name of impeachment, which is enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, which we take an oath to uphold, and to make Donald Trump’s crimes, including his two impeachments and his 91 criminal indictment counts, look like they are not serious crimes.

When you think about it, it is chilling. It is truly chilling. It is another attack on our democracy and our institutions. It is another attack on fair and free elections and the use of this Committee to try to carry it out.

So, I just want to say, I think it is obvious who the grand puppet master is here. He tweeted about it on his own social, and we see the long arm—but little hands—of Mr. Donald Trump whose fingerprints are all over this hearing and this sham impeachment.

But we know that the American people are smart, that they are not going to be fooled by what is happening here today, and especially as they shut the government down in 2 days with catastrophic impacts for our communities.

And with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Higgins from Louisiana for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Turley, Professor, we are going to be moving quickly here.

Let us retract from the absurdities of 21st-century Twitter. Let us go back to 1787, shall we?

Article II, Section 4: “The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”

And high crimes and misdemeanors is not and never has been limited to indictable criminality.

Mr. Turley, Professor, please tell us briefly, sir, what was the actual meaning in 1787 of high crimes and misdemeanors?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, this has been a matter of obviously robust debate for many decades. What we do know is that there were various terms that were offered and were rejected, the most famous being “maladministration,” and James Madison was uncomfortable with that. But they were also uncomfortable with limiting it to, like, treason and bribery—

Mr. HIGGINS. Exactly. It was never designed to be limited by writ of statute, was it, Professor?

Would Madison—would Madison argue that the, quote/unquote, “betrayal of trust to foreign powers” is an impeachable offense?

Mr. TURLEY. There are references to that type of betrayal of trust. But, also, if you take a look at past impeachments, they have gone to the violation of public trust, including the use of office to perpetuate false accounts or to obstruct this body—

Mr. HIGGINS. Agreed. So, impeachment is a mechanism of our congressional authority; it is not a criminal proceeding, is it, Professor?

Mr. TURLEY. It is not. What I have said previously is that I happen to believe you should start with the criminal code and look at things that would be crimes for others, because those resonate the most in terms of—

Mr. HIGGINS. And those criminal code violations would be revealed through the investigative effort of the congressional endeavor to inquire into impeachable offenses like this hearing. Would you agree?

Mr. TURLEY. That is right. This is the part—

Mr. HIGGINS. Moving quickly, there is—one of the gentlemen said there is no credibility to this evidence. Let me say, as an investigator, there is perhaps no category of evidence that is more credible than bank records. And bank records is what we are working with.

The House Oversight Committee, Judiciary Committee, Ways and Means Committee investigated highly suspicious money transactions from foreign powers through shell companies to Biden family members.

There is nothing more credible in an investigative effort, good sir, than bank records.

I am going to read from an email from Assistant United States Attorney Wolf, released by the House Committee on Ways and Means yesterday, identified as Exhibit 202 of the IRS whistleblower investigation. This email shows Ms. Wolf prohibiting the investigation team from looking into Political Figure 1.

Let me clarify that, during that investigation, “Political Figure 1” was the pseudonym agreed upon by the investigative team—the FBI, the DOJ, and IRS investigators. “Political Figure 1” is not a pseudonym created by Republicans or Democrats. Political Figure 1 is President Biden, is Joe Biden.

Lesley Wolf: “As a priority, someone needs to redraft attachment B. There should be nothing about Political Figure 1 in here.”

This is a response to an email delivered by Joshua Wilson, an FBI agent, that said, “Please see the attached draft for Blue Star search warrant.”

Blue Star Strategies is a longtime Democrat lobbying firm that Hunter Biden used to put pressure on U.S. Government officials to end the investigation and protect Burisma. The Department of Justice was investigating Blue Star for these activities and allowed to retroactively register as a foreign agent. To date, no one has been held accountable at Blue Star.

That happened during 2020, just months before your Presidential election, America. You should be very concerned about this.

Mr. Turley, based upon the constitutional parameters of the House of Representatives, do you agree that the Oversight Com-

mittee, Judiciary Committee, and Ways and Means Committee should be judiciously investigating reasonable suspicion of impeachable actions by President Joe Biden?

Mr. TURLEY. I do. I think it is your duty to get answers to these questions and to see if the President was involved in what I think is a confirmed corrupt influence-peddling effort.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My time has expired. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Garcia from California for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to just begin by recapping for the American people what we have seen so far today.

My Democratic colleagues have done a great job of showing that there is absolutely zero evidence linking President Joe Biden to any wrongdoing. Zero. None. This hearing is a complete waste of time, 2 days before a MAGA government shut down.

And we also know that Hunter Biden never held any sort of public office, and there is no evidence that he ever influenced any kind of policy in the White House. There is no evidence that he and his father's finances were ever linked, and we have spoken to many witnesses to prove that.

And, in fact, none of the witnesses here actually have any direct evidence that there is any sort of wrongdoing. That was repeated here by these witnesses. So, instead, we are back to falling on MAGA conspiracy theories that Rudy Giuliani parroted over and over again.

This farce is all about House Republicans trying to reelect their beloved leader, Donald Trump.

And what I want to know is why we are not actually investigating real family corruption. They want to attack President Biden's family, who actually never worked in the White House, which is incredibly hypocritical, yet we have not yet talked about these guys that actually worked in the White House.

And, in fact, I want to talk about Jared Kushner, who is right over here. We know that Jared Kushner, who is Donald Trump's son-in-law, was given enormous power in the White House. When Jared joined the White House, he was so unfit and unqualified and with so many conflicts of interest, he could not even get a security clearance. His father-in-law, Donald Trump, had to intervene, overriding national security officials.

We also know that, just months after Jared left the White House, the Saudi royal family gave him \$2 billion, with a "B," into the Kushner hedge fund, and right now Jared is pocketing an additional \$25 million a year in fees.

This is a man who was put at the head of Middle East policy in the White House.

We know he personally intervened to give the Saudis a \$110 billion arms deal that was opposed by folks—actually, folks all across the government. He supported the Saudis with their brutal war in Yemen, even after they murdered Jamal Khashoggi, a journalist, of course, who was an American resident.

The Saudi Crown Prince bragged to other Heads of State that Kushner, and I quote, was “in his pocket.” Even Trump’s first Secretary of State complained that this is inappropriate.

Now, Jared delivered for the Saudis over and over again, and he was rewarded. Even advisors for the Crown Prince advised against the \$2 billion hedge fund investment, yet he went forward anyways.

So, we know that Jared Kushner, a senior White House aide and Donald Trump’s son-in-law, was doing favors for a foreign government. Now, this is actually an enormous family scandal that this Committee should be investigating.

And I think Chris Christie put it well when he said, the grift from this family, the Trump crime family, in my opinion, is breathtaking.

You also do not need to take my word for it. This is actually what our Committee Chairman actually said about the Kushners. I am just quoting our Chairman. “I have been vocal that I think what Kushner did crossed the line of ethics.”

Now, Mr. Chairman, I completely agree that the Kushners crossed the line of ethics. And I want to know what we are going to do about it and when that hearing is actually going to be here in front of us.

See, if we are not too busy maybe next week during the Republican MAGA shutdown, we can actually have a hearing with Jared Kushner, which is clearly in a very corrupt arms deal here—deal around his investment firm, and the Chairman could also be involved in that, since he also thinks there are problems.

Now, we do know today that we are not here because of any wrongdoing of President Biden, but because this is all part of Donald Trump’s campaign. And his most extreme allies, including some Members of this Committee, are now retaliating.

In fact, some Members have been trying to impeach the President since day one. Now, this is a tweet here. I am going to read it. It says, “Two years ago, I introduced articles to impeach Joe Biden on his first full day in office. We will **IMPEACH BIDEN!**”, bolded with an exclamation point. And you see the actual resolution here.

So, we have the receipts to prove it. There really is no reason why; they do not care why they want to impeach the President, but they have been trying to do it now for years. Here you have, of course, a member of this Oversight Committee posting about introducing articles of impeachment on President Biden’s very first day in office.

And now the Speaker of the House is empowering these people in a desperate attempt to keep his job.

Ultimately, the person pulling the strings here is Donald Trump, a dangerous man facing Federal and state indictments, who is out for revenge. And he has been doing this his whole career.

I want to show you a second tweet, again, by a Member of this Committee. They are trying to expunge Donald Trump’s impeachments, as you can see here, which is also unconstitutional. I am going to read this tweet: “Expunge the **WRONGFUL** Trump impeachments. **IMPEACH CRIMINAL BIDEN.**”

These are political stunts to appeal to an extremist base, and they have seized control of this conference. If we do not act, they will threaten our democracy again.

This impeachment is a farce with no evidence.

And, with that, I yield back.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes——

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just add——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. To the gentleman's remarks that Jared Kushner was a key player in the historic——

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is this a point of order?

Mr. JORDAN [continuing]. Abraham Accords.

Mr. MFUME. Excuse me——

Mr. GOLDMAN. Is this a point of order?

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Sessions from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Mr. Gerhardt, you had been asked a question earlier that I heard a quick reply to, and the answer—the question was about the timing of a government shutdown and an impeachment. You quickly responded, “Never.”

Do you want to revise or extend that remark, about the timing of a government shutdown and an impeachment occurring at about the same time, and you said, “Never”?

Mr. GERHARDT. I understand the question, and if you are talking about 2019——

Mr. SESSIONS. I am.

Mr. GERHARDT [continuing]. There was not a shutdown.

Mr. SESSIONS. There was not. There is not now.

Mr. GERHARDT. I understand, but——

Mr. SESSIONS. There is not now. So, the people on this side are simply taking advantage of your answer.

In fact, the indictment—the impeachment of Donald Trump was December 18, 2019, and then the President signed the funding of the government December 21, 2019, 3 days later.

So, the question that you were asked perhaps you responded to correctly, “Never,” but, in fact, there is a nexus that suggests that people on this side of the dais are taking it the wrong way.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I also find that some of our Members are talking about baseless accusations of a government shutdown. All you have to do is go to—google Ohio, to apply it for WIC, which was the supposition brought up. Can be gathered in all 88 Ohio counties. It is run by the state of Ohio, not the Federal Government.

I think that we need to be careful when we make accusations here.

Thank you very much.

Ms. O'Connor, you have a history of understanding tax implications and inside the Department of Justice. These are——

Ms. BROWN. Would you——

Mr. SESSIONS [continuing]. Serious matters, and when they——

Ms. BROWN. Would you yield to the gentleman——

Mr. SESSIONS. I will not.

Ms. BROWN [continuing]. Gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will not.

Ms. BROWN. OK.

Mr. SESSIONS. The implications of this endeavor that we are attempting to understand is decision-making inside the Department of Justice. And that inside decision-making—we have already heard back a number of times how the Department of Justice did not move forward in compliance, I believe, to their job to make a determination whether the facts would or should be taken further.

With President Clinton, the FBI went and actually interviewed the President and the Vice President about these matters, and other people in the White House. And President Clinton lost his law license over that, and it ended up that there was an impeachment from the House side.

Can you please talk about what should be done from normal and regular Department of Justice officials to see whether this has occurred and whether we are entitled to ask questions about that investigation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the DOJ?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Thank you, Mr. Sessions.

I think you are more than entitled; I think that you are obligated to look into the allegations that the whistleblowers have brought.

The whistleblowers were very detailed in the investigative steps that they took and those that they wanted to take but were prevented from taking but would have taken in any other investigation.

We do not have a window into where the roadblock was thrown. We do not know who threw it. We can—

Mr. SESSIONS. Would you think it would be proper for this Committee to bring those individuals in to properly vet them about that? Or is that the duty of the Department of Justice, through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to get that done?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, I think—I think it is your obligation.

We know that the whistleblowers tried to remedy the obstruction from within the Internal Revenue Service and got no backup at all. They were left out to dry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Does that include asking for metadata that might have supported any other investigation like this?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Absolutely. For example, the WhatsApp message where Hunter Biden says that he is sitting next to his father and is in the process of shaking down a Chinese businessman—the agents wanted to find out whether that was a true statement, and they could have found out, but they were denied the authority to pursue that inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. By what authority?

Ms. O'CONNOR. We do not know exactly. All we know from the testimony is that they would request search warrants, they would be told—

Mr. SESSIONS. So, Mr. Chairman, let the record reflect this as an inquiry for us to make a determination.

Mr. Chairman, I would also—

Chairman COMER. Absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS [continuing]. Ask for unanimous consent—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS [continuing]. To place into the record the articles which I had previously provided to this Committee in testimony.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman—

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Another unanimous consent motion.

I would like to offer a press release from the same Southern District of New York that you introduced for Lev Parnas that's entitled "Devon Archer Sentenced to a Year and a Day in Prison for the Fraudulent Issuance and Sale of More Than \$60 Million of Tribal Bonds."

Chairman COMER. Devon Archer, Hunter Biden's business partner and best friend?

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is correct, sir.

Chairman COMER. OK. Without—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Your star witness, yes.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Your star witness.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Gomez from California for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOMEZ. All right. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

So, one of the things I want to kind of stress is that, from the very beginning of this Congress, the Republicans had one thing in mind: "Let us get Joe Biden." Right? "Let us get Joe Biden, and let us take—you know, find the evidence that showed he did something wrong."

But when the evidence did not exist, they would make up facts or they would exaggerate, to an extent that it was, like, honestly mind-boggling.

And I want to focus on one part first. The Republicans keep pointing out "20 shell companies of the Biden family." These are actually 20 shell companies of Hunter Biden, OK? So, anytime they say "the Biden family," they are really saying "Hunter Biden," because there has not been a connection between Joe Biden and these companies.

To an extent—do we have the slides up?

The first slide is—that is not the slide, but I will show it.

So, there is an article from *Washington Post*, August 17, 2023. And it says, "How Republicans overhype the findings of their Hunter Biden probe." And, specifically, when it comes to these 20 shell companies, as they call them, they were actually—they were overhyped, and they gave them three Pinocchios.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter this into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOMEZ. Great.

Mr. GOMEZ. Next—so they keep focusing on these 20 companies. And then the Ways and Means Committee reveals 700 pages yesterday. It was really dramatic, right? They used Section 6103 to get these returns, and they say, hey, we are going to show that they did something wrong.

The Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Adrian Smith, who also serves on this Committee, or sits on this Committee, presented—when asked a simple question, they pointed out that this actually came—the WhatsApp message of Hunter Biden

allegedly was sent in 2017, when Joe Biden was not even President, when Joe Biden was not even running for President.

So, unanimous consent to enter another article by *Yahoo News*, “NBC Reporter Destroys GOP Lawmaker’s ‘Evidence’ Against Joe Biden Without Trying.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you so much.

Mr. GOMEZ. So, let us dig into these 20 businesses. Oh, very—20—20 companies. That is a lot of companies for an average American like myself. You know, I have got a W-2. You know, I file my income taxes. My wife and I have simple returns.

But when it came to President Trump, how many companies did he have? Anybody want to take a guess?

Ms. O’Connor, how many companies did Mr. Trump have?

Ms. O’CONNOR. I have no idea the number, but I know—

Mr. GOMEZ. OK. Stop.

Ms. O’CONNOR. [continuing] They all did something. They—

Mr. GOMEZ. I reclaim my—

Ms. O’CONNOR. [continuing] Built things. They—

Mr. GOMEZ. I reclaim my time.

Ms. O’CONNOR. [continuing] Sold things.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you. I reclaim—

Ms. O’CONNOR. They provided services.

Mr. GOMEZ [continuing]. My time. Reclaim my time. See, you cannot even answer a simple question, right?

He had over—

Chairman COMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOMEZ [continuing]. Over 500—no, I will not.

Chairman COMER. Oh.

Mr. GOMEZ. He also had over 500 companies—over 500 companies. I looked at the tax returns. Why? Because I was on the Ways and Means Committee and I got to actually dig into it. Over 500 companies. Actually, between 517 to 543 companies.

And Republicans had no concern about that, when they were structured in a way that they were almost like a set of Russian nesting dolls, each one hiding the existence of who controlled the others. But did Republicans bring it up? No. Did they have any concerns? No.

But what happened last week—or, this week? Let us take a guess. A judge said that President Trump committed fraud, business fraud, for inflating the value of his net worth and his companies.

But when it comes to the Republicans, they have no problem with that, right? They have no problem. They do not want to dig into that, when Trump controlled these 517 companies. When it came to Hunter Biden controlling 20? Oh, we see—we see a direct line to Joe Biden.

So that is what the problem is, is that they are cherry-picking facts to connect it to Joe Biden. And when they do not have facts, they make it up, as they did earlier today when they put up tweets or text messages that were not connected.

So, the point is, everything they are doing is to muddy the waters. And I think it is disgraceful. Because, when it comes to a President that committed fraud, a President that caused an insur-

rection, a President that also sold our government's national interests to the highest bidder, silence.

With that, I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. Would the gentleman yield for a quick question about the President's son's 20 companies?

Mr. GOMEZ. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to put it up on the board in just a second, but this is the entire transcript of the Devon Archer testimony. I submit it to the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you very much.

Mr. BIGGS. So, in this particular colloquy that is going on, highlighted up there, you will see that Mr. Archer says—let us start at the beginning. Let us go somewhere else.

The question is, did he talk about—did Hunter talk about how bringing his dad, Joe Biden, either to Ukraine or using his dad as Vice President would add value in the eyes of Burisma officials?

Answer: Yes.

How did it come up?

He says, well, we were business partners. It just came up. We were business part—we are business partners. OK.

What kind of leverage was Hunter trying to get by using his dad?

Answer by Devon: I think it is more defensive—you know, defensive leverage, that the value is there in his work.

Also in this same document, I asked him, I said: The brand, what is it? You keep talking about the Biden brand. I said, is it Dr. Jill? Brother Jim?

No. He looks at me like I am an idiot. He says: Of course, it is Joe Biden. Of course, it is Joe Biden.

Then you go back and you see Tony Bobulinski. What does he say? Quote, "The Biden family aggressively leveraged the Biden family name to make millions of dollars from foreign entities, even though some were from communist-controlled China."

And who is the Biden family asset? Is it Dr. Jill? No. Brother Jim? No. Any of the grandkids that got money from foreign companies? Nope. None of those folks. None of those folks.

Then you get the stuff released from Ways and Means yesterday. This is Hunter Biden saying to his brother—his uncle, Jim: "BS, Jim. All around BS. Explain to me one thing Tony [Bobulinski] brings to my table that I so desperately need that I am willing to sign over my family's brand"—what is the brand? Joe Biden—"and pretty much the rest of my business life. Why? Because that is the only product I got"—Joe Biden, the Vice President at that time.

"It is plain [English]." I am cleaning it up a little bit. There is a lot of swear words in there. "Why would I give this marginal bully the keys to my family's only asset?"

Oh. OK. So, you know—but we are told that there is nothing linking them.

So, I have got this question. Mr. Turley, I am going to ask you the question.

If the brand and what you are selling is Joe Biden, the then-Vice President, and if Joe Biden or his family is receiving some kind of benefit by the sale of access or—you know, I will leave it there—selling of access, or even the illusion of access, to Joe Biden, what does that lead you to conclude?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, if you look at actual cases that I have cited in my testimony, benefits to family members can be viewed as a benefit to the principal. So, there is not much debate about that.

The issue of the inquiry is whether—there has been—let me stop and say, there has been progress in the last few weeks, in that many people after the Archer testimony said, yes, I get it, it is influence-peddling. Some have said it is the illusion of access, which is—

Mr. BIGGS. That is the new defense—

Mr. TURLEY. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. Is “the illusion.”

Mr. TURLEY. But I think that calling it by its correct name is important, and it is a form of corruption. The benefits to the family members can be attributed to the principal even under the higher standard of criminal cases.

Mr. BIGGS. So—

Mr. TURLEY. What remains is, the question is, did the President know that, direct that, participate in that?

Mr. BIGGS. Well, we know that he made 20 calls to business associates. We know he is having dinners with those associates.

Which leads me to the follow-up question which I think is critical here, because these guys are looking for the gold bars or the cash stuffed in the Menendez coat. That does not happen very often, in my experience, having tried a lot of cases.

So, my question for you is: Tell us about when you have circumstantial evidence vis-a-vis direct evidence. What is its value? Can you rest a conviction on circumstantial evidence?

Mr. TURLEY. You can. One of the things I point out, though, in my testimony is, the Supreme Court has narrowed some of the elements on things like bribery, denial of honest services. Those elements are now narrower than they were. But it is notable in the Menendez indictment that they brought the conspiracy on honest services, that they still believe that these types of gifts obviously can be based on a conspiracy theory.

But you are clearly correct. I mean, if the allegations against Senator Menendez are true, that is really, sort of, old-school bribery. Not since Jefferson and his freezer have we seen that type of raw evidence. Today, it is a lot more sophisticated.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY. I think everyone in this room has to acknowledge that influence-peddling is the favorite form of corruption in Washington. I think that it is unassailable. And it is much more sophisticated than handing over gold bars or whatever is alleged in the Menendez case.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a document I would like to get in. This is—I appreciate that my colleague trusts the American people—a CNN poll that says, “A majority of Americans believe Joe Biden, as Vice President, was involved with son’s business dealings.”

I will submit that for the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another unanimous consent motion.

I would move, with unanimous consent, to introduce an order from the Supreme Court of the state of New York from Tuesday where the Trump organization was found liable for fraud. And it is specifically on page 28 where there is a paragraph entitled, quote, "The Trump Brand Premium" that increased the value of Trump assets by 15 or 30 percent, according to The Trump Organization.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Frost from Florida for 5 minutes.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

An impeachment inquiry is a grave undertaking that is supposed to be in response to evidence of a crime.

Mr. Chairman, you have questions; many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in this hearing have questions. But questions are not the basis for an impeachment. Evidence is.

Mr. Turley, on September 1st, Speaker Kevin McCarthy said that he would not launch a fake impeachment inquiry, a sham impeachment inquiry. But then on September 12th, just 12 days later, he completely changed his mind.

My question is, why? In those 12 days, did hard evidence appear that clearly and directly links the President of the United States, Joe Biden, to a crime?

Mr. TURLEY. I cannot answer as to what was it that pushed the Speaker to make the decision.

The courts have said you do not have to have that vote on the Floor. I think it is a best practice. But—

Mr. FROST. But I am very interested in those 12 days.

And I know—we know you are not a fact witness and you are talking about things that are already public. But is there anything that came up in those 12 days that linked the President of the United States to a crime, yes or no?

Mr. TURLEY. I do not have any recollection of those 12 days, so I cannot—

Mr. FROST. Yes. Nothing. I can tell you, it is nothing.

And we have heard, even from you, that this is why we have this impeachment inquiry. But let us be clear: This inquiry has been going on since the day we got here. Since the day I was sworn in at 2 a.m. on a Saturday night, this impeachment inquiry started.

Let us pull back the curtain on what is really going on. There is no evidence of crime, only desperation and political pressure.

This is what is going on. The far-right called for this sham impeachment hearing with no evidence at the beginning of this year when we first got started. This impeachment inquiry has been going on. This is not the first hearing we have had in relation to this.

On September 1st, the Speaker of the House, Kevin McCarthy, says, "No, we are not going to do that. We do not have the evidence. We do not have the votes for it to pass on the House Floor. We are not going to do it." A good decision, in my opinion.

But then just 12 days later, 12 precious days later, something happens. I am not sure what, but something happens. Because then the Speaker of the House, Kevin McCarthy, comes out and says, “Yes, we will do an impeachment inquiry.”

So, what happened between these 12 days? It is very simple. Three threats from Members of his own caucus, at the direction of former President Donald Trump, changed his mind.

No. 1: the threat to force a vote on impeachment, which would lose on the House Floor and be another embarrassment in the long list of embarrassments this Congress for the Speaker of the House.

No. 2: They would threaten to shut down the government, something that will happen in just 2 days.

And No. 3—and this is the one that really got to him—they said, “You about to lose your job.” And they said, “We will remove you as Speaker from the House.” And that scared him so much that Kevin McCarthy, the Speaker of the House, of the U.S. House of Representatives, third in line to the Presidency, completely caved due to the threats of people within his own caucus.

This fake impeachment is based on desperate political calculation, not any evidence.

And, Mr. Chairman, you say this hearing is to establish the basis for this fake, sham impeachment hearing. But these witnesses are not giving us any basis or giving us any evidence——

Chairman COMER. That is not true.

Mr. FROST [continuing]. Or giving us any solutions.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Turley has——

Mr. FROST. They are giving us——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Testified several times——

Mr. FROST. I reclaim my time.

Chairman COMER. I have to stop, because that is not——

Mr. FROST. I reclaim my time.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. A true statement——

Mr. FROST. I reclaim my time.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. What you just said.

Mr. FROST. I reclaim my time.

These witnesses are not giving any answers. They are just asking more questions.

We have one witness who has a lot of questions, Ms. O'Connor; Dubinsky, one witness who knows something about accounting but has no real involvement in what is going on; and Mr. Turley is stopping here on his way to his next FOX News hit.

This is not a serious inquiry. And this is—impeachment is something that is very serious. And we have to ensure that we focus on the wants and needs of the American people.

This is all for nothing. Half the crowd has left. There is no line outside. The goal here, to distract from the government shutdown, is not going to work.

And to the Speaker, I have to say: You are being played by these extremists and Donald Trump. It is costing us our economy.

And this entire fake impeachment inquiry is not about the United States; it is about Hunter Biden. And the only thing the President can be guilty of here is being a father.

I yield back to the Ranking Member.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. LaTurner from——

Mr. RASKIN. He yielded to——

Mr. FROST. Oh, sorry. I yield to the Vice Ranking Member.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman from Florida yielded back. The Chair——

Mr. RASKIN. He said he yielded back to the Vice Ranking Member.

Mr. FROST. I yielded back—I yielded to the Vice Ranking Member.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you. And I will claim some of that extra time back as well.

You know, much of the Republican case and evidence has relied on words from Hunter Biden. Hunter Biden said this, Hunter Biden said that; therefore, case closed, there is something here.

Professor Gerhardt, we know—I believe it is wide knowledge with the public—that Hunter Biden, sadly, was dealing with substance misuse disorder, correct?

Mr. GERHARDT. Correct.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. He has been under indictment, correct?

Mr. GERHARDT. Correct.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Is this a reliable witness that you would deem——

Mr. GERHARDT. Probably not.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. [continuing] In your assessment?

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you very much.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Armstrong, do you seek recognition?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I have three unanimous consent motions.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. One is a hearing notice from December—or, hold on, sorry—June 10, 2019, with an impeachment hearing with Joyce Vance, who was not a fact witness; Barbara McQuade, who was not a fact witness; and 1970's story time with John Dean.

Secondly, there is another unanimous consent motion for a hearing notice in Judiciary with two witnesses here just a week before we voted on impeachment in 2019, with Michael Gerhardt and Jonathan Turley.

Appreciate you both being here very much, but you were not fact witnesses at that point in time.

And the Webster's definition of "hypocrisy."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes——

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman? I request unanimous——

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, I request unanimous consent to enter an article into the record dated January 6, 2019. A Member of this own Committee, the day after she was sworn in, came into Congress, and this article says Dems split in response to her words, "Impeach the motherf---er," the day after she was sworn in.

Some might even say these kinds of comments, not only are they hypocritical by the left in their arguments today, but that this is an embarrassment to the time and people of this country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid my friend, the gentlelady from South Carolina, just engaged in personalities against a fellow Member of the Committee.

Chairman COMER. Well, what she entered into the record was—I believe it was Ms. Tlaib’s—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, it was the commentary that accompanied it that I am referring to.

Ms. MACE. It was an article from January 6, 2019—

Chairman COMER. That is what she said.

Mr. RASKIN. Right—

Ms. MACE [continuing]. “Dems split in response to ‘impeach the motherfer’ comment” by a Member of this Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Right. It was the commentary. And, in any event, it does not make it—

Chairman COMER. No, she said it. She actually said it.

Mr. RASKIN. No, but rule 17—

Ms. MACE. She said, “Impeach the motherfer.”

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. The commentary of what she is presenting.

Ms. MACE. The article’s title is—

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. The gentlelady’s commentary—

Ms. MACE [continuing]. “Dems split in response to—

Mr. RASKIN. All right.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. ‘Impeach the motherfer’ comment.”

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Let us get on with it. I mean, you know, the government’s—

Ms. MACE. That is the title—

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. About to shut down, I think.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Of the article, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right. The Chair—order.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. LaTurner from Kansas for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The mischaracterization of what this hearing is about by my colleagues on the other side is astounding.

Throughout the Presidency of Joe Biden, the White House has attempted to claim that the President did not talk to Hunter about his business dealings. Joe Biden even said during the 2020 Presidential debate that no members of his family received money from China. He said, and I quote, “My son has not made money, in terms of this thing about China. Nobody else has made money from China,” end quote.

The White House strategy has been deny, deny, deny, lie, and then counterattack. But the evidence and the facts have forced the White House to change its story time and time again. The White House handlers continue to shift the goalposts, and President Biden continues to lie.

How can President Biden continue to maintain that Hunter’s private business was simply that, private, when it is clear from bank records, emails, and testimony that Joe Biden was intimately in-

volved in Hunter's pay-to-play schemes and crooked foreign business dealings?

This image shows an email between Hunter Biden and his business associates stating the setup of equity in a Chinese-owned energy venture. This particular business deal was with CEFC, a Chinese-owned energy conglomerate. This email lays out the payment structure for equity in the company, which was known to be tied to the Chinese Communist Party through its owner, Chairman Ye Jianming.

The Committee's investigation into the Biden family, including evidence turned over through various document productions, has shown that these men were all in business with Hunter Biden at one time or another. James Gillier, Tony Bobulinski, and Rob Walker, on separate occasions, along with other Hunter business partners, have confirmed what this email said, that they were all getting a cut.

Who else was getting a cut?

Mr. GOLDMAN. What is the date of that email, sir?

Mr. LATURNER. This is my time.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am just asking the date——

Mr. LATURNER. This is my——

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. If you are entering something into the record.

Mr. LATURNER. This is my time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my time be restored.

Chairman COMER. Please restore Mr. LaTurner's time.

Mr. LATURNER. Thank you.

Who else was getting a cut? According to this email, 10 percent was going to the "big guy."

What I am sure my colleagues on the other side are asking themselves is, who is the big guy? Well, let me tell you. We learned in the FBI's FD-1023 that Zlochevsky called Joe Biden the "big guy." Tony Bobulinski also has corroborated that Joe Biden is the "big guy." Rob Walker and IRS whistleblowers say that Joe Biden is the "big guy." And, finally, the Justice Department obstructed investigators in Delaware who wanted to look into—you guessed it—the "big guy." Listen, folks, it is obvious, Joe Biden is the "big guy."

And so, what do we have here? We have the President saying that he had nothing to do with it, that Hunter Biden and no one in the family profited from China, and we have evidence here that the big guy was getting 10 percent.

Let me read you a definition of a trendy word here lately, "gaslighting." It is a form of psychological manipulation in which an abuser attempts to gain power and control over the other person by distorting reality and forcing them to question their own judgment and intuition.

I would say to the American people, look at the evidence before you and make a judgment, and do not allow the White House or our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try to convince you that what you are seeing is not the truth, try to convince you that you are crazy.

Mr. Dubinsky, you have extensive experience as an expert witness and consultant in the areas of white-collar crime, financial fraud, and corruption. Is it characteristic of these types of crimes

that actors hide behind nicknames or other pseudonyms to mask their identity?

Mr. DUBINSKY. It is very common.

Mr. LATURNER. What about this first email image is characteristic of financial crimes that you have investigated or provided expert testimony on in the past?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, typically, you will see code names used and money is being paid to somebody under that code name. And that is how these processes work.

Mr. LATURNER. Let me ask you something. You are very experienced. When conducting an investigation, if your boss prevented you from taking investigative steps, how would you react? How would it affect your findings?

Mr. DUBINSKY. First, it would be extremely troubling if I was told not to continue to investigate something. And if I was put in that position, I would probably withdraw from the investigation.

Mr. LATURNER. Has the Department of Justice ever restricted any of your investigative steps?

Mr. DUBINSKY. No, they have not.

Mr. LATURNER. That is amazing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair now recognizes Ms. Lee from Pennsylvania for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Three hours and 45 or so minutes into this, the Republicans' own witnesses have confirmed that they have seen no evidence of any evidence.

I think that if my Republican colleagues had a so-called smoking gun, they would have presented it by now and would have talked about it, not—

Chairman COMER. Can the gentlelady read a bank statement, an email, or a text message?

Mr. RASKIN. Are you asking her to yield, Mr. Chairman?

Ms. LEE. Reclaiming my time. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. All right.

Ms. LEE. Reclaiming my time.

Instead, we are sitting here with no fact witnesses and no evidence in this sham so-called impeachment to distract from their inability to fulfill their basic duty: to fund and run our government.

Republicans know the American people do not want their shutdown. So, instead, the Republicans on this Committee are attempting to divert and distract the American people's attention by spending taxpayer dollars on this sham impeachment hearing 2 days before they shut the government down, in hopes that the media—and I do not just mean FOX News—will fall for their scheme and give more airtime to the lies being told on this Committee today than the real-life impact their shutdown will have on even their own constituents' lives.

In fact, in Chairman Comer's district, Republicans' shutdown will cost 8,937 of his constituents their paychecks.

In Jim Jordan's district, Republicans' shutdown will cost 3,939 of his constituents their paychecks.

In Marjorie Taylor Greene's district, Republicans' shutdown will cost 6,306 of her constituents their paychecks.

In Lauren Boebert's district, Republicans' shutdown will cost—
Ms. GREENE. Democrats are the party of shutdowns.

Ms. LEE. Reclaiming my time.

Ms. GREENE. You guys love shutdowns.

Mr. RASKIN. Order, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much.

In Lauren Boebert's district, Republicans' shutdown will cost 9,016 of her constituents their paychecks.

In Paul Gosar's Arizona district, Republicans' shutdown will cost 12,349 of his constituents their paychecks.

In Byron Donalds', 3,235 folks' paychecks.

In Andy Biggs', 8,433.

In Lisa McClain's, 7,286.

In Scott Perry's Pennsylvania district and the capital of my Commonwealth, Republicans' shutdown will cost 5,445 of his constituents who will lose their paycheck.

Indeed, when you add it all up, Republicans' shutdown will cost 217,583 of their constituents on this Committee's paychecks, their income, for who knows how long.

Let that sink in for a second.

Those are our mothers, our fathers, caretakers, brothers, sisters, moms, dads, grandmas, grandpas, friends, neighbors, beloved community members, veterans, who will not know how their food or medicine will be paid for or where their rent money is coming from.

Many of them vote Republican. But I would bet you not one of them cares more about Hunter Biden's laptop or helping Kevin McCarthy keep his gig as leader or Speaker of his dysfunctional caucus than they care about receiving their paycheck and making their ends meet.

And so, the Republicans on this Committee are betting that we will spend this hearing engaging in partisan bickering over their favorite buzzwords rather than talking about how the MAGA shutdown will crush all of our constituents.

To be honest, I do not quite care about a private citizen, Hunter, whom the proper authorities are dealing with, or the cable news culture-war distractions. I care about the 7 million babies, children, mothers across this country who, after Sunday, will lose access to food and formula, over 10,000 in my district alone. I care about 300,000 families, the 20,000 veterans, who, after Sunday, could face eviction from their homes; rare diseases and cancer patients whose experimental trials will be delayed for months; and I care about our seniors, unable to get help with Social Security and Medicare.

And make no mistake, their attacks are targeted, both in who is behind them and who are going to be hurt most. The most marginalized folks bear the brunt of these MAGA Republicans' attacks—Black folks, Brown folks, trans folks, poor folks, disabled folks.

Keeping that struggle in mind, we have had two hearings on the infant formula shortage on the Subcommittee Chaired by Congresswoman McClain, yet with the 320,000 babies, women, and children in her home state of Michigan about to go hungry due to her par-

ty's shutdown, it seems like my Republican colleagues only care about an issue when they can point the finger in another direction, much like what is going on in this embarrassment of a hearing today.

Mr. Gerhardt, in one of your recent op-eds—and you have repeated it here—you mentioned that a good test for assessing the constitutionality of a governmental action is to switch the names of the political parties and the actors involved. If the outcome is the same, it is a good sign of neutrality. If the outcome is not the same, then there is a good chance that partisanship is the driving force. I think we can safely say that this inquiry would fail that neutrality test.

And since I do not have time, I think we can say that we are here, America, in this sham hearing, prioritizing the political needs of the Republican Party, pushing a lie for Donald Trump, as you go hungry and you lose your homes. Shameful.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. At the request of the witnesses, we are going to take a 10-minute recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. All right. The House will come back to order, and we will resume the 5-minute question-and-answer period.

The Chair now recognizes——

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Chairman? I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a statement from Secretary Vilsack from September 25th stating that the WIC program, which is a federally funded program administered by the states, will expire for 7 million moms and children if the government shuts down.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Words mean things. Or at least they should.

Here is Joe Biden's words from August 28, 2019: "First of all, I have never discussed with my son or my brother or anyone else anything to do with their business."

From September the same year: "I have never spoken to my son about his overseas business dealings."

October, same year: Quote, "I do not discuss business with my son."

Were Joe Biden's words true? No, they were false. So why did he lie repeatedly?

In an interview back in 2019 with *The New Yorker*, even Hunter admitted that he talked to his dad about business, specifically Burisma. Many of Hunter Biden's business associates have testified Joe Biden met with them. Two of the ones closest to Hunter, Rob Walker and Devon Archer, were among them.

They not only spoke to him, they took—a lot of the business associates took photos with him. They played golf with him. Joe Biden gave them White House tours. He wrote letters of recommendation for their children and shared fancy dinners as well.

So, let us also talk about patterns.

Yury Luzhkov and Yelena Baturina, they are Russian, they are married—they were married—Russian oligarch billionaires. Mi-

chael McFaul, the U.S. Ambassador to Russia, ID'ed Luzhkov as being corrupt. Yelena Baturina wires \$3.5 million to Hunter Biden. Soon thereafter, who does she have dinner with? Then-Vice President Joe Biden.

Kenes Rakishev and Karim Massimov—Kazakhstani nationals. Massimov used to be the Prime Minister; he is now in prison. Rakishev wires \$142,300 to Hunter Biden. The very next day, Hunter Biden buys a Porsche for \$142,300. And then, soon after, who do you think Kenes Rakishev has dinner with? Say it with me: then-Vice President Joe Biden.

Vadym Pozharsky and Mykola Zlochevsky, the CEO and CFO of Burisma. The U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey Pyatt, calls Zlochevsky a poster child of corruption. Those two fellows paid Hunter Biden's shell companies a total of \$3.3 million. And who do you think Vadym Pozharsky had dinner with? Again, say it with me all at once: then-Vice President Joe Biden.

So, here's a pattern: You have crooked foreigners that deliver pallets of cash to the Bidens, and then they have dinner with Joe. And, apparently, Joe Biden is one hell of an expensive dinner date. And if that is not selling political access, I do not know what is.

My Democratic colleagues report ad nauseam when they talk to the media that there is no direct evidence linking Joe Biden to his son's crimes. Really?

This is an FD-1023, which is used by the FBI when confidential informants give them information. This 1023 is only as good as the source. It could be garbage, or it could be gold. The FBI describes this source as somebody that is highly reliable and very trustworthy. In fact, they have worked with him for over a decade and paid him well over \$100,000. What he has given to them has always checked out. This, ladies and gentlemen, is gold. Consider this with weight and gravity.

So, what does this say? I do not know what the confidential informant's name is, so I am going to call him "Ivan." Ivan is not his real name. But Ivan describes Vadym Pozharsky directly admitting to him in a confidential conversation that they hired a not-so-smart Hunter Biden to protect us, quote, "through his dad, from all kinds of problems."

Then Ivan speaks directly to CEO Zlochevsky, and Zlochevsky confides that Hunter Biden will take care of those corruption issues through his dad. Zlochevsky is being investigated by Viktor Shokin, a Ukrainian prosecutor. Joe Biden suddenly begins to call for Shokin's removal.

Now, Ivan is also told by Zlochevsky that it cost him \$5 million to pay one Biden and \$5 million to pay the other. This is direct evidence of naked corruption and bribery.

Zlochevsky also admitted to Ivan that both Bidens pushed him to pay them and to keep Hunter Biden on the board.

Please keep in mind, these were confidential conversations. Also, interesting that Zlochevsky referred to Biden as the "big guy." And I doubt he knows Tony Bobulinski.

Shokin seized two homes, land, and a Rolls-Royce from Zlochevsky. When he was fired, the Ukrainian President admitted in a phone call to none other than Joe Biden that Shokin did not do anything wrong but, "at your behest, we fired him." And then

a billion dollars of aid that was being withheld was given to Ukraine.

And, last, after Shokin was fired, Hunter Biden and the other members of the Burisma board wrote a letter to the new prosecutor demanding that Zlochevsky—the investigation into Zlochevsky ended. And you know what? Shockingly, it did. The message was sent, and the Bidens delivered.

Mr. Dubinsky, in your experience in financial investigations, you follow—quote/unquote, you follow the money. If you were investigating this and looking at a \$5 million payment from Burisma to Joe Biden, what kinds of information or patterns would you be looking for?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, I would want to know who, what, when, where, and why. What is going on? Why is the money moving? What is it for? What is the substance behind it? And talk to people. Look at documents and talk to people. That is what we do in investigations.

I would venture to say, everybody in this chamber, if they were the CEO of a company and they saw money moving like that within their own company, they would want to get to the truth. They would want to find out, why is that money moving? Why is somebody paying that money out?

Those are the questions that need to be asked and get to the bottom of.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I yield back.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another unanimous consent request.

I would like to enter into the record a July 9, 2016, letter from three Burisma board members, including Hunter Biden, to Yuriy Lutsenko, who replaced Shokin as the Prosecutor General, expressing concern that Mr. Lutsenko had initiated an investigation into Burisma.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Casar from Texas.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin with a quote.

“The people of America elected all 435 of us to do the things they expect Congress to do—real business, not theater—try to have some type of prescription drug reform legislation this year. But, instead, the Majority party is conducting baseless impeachment hearings.”

Who do we think said this quote? Was it Nancy Pelosi? Maybe Ranking Member Jamie Raskin?

Mr. Chairman, you might recognize that quote, because you said this in 2019. You said it on the Floor of the U.S. House, saying impeaching Donald Trump was political theater.

Trump was first impeached for attempting to extort a foreign President into helping the Trump Presidential campaign. And if you did not consider that criminal, how about when Trump was impeached trying to overthrow the results of the Presidential election and then incited a violent insurrection against the government?

So, if you thought that impeaching Trump was political theater, then what would you call this?

This—this—is a disgrace. And I hope that someday top Republican officials will find some integrity.

In the case of Trump, because you fear his social media wrath, right-wing officials will deny all evidence against Trump come hell or high water. But in the case of President Joe Biden, you decided to start the impeaching now and figure out the whole evidence thing later.

And you still have not figured it out. Your own Republican-called witnesses today say they do not see the evidence to impeach President Biden. A bunch of stuff about Hunter this, Hunter that, but they have said they do not see the evidence to impeach Joe Biden.

That is a disgraceful double standard. It damages our democracy, insults the institution of Congress, and, more than anything, disgraces this body in the eyes of the American public.

This inquiry is a cynical attempt to tar everyone, to make everyone look suspect, make everyone look corrupt, so that voters just give up and say, "There is not much difference here."

But we cannot give up on discerning truth from propaganda. We cannot give up on our collective governance. Congress is a place where, historically, people of enormous integrity have throughout history taken on big challenges of inequality, injustice, instability. We can and must impartially look at the evidence before us and have equal justice under the law.

And the evidence before us shows no wrongdoing by President Biden. We have not seen that evidence throughout the testimony today. Your own Republican-called witnesses have said they have not seen that kind of evidence.

There is separate evidence that supports indictments—unrelated indictments—against his son, Hunter; and multiple indictments, spanning 91 criminal charges, against former President Trump.

I, for one, am grateful we have an independent judicial system where a President's son or a former President, like Trump, can be investigated and prosecuted if they violate the law. It is my firm belief that Hunter and Trump should both face trial and, if guilty, be held accountable for the crimes they have been accused of.

Can everyone on the Oversight Committee say the same thing? Will Members of the Oversight Committee please raise your hand if you believe both Hunter and Trump should be held accountable for any of the indictments against them if convicted by a jury of their peers?

We can take a minute.

No, it is serious. This is a serious matter. If you all need to think about it, we can take a moment and think about it.

It is serious. This is very serious.

Mr. CASAR. Think about it. Should both Hunter and Trump be held accountable?

Chairman COMER. Would the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. CASAR. I want to see whether you would raise your hand. Should Hunter and Trump both be held accountable if they are found guilty on any of their indictments? Raise your hand if you think that equal justice under the law applies and Trump should be held accountable.

Mr. FALLON. I am not going to raise my hand because you asked me to.

Mr. CASAR. I think it is worse than embarrassing that Republicans will not raise their hands. They refuse to say that equal justice under the law should apply to everyone.

And when you step back and think about it——

Ms. GREENE. Then what about the January 6th defendants?

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Chairman, point of order.

Mr. CASAR. This double standard insults the institutions of Congress that people fought and died to build. This impeachment hearing clearly is not about justice. We cannot say equal justice under the law for everyone except for the guy who holds the leash.

I will yield the rest of my time to Ranking Member Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you.

I think, as you were being interrupted by several colleagues, I heard one question posed by the distinguished gentlelady from Georgia, who said, “What about the January 6th defendants?”—all of whom had lawyers, due process, the presumption of innocence. And they were convicted of various things, including assaulting Federal officers and Metropolitan Police, as well as Capitol Police.

Ms. GREENE. What about Antifa and BLM rioters that caused \$2 billion of damage in America?

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Chairman, point of order.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Raskin, if I can take my time back.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I yield back,

Mr. CASAR. We have heard, because it was not on the microphones, multiple members saying it is wrong that January 6th rioters were convicted by a jury of their peers. That is disturbing. We have started to get used to it, but we cannot get used to it.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman’s time is expired.

Now the Chair recognizes——

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon for a point of order.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent to enter the FD-1023 into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Perry from Pennsylvania for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In an attempt to establish some patterns here and get the actual facts out the media will not report, the President’s son seemed to benefit often from government positions. As far back as 1996, he received his first job at MBNA.

Then-Senator Joe Biden had supported the controversial bankruptcy bill, which really favored the company to the peril of average citizens, and he got the name “Senator from MBNA.”

After which Hunter then—he continued to benefit from his father’s public positions. And in 2011, he was contacted by Che Feng, who is a Chinese politician and businessman. They wanted to form a joint investment firm that then became a subsidiary of the Bank of China.

Now, it seems like the President’s really—the President’s son’s only skill is leveraging his family name. It essentially seems like it comes to him like swimming comes to a fish.

If we could put up on the screen an email from—between Devon Archer and the President’s son. And if you can see here where he has asked, “Why does the Super Chairman love me so much?” And the answer is, “It is easy. It has nothing to do with me and everything to do with my last name.”

That is the President’s son. That is not me saying it, that is the President’s son. He openly acknowledged it does not come from education or business acumen, it comes from his name. And let us face it, it is not—it is his name, but it is not his name that was garnering all the attention. Both were selling their name, one to MBNA and the other to the highest bidder.

Devon Archer, in his transcribed interview—if you will put that on the screen, please—he confirmed it. If I can get Mr. Archer’s testimony on the screen.

While it is getting up there, because the clock is ticking, the Biden family—he confirmed it and said the Biden family was the product or the brand. And it is fair to say, in quotes, that Joe Biden was the brand and, obviously, brought most value to the brand.

I make that case because the President’s son was addicted to drugs and he was frequenting prostitutes. So, I suspect his value of a brand was pretty low compared to his father, who was the Vice President of the United States.

I mean, companies brand their products, whether it is a food company or a car company or a shoe company, they brand it because it provides trust by their buyers or from their buyers.

Now, this Committee first released a bank memo on March 16, 2023, that showed that less than 2 months after the Vice President left office, State Energy HK Limited sent Robinson Walker—again, a very close friend and business associate of the Biden family—\$3 million.

Shortly thereafter, literally the next day and within the next series of days, Robinson Walker sent over \$1 million to the Biden family and associated businesses, and they were sent in suspect incremental payments.

And it follows a pattern. I can give you other instances where the exact same thing occurred, one-third for Robinson Walker, one-third—one-third here, one-third there. That is how it worked out.

Now, the Biden family provided no legitimate services, yet Hallie Biden, purportedly working as a school counselor, was provided some of this money. For what? What was the product or what was the service?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the first bank record memos dated March 16, 2023, new evidence resulting from the Oversight Committee’s investigation into the Biden family’s influence peddling and business scheme showing that the Biden family members and Biden-associated businesses received over \$1 million from State Energy HK Limited, a Chinese company.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you.

Mr. Turley, thank you for being here.

What is influence peddling?

Mr. TURLEY. Influence peddling is to sell access or influence to an officeholder to achieve some end. There is sometimes a very clear quid pro quo, which is a specific act that you want. Sometimes it is a general pattern of corruption, of favoring someone.

I actually in my testimony gave the—I believe it was the Canadian definition, which I thought was a particularly good one, under their law. But the United States also signed off on a convention on public corruption that also has definitions that are relevant.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Dubinsky, in the remaining time, this money, these wires being sent to family members with no apparent legitimate services being rendered, is this something that you would find interest in and would yourself, if charged with it, would investigate on your own?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired, but please answer the question.

Mr. DUBINSKY. It would be a red flag, and I would follow up on that and see where it leads.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have got a point of order.

Chairman COMER. State the point.

Mr. RASKIN. I did not want to interrupt the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, but he referred to an email at the beginning of his testimony. We have not been provided a copy of that email and I do not know where it came from. What is the source of that material?

Mr. PERRY. The source of the material is from Hunter Biden.

Mr. RASKIN. Oh, Hunter Biden sent it to the Committee? Hunter Biden sent that to the Committee? Because, you know, we have a rule on this. We have got to be provided all material that is going to be entered in the record.

Our colleagues keep relying on emails that are purportedly obtained from Hunter Biden's laptop, but we have no idea if those emails are authentic.

As you know, you have not shared with us what you say is the hard drive to Hunter Biden's laptop, and nobody has verified them. And the guy—

Chairman COMER. CBS has verified them. The CBS News did a forensic audit and said they are legitimate.

Mr. RASKIN. CBS News is not part of this Committee.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the email entered into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, then I am going to object to it because we do not know what the basis of that is.

Chairman COMER. We will work on getting you an answer for that.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. If I could just say, the computer repair guy who disseminated that stuff says he cannot account for the chain of custody of the alleged hard drive of the laptop. So, we have no idea where that comes from.

Chairman COMER. And we will get you the answer to that. But I would like to remind the Ranking Member that the President's son is now suing the repair guy for leaking his laptop. Remember, he denied it forever—

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. And you all said it was Russian manipulation.

Mr. RASKIN. But he cannot account for the custody——

Chairman COMER. Now it is——

Mr. RASKIN. Right. No, I agree with you. But he cannot account for the custody of it either. Nobody knows what——

Chairman COMER. We will get you the answer on the source of the email.

The Chair now recognizes——

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter into the record our own 2023 transcribed interview with our Committee of Devon Archer, where he clearly states, quote——

Chairman COMER. It is already in the record.

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. “The brand was Washington, D.C., not President Biden.” He was asked, “The brand was really Joe Biden?” And Mr. Archer responded, “D.C. was the brand.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. It is in the record twice now.

Mr. CASAR. Well, I guess it is a reminder.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Before I begin my questioning, I want to remind everyone that the information recorded in the FBI Form 1023 that my Republican colleagues keep citing is not evidence of anything. This form reflects years-old, secondhand, unverified information from a Ukrainian oligarch as relayed to the FBI by a confidential human source.

These unverified, secondhand allegations have been repeatedly debunked and undermined, including by the confidential human source who relayed this information to the FBI. The tip recorded in the Form 1023 was thoroughly explored by the U.S. Attorney handpicked by Donald Trump, which was Attorney General William Barr, and the assessment was closed.

Finally, Devon Archer, Hunter Biden’s former business partner, who worked with the Ukrainian oligarch in question, told this Committee in a transcribed interview in July that he had no knowledge of any such payments allegedly described in this form.

Repeating the same lies will not somehow turn them into truths, kind of like the election that Trump lost. Say it with me. He lost it. Repeating the same lie, that he won, was not going to turn the election around. The lost in this chamber keep pushing lies and lunacy on behalf of a multitime loser.

So, if we are going to talk about China, let us go ahead and talk about China, and let us talk about the dealings.

And let me point out the fact that right now each of you has admitted that none of you are fact witnesses. We walked in without facts and, unfortunately, because what we say is not necessarily evidence, we have wasted the American people’s time and we are going to walk out of this Chamber and we still have no facts that are leading to anything.

But let me give you all a little bit of teeth while we are here.

So, I have a document that I will ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record. It is a fact sheet on President Trump's shady business dealings with the Chinese Government.

Chairman COMER. What are you entering in, a record from who?

Ms. CROCKETT. This is from the Congressional Integrity.

Chairman COMER. Congressional Integrity Project, the dark money PAC?

Mr. BURCHETT. I object.

Chairman COMER. I object to that too.

Ms. CROCKETT. Of course, you all are going to object, but we are going to talk about it.

So, it says: "Trump has extensive financial ties to the Chinese Government."

"President Trump collected millions from Chinese Government-owned entities while in office."

"I have the best tenants in the world.' President Trump was well aware of the multi-million dollar lease to Chinese interests."

"President Trump promised to donate foreign government profits while in office—but he donated less than a third of his proceeds from the Chinese Government."

"President Trump maintained three foreign bank accounts while in office—including one in China."

"President Trump's business with China raised legal and ethical concerns."

President Trump: "President XI loves the people of China, he loves his country, and he is doing a very good job."

Let me tell you something. I do not want to talk about what you all want to act like is some big mystery, because we keep sitting here.

And, Professor Gerhardt, just to be clear, as my colleagues have even tried to provide evidence, which they are not the ones to provide evidence, have you ever heard them say "if" since we have been sitting here for I do not know how long?

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes. I have been taking a tally.

Ms. CROCKETT. Oh, OK. Can you show us? Can you tell us what the tally is?

Mr. GERHARDT. And so, more than 35 times the Republican witnesses and the Republican Members of the Committee have used the word "if."

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much for that, because, honestly, if they would continue to say "if" or "Hunter" and we were playing a drinking game, I would be drunk by now, because I promise you, they have not talked about the subject of this, which would be the President.

But let me tell you something that was so disturbing as I walked into this Chamber today. As I prepared, I said, what is the crime? Because when you are talking about impeachment, you are talking about high crimes or misdemeanors. And I cannot seem to find the crime.

And, honestly, no one has testified of what crime they believe the President of the United States has committed. But when we start talking about things that look like evidence, they want to act like they blind. They do not know what this is.

These are our national secrets, looks like in the shitter to me. This looks like more evidence of our national secrets, say, on a stage at Mar-a-Lago.

When we are talking about somebody that has committed high crimes, it is at least indictments. Let us say 32 counts related to unauthorized retention of national security secrets, 7 counts related to obstructing the investigation, 3 false statements, 1 count of conspiracy to defraud the United States, falsifying business records, conspiracy to defraud the United States, 2 counts related to efforts to obstruct the vote certification proceedings, 1 count of conspiracy to violate civil rights, 23 counts related to forgery or false document statements, 8 counts related to soliciting. And I could go on, because he has got 91 counts pending right now.

But I will tell you what the President has been guilty of. He has, unfortunately, been guilty of loving his child unconditionally, and that is the only evidence that they have brought forward. And, honestly, I hope and pray that my parents love me half as much as he loves his child.

Until they find some evidence, we need to get back to the people's work, which means keeping this government open so that people do not go hungry in the streets of the United States.

And I will yield.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Timmons from South Carolina.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to try to simplify this for the American people.

My colleagues across the aisle allege that this inquiry is improper and that this hearing is improper, but that could not be further from the truth.

We now have enormous amounts of evidence to indicate that Hunter Biden was engaged in nefarious and illegal activities with foreign nationals from China, Romania, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Russia, all while making millions of dollars doing so.

We do not even know the full extent of it yet. To date, we have discovered up to \$25 million in payments, and that is without even having Hunter Biden's personal bank records.

The question is this, though, this is the question, this is why we are here: What did Joe Biden know and when?

Due to the evidence that we have found to date, Speaker McCarthy appropriately initiated an impeachment inquiry to give us additional tools to get the answer to that question.

Based on the circumstantial evidence we have—the laptop, the whistleblowers, shell companies, bank records, and testimony from Devon Archer—this Congress has a duty to further investigate whether Vice President Joe Biden was an affable, loving father simply taken advantage of by his delinquent son or a knowing participant who was complicit in the scheme and financially compensated for his role.

That is why we are here today, to answer that simple question, to determine if our current President is compromised.

Look, this scheme is complicated. You have got all these countries and all these different roles different people played.

But the plan is simple and repeated often. A foreign client has a problem. The foreign client pays a Biden. The Vice President

leverages influence to force favorable outcomes for the client. The Biden family earns their fee. That is the scheme. We have seen it played over and over.

As we continue to investigate all of this wrongdoing, I have put a lot of time trying to figure out how all this got started.

In 2014, it seems that Vice President Biden, after four decades of public service and thinking he would never hold public office again, started down a slippery slope. Perhaps he just wanted to help his struggling son. Maybe he never intended to sell policy decisions and for the Biden family to get millions of dollars. But there is mounting evidence that suggests that he—that that may very well be what has happened.

It all began in the spring of 2014, though. Hunter Biden gets his father to have dinner with foreign nationals and his business partner Devon Archer in Georgetown. The foreign nationals attending this dinner were Karim Massimov, the Prime Minister of Kazakhstan; Kenes Rakishev, a Kazakhstani oligarch; Yelena Baturina, a Russian oligarch who also happened to be the wife of the mayor of Moscow.

We know that, beginning in early 2014, Baturina sent a \$3.5 million wire to one of Hunter Biden's shell companies, and Rakishev wired \$142,300 to yet another shell company for Hunter Biden to buy a Porsche. We have the bank records to prove this.

So, the logical question here is, what was this money for? What were the goals of those payments?

For Baturina, it seems her motives were clear. She knew that Russia was going to invade Crimea and as a response to the invasion the Obama Administration would inevitably announce sanctions and visa bans.

Who was left off the list that the Obama Administration published? Who was noticeably missing? Yelena Baturina, the richest woman in Russia, the woman who wired Hunter Biden \$3.5 million just days earlier. That is just a coincidence.

For Rakishev, the motive was to leverage Biden's influence to aid in the facilitation of the sale of Kazakhstani state oil rights to Burisma. And guess what? In December of the same year, Rakishev's oil company and Burisma joined a Chinese Communist Party-linked company and announced a deal. Everyone got rich. Again, another amazing coincidence.

These are only the first two of dozens of examples of the scheme. A foreign client has a problem. A foreign client pays a Biden. The Vice President leverages influence to force a favorable outcome for the client. The Biden family earns their fee.

Our work over the last 9 months warrants additional scrutiny of Biden family members and business associates and requires additional tools at our disposal to uncover whether Joe Biden was complicit—again, the purpose of this investigation.

Our next steps are to subpoena additional documents that will give context to these transactions to help determine Joe Biden's culpability. We are going to subpoena Hunter Biden's personal bank records, various business records, such as invoices and contracts, to clarify what these payments were for; Secret Service logs detailing movement patterns of then-Vice President. The list goes on and on.

And, again, I just want everybody to remember, we are doing this because the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the IRS refuse to do their job. And we have evidence just in the last week that they are actively concealing these possible crimes.

If we discover that Joe Biden was taking half of Hunter Biden's income, like Hunter told his daughter in a text message, I hope that my Democrat colleagues will put politics aside, do the right thing, and join us in impeaching a corrupt President who sold out the American people.

And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Goldman from New York.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This hearing is entitled "The Basis for an Impeachment Inquiry."

You would think that after 8 months of an investigation we would not need to have a hearing, with no witness who has any direct knowledge of the evidence, to determine that there is a basis for this impeachment inquiry.

And this is an impeachment inquiry. Mr. Turley and Mr. Gerhardt testified in 2019 in the official impeachment process in the Judiciary Committee. The inquiry was in the Intelligence Committee. And in the Intelligence Committee, there were 17 firsthand witnesses with direct knowledge of the allegations. And the public hearings had 12 witnesses, all with firsthand.

Here we are in our first hearing. No one has any actual knowledge or evidence. There is nothing new here.

So why don't we have some of the fact witnesses here? You have brought them in. They have come in already. What about Devon Archer?

Now, Mr. Donalds and the Chairman now want to disavow Mr. Archer's testimony that Mr. Biggs entirely relies upon, but they do not want him to come sit here.

Why? Well, maybe because he testified that Joe Biden never discussed business with Hunter or other business associates, he got nothing from their businesses, and he never took any official acts related to the businesses.

Or maybe the American people might hear that this \$3.5 million from Baturina actually had nothing to do with Hunter Biden, which is what Devon Archer testified.

Or what about Eric Schwerin, Hunter Biden's partner and accountant? He also performed a number of administrative and book-keeping tasks for then-Vice President Biden and Hunter Biden. He saw Vice President Biden's bank accounts.

And he told the Committee that he was not aware of any involvement by President Biden in the financial conduct of his relatives' businesses, much less any transactions into or out of then-Vice President's bank account related to business conducted by any family member.

And the list goes on. We have already talked about Lev Parnas and Rudy Giuliani.

The reason is, you bring in the fact witnesses and your case goes down the drain.

So, let us talk about what your allegations are.

\$15 million to nine Biden family members from 2014 to 2019.

Mr. Dubinsky, was Joe Biden President of the United States from 2014 to 2019?

Mr. DUBINSKY. No, he was not.

Mr. GOLDMAN. And, in fact, from 2017 to 2021 he was a private citizen, right?

Mr. DUBINSKY. That is my understanding, correct.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Gerhardt, am I correct that the Framers made very clear that conduct as private citizens are best left for the legal system, not the impeachment process? Is that right?

Mr. GERHARDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Now, even yesterday, in releasing 700 pages of documents, Chairman Smith admitted that he is not an expert in the timeline, which seems to encapsulate this investigation to a tee, because here we are seeing texts and emails from 2017. We are seeing Department of Justice emails from 2020, when it was the Donald Trump Justice Department. And all we hear all day long: Biden family, Biden family, Biden family. And every time you hear that, you know that it does not include Joe Biden.

If there were nine Biden family members who got money from these business transactions, is it not striking that Joe Biden was not one of them? Pretty remarkable.

And what we hear is this is an exceedingly complex chain of transactions. That is what the House Republicans said. Pattern of incredible financial complexity.

Mrs. McClain showed a chart. It had an investor. It had an investment company that invested money, that received money. And then it went to the investors.

Mr. Dubinsky, that is not very complicated, is it?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, that is not really the question. The question is, what was going on there? Was there an investment? What is—

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am just asking about the structure—

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, that structure—

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Because what we have here, and we hear so much about services and all of this, services are legitimate or product. It is an investment company. It is a private equity company that invests capital in other corporations and companies. That is standard practice.

Mr. DUBINSKY. Well, that is an assumption.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Turley, you said in 2019 that impeachment requires a clear criminal act. Is that right?

Mr. TURLEY. No. In fact, in the Trump impeachment I said repeatedly you can impeach someone for noncriminal conduct. What I said then I am saying now, which is, I strongly encourage you to look at criminal acts.

Mr. GOLDMAN. All right. Well, that testimony is there.

Mr. TURLEY. Well, can I—

Mr. GOLDMAN. No, you cannot, because I have 10 seconds left.

You have said that lying as a President is not impeachable. You have said that there is an influence-peddling campaign.

But you will acknowledge, will you not, that in order to have a criminal act of public corruption or bribery there must be, under McDonnell, an official act in connection to some sort of personal benefit. Is that right?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired, but, Mr. Turley, please answer the question.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, I can just point you to my testimony. I talk about quid pro quo.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Just answer the question.

Mr. TURLEY. Because it is a little more complicated.

Mr. GOLDMAN. No, it is not. An official act for personal benefit.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired.

The Chair now recognizes Ms. Greene from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On July 25, 2023, Chairman Comer and I sent the Department of Justice a letter requesting information related to victims of Hunter Biden, specifically women he sexually exploited and then claimed as deductions on his taxes through his law firm. But he never paid those taxes.

Not surprisingly, the Department of Justice did not respond.

After the DOJ's sweetheart Hunter Biden deal fell apart—by the way, led by the special counsel, David Weiss—on September 8, 2023, Chairman Comer and I again sent a letter to the same DOJ officials asking about victims' rights issues related to Hunter Biden's sexual exploitations. DOJ once again failed to respond.

Well, yesterday I found out why they do not want to talk with us. In a new email just released—by the way, from October 2020—could you please display the email—the Delaware U.S. Attorney's Office, DOJ Tax, FBI, and IRS described evidence they have related to Mann Act violations.

By the way, the subject of the email says "Mann Act."

First, the title, "Mann Act." Then it is clear there are charges on the table while the Department of Justice is in hiding from meeting with me.

The Department of Justice and IRS email and David Weiss' Delaware U.S. Attorney's Office, the email states there are communications with Trafficker #1 and Trafficker #2, and that Hunter Biden had escorts who traveled across state lines.

These women are victims, and the Department of Justice is refusing to protect their rights.

Not only that. David Weiss, the now-special counsel in charge of supposedly investigating Hunter Biden, has been clearly covering up Hunter Biden's crimes since before the 2020 election, which is undoubtedly election interference. David Weiss is complicit and must be removed from the special counsel.

We also have more information we subpoenaed. Let me give you an even better example, based on an interview with one of Hunter Biden's victims with law enforcement.

It says here that the victim, Hunter Biden's victim, stated that Biden told her that his father was the Vice President and asked to Google search his name.

Hunter Biden's victim stated she told Biden she was not interested in Google searching his name and just wanted to be paid. Hunter Biden's victim stated that Biden then showed her a picture of his father with President Barack Obama. Do not forget, his father was Vice President then.

Hunter Biden's sex—Hunter Biden's victim stated, after she was shown the aforementioned picture, who was the Vice President of

the United States with the President of the United States, Barack Obama, she became afraid.

After Hunter Biden's victim left the location, she arrived back at her apartment and told her friend who she was just with. Hunter Biden's victim stated that her friend told her, "You have no idea who you're dealing with." These women were terrified, terrified.

He used his father—Hunter Biden used his father, the Vice President of the United States, to threaten his victim who he had just trafficked for sex, and the Department of Justice refuses to speak to me?

Hunter Biden needs to be held accountable for his sexual exploitation of women. And we have shown more evidence. We have shown evidence. This is what it looks like. This is what Mann Act violations look like.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman?

Ms. GREENE. I reclaim my time.

Mr. RASKIN. I would like to challenge the use of this exhibit under clause 6 of Rule XVII.

Ms. GREENE. Hunter Biden should be held accountable.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Point of order. Point of order.

Ms. GREENE. It is sad that my Democrat colleagues pretend to care about women's rights while allowing Hunter Biden to exploit women. This is a shame.

But let us talk about—

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, there is a parliamentary challenge before us.

Chairman COMER. There is a point of order.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Chairman COMER. Address the point. And we will stop the clock for you, Ms. Greene.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, our colleague from Georgia has introduced before pornographic exhibits and displayed things that are really not suitable for children who might be watching. And—

Ms. GREENE. A bathing suit is not suitable, Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I am saying I would like the witness to—I would like the Member to be instructed to not introduce any pornography today, at least without running it through the Chair first.

Ms. GREENE. A bathing suit is not pornography, Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, we cannot see it from down there. So, you did not make it available to the Minority before you started.

Ms. GREENE. You have seen it before. It is on the internet. It is everywhere.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. And you are submitting a naked woman's body.

Ms. GREENE. This is a bathing suit. This is a bathing suit.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. And it has not been cleared before this Committee.

Ms. GREENE. Put your glasses on. Do you wear them or not?

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. I have contacts in, thank you.

Ms. GREENE. Oh, congratulations.

Chairman COMER. The Chair asks Ms. Greene to proceed.

Ms. GREENE. Now, let us talk about more evidence the Democrats have denied that has turned out to be true.

We all know Joe Biden is the big guy, and we confirmed that Hunter Biden was lobbying his father.

Here is another example that was just released yesterday. This is from a timeline from one of the IRS whistleblowers and quotes an email between Vuk Jeremic, a Serbian politician, and Hunter Biden.

“Did you have a chance to talk with the big man? He is receiving my Prime Minister on Wednesday. Please let me know if you think that what we discussed back in D.C. can be mentioned in the meeting. My domestic strategy (how I proceed in dealing with my government) very much depends on whether it happens or not.”

This is a conversation between Hunter Biden and Vuk Jeremic. This is called influence peddling. This is how Hunter Biden was selling his father’s political power and influence, and this is a perfect example. This is evidence right here.

I would like to remind everyone that this is the beginning of the impeachment inquiry, where we are casting a wide net and finding every single person, whether it is last Administration, the administration before that, and whether it is the current Administration that has covered up the crimes of the Biden family.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Ms. GREENE. And we will continue pulling more evidence.

Mr. RASKIN. She is 54 seconds over, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. And I let Mr. Goldman go over 30 seconds, so we owe you 20 seconds too.

Mr. Moskowitz, it is your lucky day. You get 5 minutes and 20 seconds.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is your lucky day.

What a day we are having here, isn’t it, right? I mean, listen, as a former Director of Emergency Management, I know a disaster when I see one.

I mean, by the way, you do not believe me, just ask Steve Bannon. Steve Bannon, that is your guy, just went on and said, you know, perhaps—

Chairman COMER. Whose guy is Steve Bannon?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Well, you know who Steve Bannon is.

Steve Bannon just went on and said, perhaps the Republicans should not have started with a witness—he was talking about Professor Turley—who was going to say right off the bat that there was not an impeachable offense. I quote. He says, “Perhaps we should have put him on the maybe list for one of our witnesses.”

So, your other witness, Ms. O’Connor, she gave a complete recitation of the last 9 months, 8 months of these hearings. She went through some of the greatest hits that have come out, right, everything that has been presented, you know, both in these Committees that we have been having, on TV, all of the evidence that you guys have been presenting over the last 8 months, all of that together.

And what does Professor Turley say? It says: Everything we know at this juncture does not rise to the level of impeachment. Boy, that is awkward. I mean, look, it is like political impeachment malpractice.

But look, let us go back at some of the previous comments that my colleagues have given.

So, the Chairman—and I have a slide—the Chairman goes on “Hannity”, right—you guys all know Sean, you appear with him on FOX News all the time, right—and Hannity asks a softball question, right? This is a total softball.

“Do you believe that this is now officially the Joe Biden bribery allegation, and do you believe you will be able to prove it?”

The Chairman should have just said yes. But nope, he says, “Hope so,” because he does not have any evidence. Could not say yes, right?

Next slide, please.

Then we have Senator Grassley. Grassley says what we all know out loud. “We are not interested in whether or not the accusations against Vice President Biden are accurate.” Chuck, we know. We know you are not interested in the truth.

Next slide, please.

And then Donald Trump, you know, he is giving it all away. We know he does not—he likes to show his cards. He says: “I think had they not done it to me perhaps you would not have it being done to them. And this is going to happen with indictments too.”

So, you know, Donald Trump, the tough guy, right? What is he saying? He is teaching the lesson we all teach our kids, right? If they do it to you, go do it back.

So, look, you know, look, we are all appearing now in the world’s worst-acted TV drama, right? It has been picked up for a second season, “The Real House Republicans of Oversight.” You know, perhaps the material is so bad due to the writers’ strike.

I mean, how many Republicans, Freedom Caucus members, part of the chaos caucus, have said there is no evidence to impeach Joe Biden?

And, again, of course, we know it is not about the evidence. Why? Here is a list of all of the Articles of Impeachment that have been filed by my colleagues, some that are on this Committee.

When was the first article filed? It was filed in January 21, 2 weeks after January 6. So, before we had a single hearing, before they went through this myriad of fishing, they were filing Articles of Impeachment.

Professor Turley, you said this does not rise to the level of impeachment, and you said they should not prejudge. Well, here is a list right here of every single Member, many on this Committee, prejudging.

They are filing Articles of Impeachment—COVID, Afghanistan, Hunter Biden—and they are all one-upping each other in the Donald Trump Friend Olympics, trying to get invited to the sleepover at Mar-a-Lago. “I filed Articles of Impeachment against Merrick Garland.” “No, I filed Articles of Impeachment against Kamala Harris.”

OK. It is ridiculous.

But this is what this is about. Let me show you. It is a simple board, right?

So, all other Presidents in the United States, 50 percent of the impeachments, Donald Trump the other 50. Donald Trump has half of the impeachments in American history. But you know what? He has got 100 percent in the indictments, 100 percent of all indictments. Zero for the other Presidents.

Listen, let me do it another way. I want to channel my inner Tim Russert. So, let me go to the board, right? And I do not have Florida, Florida.

But Donald Trump impeachments. Oh, how many impeachments? We got two there. How many indictments? We got four. How many for Biden? Zero, zero.

Donald Trump is right. He is sick of winning. He is just winning, running away with it.

And that is why we are here. We are here because of math. That is what this is about. They cannot save Donald Trump. They cannot take away the two impeachments and the four indictments, but they can try to put some numbers on the board for Joe Biden. But the problem is, when you sling mud, you got to have mud. And they just do not have anything, Mr. Chairman.

So, look, we get it. We know why we are here. That is why they say the Biden family, the Bidens, James Biden, Joe Biden's dog Commander, but not Joe Biden, never Joe Biden.

So, when are you going to have the vote on impeachment, Mr. Chairman? What are you scared of? Call the vote. Come on. If you all think there is so much evidence, we are here, call the vote on impeachment. Impeach him right now. I dare you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time is expired.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Gosar for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Here we go again. We have more evidence that Joe Biden and Burisma [inaudible] Chairman Ye, the CEFC of China Energy.

Who is Chairman Ye? Chairman Ye and CEFC reportedly had connections to the Chinese military. Though it was, in theory, a private company, CEFC has layers of Communist Party committees, which are usually staples of state-owned enterprises.

This CCP-affiliated entity was closely connected with China's Belt and Road Initiative, and there is evidence Joe Biden was in business with it.

Joe Biden was engaged so closely with Chairman Ye and CEFC that he planned to share office space in Washington, DC, with him. Joe Biden was actually considered a partner.

Let us break down the evidence. The email I have on display shows on September 21, 2017—yes, we will talk about that in a minute—Hunter Biden emailed the General Manager of House of Sweden, a building in Washington, DC, to request that keys be made available for office mates Joe Biden, Jill Biden, Jim Biden, Gongwen Dong, Chairman Ye's CEFC emissary.

Not only did Joe Biden share office space with the Chinese Communist-affiliated CEFC leadership, his son, Hunter Biden, asked that the signage for the venture be listed as, quote, "The Biden Foundation, Hudson West (CEFC U.S.)."

In case it is not clear that Joe Biden was not a partner in these business dealings with CCP-affiliated entities with a key to shared office space, the email I now have on display shows that Hunter Biden specifically referenced Joe Biden as his partner in this venture.

Hunter even shared the personal phone numbers for Joe Biden, to whom Hunter Biden refers to as his partner, along with

Gongwen Dong, Chairman Ye's emissary, and Jim Biden. The management was told to call Joe Biden if they chose.

CEFC Chairman Ye additionally gifted Hunter Biden a diamond worth \$80,000 during their business relationship. Chairman Ye was detained in 2018 by Chinese authorities, and it was initially reported by Chinese media that his detention in China was ordered directly by Chinese President Xi Jinping.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter in the record this email dated September 21, 2017, showing Joe Biden's involvement in sharing of office space with the family's CCP-linked business partner, Chairman Ye Jianming.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOSAR. Let me ask you a question. Who do you think I am referring to? Who has a family of high-ranking government officials receiving tons of money, cars, and luxury items from a foreign government? You might have said Senator Menendez, and you would be right. But Hunter Biden also received those same things.

Mr. Turley, in your experience, is it concerning that a public official such as Joe Biden is involved with the CEFC China Energy, a company with ties to the CCP and Chairman Ye, who was later detained by China for fraud?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, it is certainly a concern that some of these individuals have been either accused of or has been convicted of fraud, including one by the U.S. Government.

The question is whether that conduct extended to the Vice President—or the President today—and whether that is part of a continuum of conduct.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Dubinsky, when you see a pattern of problems, particularly in corruption, does that pattern usually continue? It is kind of a cover-up. Do you agree with that statement?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I do. We call it pattern evidence, and that is what we look for when we are doing investigations to see what is continuing in that regard.

Mr. GOSAR. So, if you started prior as a Vice President, you would continue through this as a private citizen, you would see it also as President. So, those are the aspects that you would follow through, right?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Absolutely.

Mr. GOSAR. Now, for all three of you real quick. The other side has said over and over again you have given no information. But isn't it true that we should be looking to you for establishment?

I am not an attorney. Neither are most of these folks here. Should we not be utilizing your expertise to go get that information, to make sure it is valid?

Mr. Turley, would you agree with that?

Mr. TURLEY. I agree. My testimony tried to lay out the historical baseline for an inquiry. This is just the beginning of that formal inquiry.

Mr. GOSAR. Ms. O'Connor?

Ms. O'CONNOR. My testimony was to aid in understanding what the whistleblowers had brought forward.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Dubinsky?

Mr. DUBINSKY. And my testimony was centered around conducting an unbiased investigation and getting to the truth.

Mr. GOSAR. Unbelievable. I think this is so perfectly set up. We wanted the very basis of this, and we wanted a slow, methodical, make sure it is done appropriately.

You know, it just overwhelms me when we start to see the rhetoric that comes out of the other side and especially the show that we just saw. You know, that belongs on “Saturday Night Live.”

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, a unanimous consent motion—or request, rather. I would like to enter six different instances of the Devon Archer transcript where——

Chairman COMER. And it has been entered twice, but if you want to enter it again, go ahead.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes. Well, there are six ones where he said that all they discussed was the weather and never business, never business.

Chairman COMER. Look, Mr. Goldman, we will enter in the total, entire transcript for a third time.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib from Michigan for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASAR. Before she starts, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to enter an October 23, 2020, *Wall Street Journal* article that states: “Text messages and emails provided to the Journal by Mr. Bobulinski do not show either Hunter Biden or James Biden discussing a role for Joe Biden in the venture.”

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, just before also, I would like to enter into the record on behalf of Congresswoman Crockett all of Donald Trump’s indictments. And so, I would like to also enter those into the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you so much, Chair Comer, and, of course, our wonderful Ranking Member Raskin.

It is great to be on this Committee. And when I first came in, I looked up on the wall and saw the incredible—our incredible former Chair of our House Oversight Committee, Elijah Cummings. And it reminded me of our first meeting, our first Committee hearing here in this Chamber.

I can tell you it was incredibly powerful.

I do not know, Mr. Turley, if you know. Do you know what the subject matter of that hearing was?

Mr. TURLEY. I do not.

Ms. TLAIB. It was around insulin, price gouging of insulin. And the first witness was a mother of twins who had to ration her insulin between the two children.

It was incredible because at that moment I thought, this is exactly the Committee I want to be on, here doing, you know, what is needed for the American people in fighting back against, you

know, greed and a number of broken systems and processes that I think, again, leave many of our families behind.

But here we are, though, doing the bidding of a twice-impeached, indicted former President instead of working for the people of our country.

Mr. O'Connor, 47—Ms. O'Connor—47,395. Do you know what that is, Ms. O'Connor?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I do not know what number you are referring to.

Ms. TLAIB. That is the number of Active-Duty/Reserve men and women serving our Nation's Armed Forces in Kentucky who are going to be forced to go without pay because of the shutdown.

Ms. O'CONNOR. And I should know that because?

Ms. TLAIB. No. It is because you have nothing to say about any of this, because you are not a fact—you do not have any facts. You were not there.

So, Ms. O'Connor, do not take it personally.

Ms. O'CONNOR. You are right, I am not a fact witness.

Ms. TLAIB. Ms. O'Connor, do not take it personally that you are here being used for somebody out there being indicted.

This is not helping the American people.

Mr. Gerhardt, what is this over here? What does this say?

Mr. GERHARDT. Well, one thing I am learning in this hearing is that I need new glasses. But that is the countdown to the shutdown.

Ms. TLAIB. That is right. What is it, a couple days here?

Mr. GERHARDT. Two days and 8 hours.

Ms. TLAIB. So, Mr. Dubinsky, do you know who said the following: "We have thousands of members across the country who returned holiday presents because they needed cash, missed a mortgage payment, took out a short-term loan and ran up their credit card debt because they had no paycheck for the month."

Ms. GREENE. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. State your point and stop the clock for Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

Ms. GREENE. All government employees are going to get paid at the end of this month. And also, the Democrat Party forced shutdowns on the American economy, forcing people to lose their job.

Mr. GOLDMAN. That is not true.

Chairman COMER. Reclaiming order, order.

Mr. GOLDMAN. It is not a point of order.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Chairman, point of order.

Ms. TLAIB. You know what, that is going to be not true on October 1st.

Chairman COMER. Hold on. Hold on. Chair recognizes Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. We cannot allow people to be misleading the American people. We all know. I was here. I was here in 2019 when the shutdown was there for 35 days. Because you know what? Do you know who said this?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I lost track of the question.

Ms. TLAIB. I know. Doreen Greenwald. She is a member of the National Treasury Employees Union. She said 150,000 workers and 35 agencies. She said, this is the irresponsible 2018–19 Republican shutdown from the previous Administration.

Do you know what she also went on to say? Because this is important. This is what this Committee should be used for. She went on to say: "They stood in line at food banks, pulled their children from childcare, were unable to put gas in their cars, and begged creditors for grace."

This is not how the United States of America should treat its own employees. That is verbatim from a Federal employee that did not get paid at last shutdown. So let us not lie to the American people.

Right now, the Department of Agriculture will be forced to stop processing housing loans which provided over 675 million—people and 3,431 families in rural North Carolina. That is all going to stop. The Department of Ag would be forced to stop processing a loan in Wisconsin, about \$181 million loans that are impacting rural Wisconsin.

Small Business Administration, you all, would stop processing small business loans, halting over \$284 million in funding small businesses in Alabama. That is just one state.

The Federal Government shutdown has real consequences. I would like to submit, Mr. Chair, to the record FEMA funding would be impacted if the government shuts down. This is in regards to the impact in Florida specifically if the government shuts down and the impact on the many, many humanitarian aid that has to go to many homeowners that were impacted.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. TLAIB. In my district, 56,000. Do you know what that is? That is the number of children that will lose their childcare spot, the spot to receive childcare. State—countrywide, it is 3.5 million children impacted.

This is how many children, again, our caucus, again, Republicans are literally just putting aside and saying, no, we are going to do this instead. We are going to go and bring the campaigning, the ugliest toxicity that our families do not need right now into this Chamber instead of doing what we need to do, which is making sure we have a functional government that provides for our families.

When it comes to dysfunction, to all of our witnesses here, you are now part of it. You came to this Committee. They are over-achievers when it comes to dysfunction. Why stop at destroying childcare across our country. They are devastating public health, education, social safety nets, and our country.

And, Ms. O'Connor, you are part of it now because you came here today. Do not say you are not part—

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady's time is expired.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Burchett from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

President Biden has sent over \$110 billion of taxpayers' hard-earned money to Ukraine and wants to send even more. Yet, his son failed to pay any taxes on the millions of dollars he received from Ukrainian companies.

Many folks in east Tennessee cannot afford to buy even their dadgum groceries, let alone a home or an automobile, but these decent people and Americans all over the country still pay their taxes.

The fact is, if your last name is Biden, you do not have to play by the same rules.

Who is going to write the check for the money Hunter Biden did not pay now that it is too late to bring charges for these taxpayers? Who is paying taxes on the 250,000 that China sent to President Biden's Delaware address?

I will tell you who. It is the hardworking Americans that got to get up every morning that do not come into work at 10 o'clock and take 2 hours for lunch and then walk out of here in their Brooks Brothers suit with their jacket thrown over their dadgum shoulder, claiming that they worked hard, because they know they did not work hard.

The people back home are working hard and they are paying their dadgum taxes. Yet, the Biden family does not have to.

This past July, two high-level IRS agents, Gary Shapley and Joseph Ziegler, testified before our Committee. They painted a very disturbing picture—worse than one of Hunter Biden's paintings, by the way—of misconduct and obstruction within the Department of Justice criminal investigation of Hunter Biden, the Biden family business dealings.

They testified that Hunter Biden should have been charged with a tax felony, not a misdemeanor. Hunter was saved by Merrick Garland's decision to change the Department's longstanding policy to charge the most serious offense that can be proven. This paved the path for Hunter Biden to attempt to plead guilty for two tax-related misdemeanors rather than any of the six felonies recommended by the Department's Tax Division.

I have literally seen people in Tennessee be charged with more for traffic violations.

Moreover, Mr. Garland's decision does not align with Chapter 10 of the Criminal Tax Manual, which prohibits prosecutors from allowing a defendant to plead to a misdemeanor when elements of a felony can be proven.

David Weiss should have followed Department policy and charged Hunter Biden with tax felonies. The Department of Justice should have ensured Hunter paid his back taxes, just like any other person in this position. Hardworking Tennesseans should not have to subsidize the Biden family's crime spree. I would like to know, did any of them pay any of their dadgum taxes?

I yield the remainder of my time to my friend from Ohio, Jim Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Turley, I want to get back to what you said in your written statement about the abuse of power model that we have seen in other administrations and you think may exist here with this Administration.

I just want to look at—the gentleman before me was just talking about the way the Justice Department ran the investigation into Hunter Biden. And some of the things we have learned from the whistleblowers were they were prevented from taking certain investigative steps.

They could not interview the adult grandchildren of the President. They could not execute a search warrant on a storage unit without first tipping off the defense counsel. They could not use—

in interviews they got to do, only a couple, they could not use the term “big guy.” They could not look at Political Figure 1, which we know is the big guy, is Joe Biden. They could not investigate tax years 2014 and 2015 because they let the—they could not charge for that, I should say, because they let the statute of limitations expire.

Is it an abuse of power when the Biden Justice Department stops investigative steps that all potentially lead to Joe Biden?

Mr. TURLEY. It certainly can be if there is a linkage to the President. If you look back, I think Article 2 of the Nixon impeachment was an abuse of power provision that dealt with that type of nexus. Article 1, I think, of the Trump impeachment I think dealt with that type of nexus.

So, you just have to establish those linkages as you go forward in an inquiry to make an article—to substantiate an article of impeachment.

Mr. JORDAN. I want you to elaborate on something you said earlier too. I wrote it down. You said, “confirm corrupt influence-peddling operation.”

Can you elaborate on what you think that entails? Those are pretty strong words. You said, “The Biden influence-peddling scheme was confirmed, corrupt influence-peddling operation.”

Mr. TURLEY. I think that it is now, in my view at least, largely unassailable. Even people that have long been critical of some of the investigations have acknowledged recently, particularly after the Archer interview, that this was an influence-peddling effort. Whether it was an illusion or not is part of the task for the inquiry.

But it seems to me abundantly clear from these emails and statements and now sworn testimony that Hunter Biden and his associates were selling access to Joe Biden. And the question is whether any of that effort resulted in decisions, in changes being made by Joe Biden, and also the degree to which he knew of it, directed it, encouraged it.

That is all the subject of an inquiry that has to be determined. It can be disproven or proven, but that is what lays ahead of you.

Mr. JORDAN. I yield back to the gentlemen, appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman’s time is expired.

The Chair now recognizes Ms. Porter from California.

Ms. PORTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Comer.

Mr. Dubinsky, do you believe that this impeachment inquiry has merit?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Again, I am not a legal scholar. I am a forensic accountant. I think, from what I have seen, there is merit for the inquiry to look for other information now.

Ms. PORTER. OK. So, I am going to say yes, you believe the impeachment inquiry has merit.

Mr. DUBINSKY. Yes.

Ms. PORTER. Ms. O’Connor, do you believe this impeachment inquiry is legitimate?

Ms. O’CONNOR. I do not know enough about the House rules and how things are supposed to work here to know whether it is or not.

Ms. PORTER. OK.

Mr. Turley, do you agree? Do you think this impeachment inquiry has merit or is legitimate?

Mr. TURLEY. I do. I think that they passed—the House has passed a threshold for an inquiry. That is separate from the question of the Articles of Impeachment.

Ms. PORTER. Thank you very much.

A veteran of several impeachments said that an impeachment inquiry without a Floor vote by the Congress would, quote, “create a process completely devoid of any merit or legitimacy.”

Mr. Dubinsky, who said that?

Mr. DUBINSKY. I do not know.

Ms. PORTER. Ms. O'Connor, who said this?

Ms. O'CONNOR. No clue.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Turley, who said this?

Mr. TURLEY. I made an objection along those lines to the earlier decision from Speaker Pelosi to go forward without a House vote and I have made the same objection today, that I think the best practices in going forward is to do that. And what I have said in my testimony is that it is not required under the Constitution.

Ms. PORTER. Correct.

Mr. TURLEY. So, if you are talking about what is——

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Turley, reclaiming my time. I agree with you. We are not talking about whether it is required legally. I am just asking you, can you say again for the Committee do you know who made this statement and, if so, who?

Mr. TURLEY. I do not. I have made an objection along those lines.

Ms. PORTER. OK. Reclaiming my time.

This quote is a statement from now-Speaker Kevin McCarthy.

Mr. Dubinsky, do you know the date of the House Floor vote on this impeachment inquiry?

Mr. DUBINSKY. No. I do not think there was a House Floor vote.

Ms. PORTER. Ms. O'Connor, do you remember any House vote?

Ms. O'CONNOR. I have not been following that.

Ms. PORTER. Professor Turley, was there a House vote on this impeachment inquiry?

Mr. TURLEY. Not that I know of.

Ms. PORTER. So, this House vote did not happen. There has not been a House vote to move forward with this impeachment inquiry. So, we have not followed what the Speaker himself, Mr. McCarthy, has said is the process that we should be following so that an impeachment inquiry would have merit or legitimacy, which is something that I think all Americans, on both sides of the aisle, should expect investigations or inquiries like this to have. I think Americans should be able to expect that the things we do in this body have merit or legitimacy.

Today, by holding this hearing, Republicans have changed their tune. I think I know why Speaker McCarthy is going back on his conviction. His Members are demanding an impeachment. But their months and months of investigating our President have not revealed yet any evidence that he himself has committed crimes.

But Speaker McCarthy wants to keep his job, so he is set on delivering an impeachment inquiry whether or not there is any evidence and even if, in his own words, that impeachment inquiry would be devoid of any merit or legitimacy.

Mr. Dubinsky, I have one final question.

What is the title of this hearing?

Mr. DUBINSKY. The title was "The Basis for an Impeachment Inquiry of President Joseph Biden."

Ms. PORTER. But, according to Speaker McCarthy, there is not a legitimate or meritorious basis yet for this hearing, and no amount of noise on the other side of the aisle is going to change this. As Speaker McCarthy said, in his words, "This impeachment inquiry is devoid of any merit or legitimacy."

Wow, I just did it. At the very end of an extremely contentious hearing, I found something that Speaker McCarthy was correct about.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

And I believe—

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Point of—I just have a unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. OK.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Thank you.

I request to submit to the record a *Washington Post* fact check that pointed out that the Committee Republicans' own memo fails to support the claim about shell companies.

Thank you.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Chairman COMER. Without objection. So, ordered.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair—

Chairman COMER. Who—I do not—OK, Ms. Tlaib.

Ms. TLAIB. I just want to submit for the record, if I may, an article from the *Augusta Chronicle* that says: "Government shutdown: Georgia military service members will see no pay."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Boebert from Colorado for 5 minutes.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Joe Biden had dinner with Hunter and his business associates, including Yelena Baturina, a Russian tech and energy oligarch, who was married to the mayor of Moscow at the time. Hunter then received \$3.5 million in payouts from Baturina. She was not sanctioned after the invasion of Crimea.

Joe Biden has maintained for years that he was not involved in his son's business dealings. Yet we have proof that Joe Biden attended business dinners with his son while he was Vice President of the United States of America.

Here you have an excerpt from Devon Archer's transcribed interview on the screen, if we could get that up there.

During his interview, Archer testified to the fact that, on multiple occasions, then-Vice President Joe Biden attended functions with business associates of his and Hunter Biden.

One such example is laid out on the screen for us. Mr. Archer is explaining here that, in the spring of 2014—if we could get this slide up—Devon and Hunter had dinner at Cafe Milano with several of their business associates. One of these attendees was Yelena Baturina. Ms. Baturina was at the time the richest woman in Rus-

sia, and she was married to the former mayor of Moscow, as previously stated.

Interestingly, on February 14, 2014, Ms. Baturina wired Hunter Biden and Devon Archer \$3.5 million. It is still uncertain what legitimate service Hunter Biden provided to Ms. Baturina in exchange for this large sum of money, if any at all. Furthermore, it is concerning how Hunter Biden and Devon Archer moved this money from bank account to bank account.

And it is also convenient that the U.S. Government never placed Ms. Baturina on their public sanctions list after Russia invaded Crimea. This billionaire continued to evade the public sanctions list even after Russia invaded Ukraine. I want these facts to be clear to the American people. The billionaire continued to evade the public sanctions list after Russia invaded Ukraine.

Joe Biden's attendance at this dinner shows that Joe Biden's involvement in Hunter Biden's deals was more than just the illusion of access; it was access. There were direct benefits leading to Hunter and his business partners after Joe's attendance at this Cafe Milano dinner. This pay-to-play type of engagement was selling direct access to Joe Biden and the Office of the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the third bank records memorandum produced by this Committee on Oversight and Accountability on August 9, 2023.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Turley, as an expert on constitutional issues and impeachment, where does selling access to an Executive office fall in terms of what justifies an impeachment inquiry? And what is deemed an impeachable offense?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, it is two separate questions. What I have suggested is, for the four areas for Articles of Impeachment that you can explore, you can look at some of the criminal code. And that includes things like bribery under 201; Hobbs, the Hobbs Act cases. And those have different standards that I think are relevant.

In terms of the impeachable standard itself, there has been, obviously, decades of debate about that. I would hope that there would be general agreement that public corruption, if the President engaged in—

Ms. BOEBERT. Selling any access.

Mr. TURLEY. Right.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY. If he engaged in public corruption involving—

Ms. BOEBERT. Any sort of peddling of influence.

Now, as a follow-up, in previous impeachment inquiries, have actions such as influence-peddling and pay-to-play schemes like this been deemed as offensive to the conscience of the American people in such a way to warrant an investigation?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I think that there is certainly a basis for this inquiry to go forward. There is—you know, my position is simply that I—this is early on in an inquiry in terms of linking these—which are still just allegations—to the President, and that is the linkage you have to establish.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Turley.

It is far time for Joe Biden to stop lying to the American people about his shady foreign business deals. He intentionally misled the American people by using complex maneuvers to pocket millions of dollars from our adversary.

He lied when he was Vice President. He lied as a candidate to gain the office of President of the United States. Now this Committee has uncovered the truth, and it is time to impeach this compromised Commander in Chief.

Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman? A point of order, if I could.

I did not want to interrupt the good gentlelady from Colorado, but you cannot engage in personalities against the President of the United States.

Ms. BOEBERT. We have established that, Mr. Ranking Member. Thank you.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. And so, you cannot say that Joe Biden lied. First of all, he did not lie——

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Ranking Member——

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. But even if he had, you cannot say it.

Ms. BOEBERT. [continuing] We have established this since the beginning of the hearing.

Mr. RASKIN. You cannot say it, Mr. Chairman. I hope——

Chairman COMER. This is——

Ms. BOEBERT. This is an impeachment hearing.

Chairman COMER. This is——

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. You will get a ruling from the parliamentarian. I can——

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Provide you all the cases.

Chairman COMER. This is——

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have a unanimous consent——

Chairman COMER. Reclaiming order.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Ivey from Maryland.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have a unanimous consent motion before Mr. Ivey goes.

Chairman COMER. Yes, Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I would like to reintroduce once again the Devon Archer transcript and especially point to when he says that——

Chairman COMER. Look, Mr. Goldman——

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Hunter Biden was not involved——

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman, we have reentered it four——

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. In the Yelena Baturina \$3.5 million.

Chairman COMER. This will be the fifth time. Without objection, we have reentered the Devon Archer transcript for the fifth time.

Now the Chair recognizes Mr. Ivey from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the chance to let me waive in today because it is such an important hearing.

Mr. Turley, it is good to see you again. You should get office space here on the Hill, I think. This is our third or fourth Committee hearing together.

I do want to say this. You know, impeachment is one of the greatest powers that the Constitution gives to the House of Rep-

representatives, and I think it is important to make sure that we treat it with that level of esteem. But I think what is going on, or has gone on here in the House for several months now, is that that power has been abused.

And kicking off this hearing today—and I appreciate that the word probably used most today is “if.” Because a lot of these are statements that are made in the forms of allegations but, with respect to connecting them to the President, that has not happened. There is a lot of, “Well, if this is true, then that.” And I do not think that is sufficient to move forward at this point.

I appreciate Mr. Turley’s comment—I think you were saying before Mrs. Boebert cut you off that it was early and that, you know, Mr. Biden had not been linked at this point. I think that is true; he has not been linked to any of these allegations that have been raised.

I did want to talk about a couple of them specifically.

With respect to the prosecutor issue, the removal of Prosecutor General Shokin, a couple points I want to make on that front.

A key one, I think, is that the removal of Shokin was actually detrimental to Hunter Biden and Burisma. Because it was pretty clear, based on statements and testimony that has been given, here in the House before these committees and in other instances, that he was not doing a great job, to say the least. He was sitting on the investigation; he was not moving it forward.

I think there have been statements that have been made with respect to the IMF pressuring to have him removed by threatening to withhold \$40 billion in international assistance unless he was removed. President Biden’s request to have him removed along those lines was actually consistent, not only with what he pushed for, or the IMF pushed for, but with what others were pushing for as well, including Senator Johnson, I believe, on that front.

So, what we have got here is an effort to argue, by our Republican colleagues, that the removal of this prosecutor—President Biden asking or, you know, pressing to have him removed was in some way an effort to undermine an investigation for Burisma. But it is pretty clear, I think, based on, again, the testimony that we have received and that has been presented in Congress before and published in some of our documents, that that is the exact opposite. Things were moving forward—not moving forward with him there; they were more likely to move forward without him.

And so, there is really no linkage there between the President and derailing any kind of investigation.

With respect to the Devon Archer statements, Devon Archer said—he has confirmed that, over his decade-long business relationship with Hunter Biden, he never heard Hunter Biden discuss business with his father, either on phone calls or in person.

And I did want to add this as well: Mr. Biden’s bookkeeper, Eric Schwerin—from 2009 to 2018, he was his bookkeeper, had access to his bank accounts—said he had no knowledge of President Biden having any involvement in Hunter Biden’s financial activities.

With respect to the Weiss issue—and I know that has been an issue that has been pushed a lot, too—that argument is that, you know, Weiss was derailing the investigation into Hunter Biden and slowing it down. You know, the key points on that, obviously, are

the fact that Weiss was appointed by President Trump. And, as Congressman Buck said a few days ago over in the Judiciary Committee hearings, if the President had removed Weiss when he first came into office, Republicans would have argued that that was an effort to derail the investigation against Hunter Biden. In fact, when the Attorney General testified, he noted that he had Senate Republicans who explicitly wanted him and sort of pressed for in their personal meetings that he promise not to remove Weiss or replace him.

And we have had other testimony with respect to the FBI supervisory special agent who was in—the SAC for the investigation working with Mr. Weiss.

Question: Have you ever known U.S. Attorney Weiss to make prosecutorial decisions based upon political influence?

Answer: No.

Have you ever known any of the AUSAs in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the office of Delaware to let their prosecutorial decision be guided by political interference?

Answer: No.

So, I apologize for running over——

Chairman COMER. All right.

Mr. IVEY [continuing]. But I appreciate the——

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair now recognizes——

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have another unanimous——

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Fry from South Carolina.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Consent request, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to enter into the record a bipartisan letter signed by Senators Portman, Johnson, and Kirk urging Ukraine to remove Mr. Shokin because of his own corruption.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Fry.

Mr. FRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Professor, you know, in a trial, there is an exchange of evidence back and forth. What we see here today, we have presented evidence. I mean, the other side is a lot of bluster and theatrics.

And also, in a trial you have affirmative defenses. I think the only affirmative defenses that are coming from the other side is, one, Donald Trump—like, the ultimate affirmative defense, that you could just say his name and all wrongdoing is gone away.

I mean, Lisa McClain talked about this earlier, that he is living in their head. I would also submit to you that he is tap dancing in their head, because that is all that they talk about.

The second affirmative defense, according to the Democrats, is this magical shutdown clock that they have. But would it surprise you that every single appropriations bill that has tried to come before the Floor, they have voted they do not want a debate on government funding? They want to shut down the government. This is the kind of stuff that they are doing.

And, of course, the third affirmative defense, as you well know at this point, is: attack the witness. Right? You do not have the facts; you do not have the law. You have theatrics, and you just go after the witness.

It is like we live in amnesia—like they have this constant amnesia. We have statements from the Ranking Member about “you do not need a vote on the Floor,” but that is what they talk about.

You know, for the past 9 months, we have worked tirelessly to analyze all the evidence. Every single week, there is more evidence that drops. And this is despite the FBI, this is despite the DOJ. We have witness interviews, accounts of confidential human sources, whistleblower testimony—they have not disputed that at all—bank records, suspicious activity reports, text messages, WhatsApp messages. It is endless.

And despite what my friends on the other side of the aisle may say, House Republicans have always held that this investigation should follow proper procedure and be done the right way. Which is why we are here today.

We know that Biden family members were complicit in and benefited from Hunter Biden’s foreign business dealings. And as the lens begins to focus and as the evidence begins to mount, we uncover more and more about Joe Biden’s involvement.

Today, I want to focus on the FD-1023, a document that shows a conversation between a confidential human source and a Ukrainian business executive, Mykola Zlochevsky. Let us dive into a few key points.

The source asked Zlochevsky about the Ukrainian prosecutor’s investigation into Burisma. He replied: Do not worry, Hunter will take care of all these issues through his dad.

Two, although Hunter Biden was labeled as stupid, that the guy’s dog was smarter than Hunter, the source was told in 2016 that Hunter Biden was brought onto Burisma’s board to protect them.

Three, big fact: Hunter and Joe Biden both told Zlochevsky that he should keep Hunter Biden on the board. And, of course, he received a million dollars a year.

Point four: After the elections, Zlochevsky said it cost \$5 million to pay one Biden and \$5 million to another, meaning Joe Biden.

And point five: In 2019, Zlochevsky said he did not send any funds directly to the “big guy”—wonder what that means; we have talked about that a lot today—because, according to Zlochevsky, it would take investigators 10 years to find the records of payments to Joe Biden. If these allegations are true, and there is—there is’ a reason why it was so hard to put together. This was done deliberately and on purpose.

So, we are here months later. We finally get this document released to the public.

Mr. Turley, what, in your eyes, is the most serious allegation outlined in the FD-1023?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, first of all, the—I am not someone that puts a great deal of emphasis on these types of field reports from sources, but this was not just any source. This was a source that was not just trusted but he received considerable amount of money from the FBI and had a long track record. So, it does come with that degree of support.

What I think an inquiry has to do is to drill down on the 1023. There may be nothing there when you drill down, but there may

be bribery. And, of course, that is the second offense that is mentioned for impeachment.

But what makes the 1023 concerning is the overall context. And this is one of the reasons why, when Representative Goldman was asking me about bribery, it is a little more complex. Because you have Section 201, you have got the Hobbs Act, and you have all these cases that suggest that it is public corruption in a lot of different forms.

So, really, you are sort of at the water's edge here. Everything that has gone so far, from what I can see, has been tracking money from banks, often transnational transactions that have arrived at the United States. What we have not seen is the back end of those transfers, to what extent can you track that money with regard to the Bidens themselves. And that, I suppose, will come out through an inquiry. But until you have those interstitial relationships, you do not quite know what you have.

Mr. FRY. Professor, how can we use this document and maybe other documents that we have to expand the case? And how pivotal do you think that this document is to the case?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I think that, in an inquiry, when someone who is trusted by the FBI suggests that there was actual bribery involving the President, you need to contact everyone involved, including the source for the 1023. But, also, this is secondhand information, so you are going to have to pursue the references made by that source. And you do it in good faith and to see if there is a "there" there.

Mr. FRY. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes—

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion for unanimous consent.

Chairman COMER. For what?

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record a *Washington Post* article titled "The Republican case against Biden takes a body blow . . . from Fox News," because they "failed to show any connection," and their evidence is "too far down the path" to admit that they are wrong.

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just like to start out by commenting, while this is not directly affecting this impeachment inquiry, I am so excited to have heard so many times from that side of the room how concerned folks are over keeping the government running. Because you are all going to get a chance in just a few hours to put your money where your mouth is and vote on some bills that are going to keep the government funded. And I hope it is as important to you when you go to cast those votes as what you have said that it is this afternoon.

We have heard today how many times Joe Biden has lied. He has lied about his role in his family's business dealings. We have also heard how in the White House he struggled to keep up with new evidence about—consistently shifted its messaging on President Biden's involvement in Hunter Biden's foreign business affairs.

This summer, White House spokesperson Ian Sams shifted the White House's messaging, to now claim that President Biden was never in business with his son. This is dramatically different than what we heard from the White House in their previous claims, where we were told that President Biden had no knowledge of Hunter Biden's business dealings.

And, yet again, the Committee has revealed evidence that then-Vice President Biden had direct knowledge of and involvement in Hunter Biden's foreign business dealings.

Kenes Rakishev is a Kazakhstani oligarch who was a director at Kazakhstan's state-owned oil company. Importantly, Rakishev maintains ties to Karim Massimov, who became Prime Minister of Kazakhstan on April 2, 2014.

On April 22, 2014, Rakishev wired \$142,300 to an account associated with Hunter Biden, Rosemont Seneca Bohai. The next day, that same amount was sent to a car dealership in New Jersey for an expensive sports car for Hunter Biden.

Around the same time as the payment for Hunter Biden's sports car, then-Vice President Biden attended a dinner with Kenes Rakishev, Karim Massimov, Yelena Baturina, Hunter Biden, and Devon Archer at Cafe Milano in Washington, DC.

And I believe that we have a photo of those here.

There they are.

And here on another screen, we see a photograph with Mr. Massimov, on the right, standing with Joe Biden and Hunter Biden, along with Mr. Rakishev on the left.

I do not know if that picture came up or not.

Additionally, in April 2015, then-Vice President Biden attended another dinner in Washington, DC, with Prime Minister Massimov, Hunter Biden, and Devon Archer.

Clearly, Hunter Biden was selling the Biden brand and all the access and political favors that came along with it.

This transcript—I believe we are going to see it come up on the screen—is taken from the Committee's interview of Devon Archer earlier this summer.

In this excerpt, Archer reveals that then-Vice President Biden hosted Hunter Biden, Archer, and Marc Holtzman, who was then the chairman of Kazakhstan's largest bank, for breakfast at the Naval Observatory, where Holtzman discussed who was going to be the next U.N. Secretary-General with Vice President Biden. Mr. Holtzman was lobbying for Karim Massimov to receive the position.

That meeting occurred on July 7, 2015, shortly after the Vice President had dined again with Massimov at Cafe Milano in Washington, DC.

Was Massimov trying to cash in? After all, a meeting with the Vice President of the United States when trying to become U.N. Secretary just might be worth it for a sports car.

And around that same time, Hunter Biden and Devon Archer were pursuing energy projects in Kazakhstan on behalf of the corrupted Ukrainian energy company Burisma, which was trying to expand its business into the country. This is another clear example of Hunter Biden peddling access to his father and Joe Biden participating in the influence-peddling scheme.

Hunter seeks business opportunities in a foreign country and provides access to and political favors through his father's office to get paid.

Mr. Chair, I see I am out of time, so I will yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair now——

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I have a unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Yes, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. I seek unanimous consent to enter into the record a memorandum issued by staff of the Committees on Judiciary and Oversight explaining how the testimony of five senior IRS and FBI agents has been de——

Chairman COMER. Without objection.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Langworthy from New York for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For years, we have heard shifting denials and deflections from President Biden relating to his son's foreign business deals and ventures. In fact, we know that President Biden has lied to the American people at least 16 times about his family's business schemes.

In August 2019, Joe Biden told reporters, quote, "First of all, I have never discussed with my son or my brother or anyone else anything having to do with their business, period," end quote.

Joe Biden continued to double-down on this statement throughout the 2020 Presidential race. In September 2019, Joe Biden again stated, "I have never spoken to my son about his overseas business dealings." These lies continued throughout the 2020 Presidential race.

It was only recently that the Biden Administration has grudgingly begun to shift their answer on what Joe Biden knew about his son's foreign business deals. In June of this year, the White House changed its position by claiming that "the President was not in business with his son."

Moreover, media and Members across the aisle continue to run cover for President Biden, repeatedly shifting the goalposts and repeatedly peddling the notion that Hunter Biden was selling the, quote, "illusion of access."

Evidence discovered by this Committee in its investigation into the Biden brand, however, has revealed Hunter's product went well beyond illusions of access. On display is an example of actual access to the then-Vice President.

During his transcribed interview, Devon Archer was questioned about how many times Hunter Biden had put his father on speakerphone while in business meetings. Now, Archer made it clear, during this whole 10-year partnership, that Joe Biden was on speakerphone maybe 20 times while Archer was present.

And when later interviewed by Tucker Carlson, Archer went on to say, "If you are sitting with a foreign business person and then you hear the voice of the Vice President, that is prize enough. That is pretty impactful stuff." Archer later stated, "In the rearview, it is an abuse of soft power."

Now, President Biden's involvement in Hunter's business deals was not overt. Joe Biden did not email Hunter asking for Burisma's quarterly reports. All it takes for Biden to be involved in Hunter's business dealings is Biden crafting and implementing policy based on promptings from his son and receiving payment in return.

Mr. Turley, have you ever had your parents call in during an official business meeting?

Mr. TURLEY. No.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. OK.

Members across the aisle have characterized Hunter's speakerphone calls during business meetings as, quote, "casual conversation and niceties about the weather and what is going on."

Now, during business—during a business meeting, have you ever answered a call from a parent or put them on speaker and then proceeded to discuss the weather?

Mr. TURLEY. Not in my case, no.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. OK. Would you say that such actions are generally out of the ordinary in the business world?

Mr. TURLEY. I could not speak for the whole business world, but it strikes me as being odd.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Yes.

Looking at the evidence, like this transcript of Devon Archer's testimony and other evidence discussed in today's hearing, can you contrast the level of thoroughness of this committee's investigation compared with the Democrats' impeachment inquiry in 2019?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I was highly critical of the—obviously, the Trump impeachment in—the first Trump impeachment, which I felt did not develop a sufficient record to support the articles. I actually said that the investigation had merit to go forward but that they had not established the basis for the articles.

In the second impeachment, they used what I call a snap impeachment. They just—they jettisoned any hearing at all, which I think did do damage to the impeachment process.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Now, looking at this transcript of Devon Archer's sworn testimony, would you agree that there are inconsistencies with President Biden's statements that he never discussed business with his son or even, later, that he was not in business with his son?

Mr. TURLEY. Well, I think—my understanding is that Devon Archer himself was asked that question and said that it was patently false to suggest that President Biden was not aware of his son's business dealings.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Very good.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back any time to you.

Chairman COMER. Thank you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman? Over here.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record this article by the *New York Post* dated September 14, 2023, "House GOP probing then-Vice President Biden's dodgy breakfast meeting with Kazakh bank official at official residence," showing Vice President Joe Biden taking meetings at the Vice President's residence with his son's business partners.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Ms. O'Connor, what—I assume you have had time to review, hopefully, the bank memorandums and the evidence that we derive from the suspicious activity reports about the various bank reports that allege money laundering, allege receiving wires from state-owned entities, and things like that.

How does that—what kind of crimes are we talking about there? And how often do you run across people, even the most criminal people, who have 170 suspicious activity reports?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, there was more than—or about 700 pages' worth of documents that you released yesterday. I have not looked at them all carefully.

But one factor that continues to be overlooked is the fact that, in tax law, there is the concept of constructive receipt. If I owe you \$100 but I do not want to pay you directly, I do not want any sort of trace, but I know that Representative Jordan pays your bills, I will pay him, knowing that he is going to take care of you. But you have constructive receipt of that money from me.

And I think that if the special agents were able to follow the leads that they wanted to develop, they would develop a lot of information that you would be interested in.

Chairman COMER. All right.

The Chair—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Just to clarify, because Mr. Langworthy said that it was the Democrats who said that Joe Biden and Hunter Biden talked about the weather—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order. Is that a—point of order.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. I would just like to—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Reintroduce the Devon—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. Archer testimony where he says they talked about—

Chairman COMER. The Chair—

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. The weather six times.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. My point—my point of order is, that is not—

Chairman COMER. That is not a point of order; you are correct. You are correct.

The gentleman from Arizona is correct.

The Chair will now—

Mr. GOLDMAN. It was a unanimous consent request.

Chairman COMER. Do you have a unanimous consent—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes, to reintroduce those six pages of testimony from Devon Archer where—

Chairman COMER. OK.

Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. He said they talked about the weather.

Chairman COMER. For the seventh time, without objection.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes—

Mr. GOLDMAN. You could have just called him—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Burlison from Missouri.
Mr. GOLDMAN [continuing]. And we would have been able to question him.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you——

Mr. BIGGS. Well, as you know, he has headed to——

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes——

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. Prison.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Mr. Burlison.

Oh, oh, oh. Who was—was that Mr. Biggs? OK.

Do you have a point of order?

Mr. BIGGS. No. We were having a colloquy.

Chairman COMER. All right.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Burlison from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you.

Professor Turley, could you tell me, would it be illegal or certainly unethical for elected officials to utilize the resources in their office, utilize their staff, to financially benefit their family member's business or their own?

Mr. TURLEY. They would.

Part of the problem with—the reason I think the “illusion” defense is sort of illusory is that, if the President was involved in that influence-peddling scheme, it would still involve using his office as a commodity for corruption——

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. Right——

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. Even if you did not follow forward. And I think that that, itself, would become an issue of public corruption we would have——

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. TURLEY [continuing]. To discuss.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you.

In fact, on multiple occasions, he claimed that he was not involved in his family's business dealings. However, the work of this Committee, the reports that we have had from the Treasury Department, suspicious activity reports, the IRS testimony, all tell a different story, all from different sources.

And even his own staff did not get the memo that they were not supposed to communicate with his son's business. This email, dated December 4, 2015, shows that Vice President Biden, through his communications staff director, Kate Bedingfield, coordinated a response to reporters when they questioned about the conflict of his involvement with Ukraine and his son's involvement with Burisma—she coordinated with not just Hunter but Hunter Biden's business associate Eric Schwerin. OK? Why is the staff of the President of the United States communicating with a business associate for the President's son?

Mr. Schwerin, who served as the executive of Hunter Biden's Rosemont Seneca Advisors, was intimately involved in corrupt—in the Biden family business dealings, and he visited Joe Biden's residence 36 times while he was Vice President.

So, in this email exchange, he actually says to her, “Will you call me when you get a chance? I'm in the office or on my cell.” And 47 minutes later, this email that was seen on the screen was sent.

And the email clearly was a coordination of talking points between the President's office and the business.

In fact, what really is striking is that this interaction occurred on the same day—wait, back up.

So, the other thing that is really interesting to note is, not only did they have an interaction, but in the email it says, the VP signed off on this. The VP signed off on the shared communication.

The timeline of this is that this occurred on the very same day that the board of Burisma had requested Hunter to help alleviate pressure that it was facing from the prosecutor Shokin's investigation.

Let us turn to another email. We have a staff member from Vice President Biden's office emailing Joe Biden about a scheduled call with Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko.

Not only was this email sent to, which I found strange, Robert L. Peters—we all would think that that would be strange, that Biden is using that alias—but the more strange thing about this email is who is cc'ed in the email: Hunter Biden. And not just his personal email, his business email account.

So, you have, again, a staff person coordinating a meeting with the President and using those resources to coordinate that with the—with Biden's business.

So, if our President is believed whenever he says he was not involved in his son's business ventures, then why is his son copied on the email?

Mr. Chairman, I ask, before I forget, that these items, these emails, be added to the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BURLISON. What the American people need to be asking is the question: Why in the world would the Vice President coordinate with a business associate of Hunter Biden? Why would he direct his staff to coordinate with a business associate of Hunter Biden? And why does Hunter Biden need his father's approval to sign off on alleged separate business dealings? And why would President Biden lie about his involvement in his family's international business dealings?

You know, the analogy that was made before, about Hunter using his father's car to get a speeding ticket, is an absurd analogy. A more accurate one would be Hunter—if Joe Biden threatened the job of the prosecutor or the officer who was issuing the speeding ticket to his son.

And, with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

And our last questioner is Mr. Armstrong from North Dakota.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You know, we spend all day long talking about evidence and proof and different definitions and all of those different things. And we spend the days talking about unconditional love for sons, and addiction, all of these different issues. But I think we missed one of the points, in that this was going on for years. And this was going on for years with various different companies during the course of Joe Biden's Vice Presidency, after his Vice Presidency, and at least during his candidacy for President.

I am going to use one example out of many.

In 2015, Hunter Biden and James Biden started working with CEFC, which is a Chinese energy company with direct ties to the Chinese Communist Party. Now, there is evidence that they delayed payment until after Joe Biden was no longer Vice President as to assume no appearance of impropriety.

In 2017, after Joe Biden left office, Hunter wants to get paid by the Chinese Communist Party.

And on July 4 of 2017, there is a meeting in Moscow between Vladimir Putin and President Xi, where the chairman of the CEFC, which is the Chinese energy party, was present and is talking about a large-scale oil and gas purchase of a company called Rosneft by the Chinese Communist Party.

Now, on July 30 of 2017, there is a text with Hunter Biden and the members of CEFC. And that text reads, "If I get a call or a text from anyone involved in this other than you, Zhang or the Chairman, I will make certain that between the man sitting next to me and every person he knows and my ability to forever hold a grudge that you will regret not following [that] direction."

The people he is talking—this guy disappeared. He has either been killed or—he has not been seen since 2018. That is true.

On August 30th, there is—or, August 3, there is another text: "I am tired of this Kevin. I can make \$5M in salary at any law firm in America. If you think this is about money it is not. The Bidens are the best I know at doing exactly what the Chairman wants from this partnership. Please [do] not quibble over peanuts."

We have talked about influence-peddling, we have talked about all of this. This is a shakedown. Like, we can use whatever terms we want; this is a threat. And they believed it, because the next day they sent \$100,000. Do you think they were scared of Hunter Biden? I do not know. I think we should find out.

And it matters. Because on 9/17 of the same year, there is a deal done between the Chinese Communist Party and Russia for a 17-percent sale of Rosneft. And we continue to go through all of those things.

And now, finally, in December 2018, over a year later, there is another text.

So, we are not talking about a speeding ticket, Mr. Gerhardt. We are just not.

"You are right Hallie and I find myself (because I have chosen to alienate all my friends and family and employees and you and the kids and my kids etc.) very alone in dealing with rebuilding an income that can support an enormous alimony and my kids costs and myself, dealing with the aftermath of the abduction and likely assassination (that is what the [*New York Times*] suspects) of my business partner the richest man in the world, the arrest and conviction of my client the chief of intelligence of the people's republic of China by the US government, the retaliation of the Chinese in the ouster and arrest of US suspected CIA operatives inside China, my suspected involvement in brokering a deal with Vladimir Putin directly for the largest sale of oil [and] gas assets inside Russia to China, a tax bill that Eric left hanging over my [head], and"—oh, by the way—"my Dad's running for president."

Mr. Turley, given the evidence we have, would the next step in this investigation be to subpoena Hunter Biden or James Biden's bank records?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes.

In my testimony, I do warn the Committee that, once you proceed along the impeachment, the Constitution is on your side, but the calendar is not. You have to quickly determine if this information is going to be withheld so that you can seek judicial review.

And that is one of the things that I encourage you to do so that you certainly do not—you should not tarry in an impeachment inquiry.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Ms. O'Connor, do you agree with that?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Completely. I wish I could have said it as well.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Dubinsky, you are a forensic accountant. Would you like to see those bank records?

Mr. DUBINSKY. Absolutely.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Here is the thing. And this is the bottom line. If the Vice President Biden knew or helped or engaged in any conduct that in any way, while he knew his son was involved in, that was helping move forward the interests of Russia and China, our two strategic adversaries on the world stage, the American people deserve to know.

If the former Vice President was doing the same thing or knew his son was doing it or helped in any meaningful way, the American people deserve to know.

And if the Presidential candidate for the Democratic Party in 2019 knew about any of those things, the American people deserve to know.

And, with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

I will now yield to Ranking Member Raskin for a brief closing statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Online, everybody is making fun of this "Seinfeld" impeachment—an impeachment hearing about nothing, apparently—2 days before the government is about to shut down.

But I want to say that all four of these witnesses have done a great service for us—not just the Republicans, but for the Democrats too. And I want to thank them for their patience and their intellectual honesty and their surprising consensus on the key questions today.

This process might not be such a whipping post, Mr. Chairman, if we heard from actual fact witnesses, which is why I am so dismayed by the party-line vote not to call Rudy Giuliani or Lev Parnas to testify.

Now, if the Majority is abandoning the Ukraine-Burisma theory, which used to be the heart of the investigation as I understood it, then clearly, we do not need them. But if you are not abandoning that, we absolutely need to hear from them.

It is not the complete absence of fact witnesses that troubles us so much today; it is the complete absence of facts.

When I started out as a young assistant attorney general, I went to court, I remember, my first day of work, and I heard a judge lecture a lawyer by saying, "Counsel, you have forgotten the very first

rule of being a lawyer, which is, when you go to court, don't forget to bring the evidence with you." And I am afraid the Majority forgot to bring the evidence with them today.

And our GOP colleagues are frustrated, and I know why: Their own witnesses do not agree with them. At least a dozen GOP Members on that side of the aisle on the Committee have already called for impeachment of Donald Trump, and yet these three expert witnesses called by the Majority have all agreed that there is not a sufficient quantum of evidence that would justify impeachment of President Biden.

And, you know, it is not Professor Turley's fault. He is a constitutional law professor. I do not know if they looked across the country for other constitutional law professors. I do not think you could find one who would say that there is a sufficient quantum of evidence. Maybe John Eastman, but I think he may be detained these days.

The fact is that this hearing has been dominated by the word "if," as many people have said; it has been filled with hypotheticals. And I am a law professor, so I am not averse to them. Imagine a world without hypotheticals. But you do not impeach a President based on hypotheticals and based on obsolete conspiracy theories.

Finally, Mr. Chair, I just want to say, we have talked a lot about Ukraine today, kind of elusively, indirectly. We have talked about the beleaguered Burisma theory. We have talked about Rudy Giuliani and Lev Parnas and their travels there. We have talked about the Ukraine shakedown. But while we were debating all of this and mentioning Ukraine, there was a very important debate going on in the House Floor, because the Republican Majority in the House Rules Committee has advanced an amendment to delete \$300 million from the Defense Appropriations Act which will go to provide military and strategic security assistance to the people of Ukraine, who are struggling to defend themselves against Vladimir Putin's bloody invasion and imperialist attack on their national sovereignty and on the rule of law there.

That war has involved mass kidnapping of children—and I would love to hear from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle with QAnon talk about the actual kidnapping of children that is taking place in Ukraine today—mass rape of women and girls, and mass civilian atrocities, bombing of civilian residences, schools, hospitals, and so on.

And yet the pro-Trump, pro-Putin elements in the MAGA caucus—and I know that does not apply to everybody on the other side of the aisle, thank God; and I appreciate everything Ken Buck has been doing—these people are trying to cut funding for our democratic allies in Ukraine.

And so, the assault that began on Ukraine with Donald Trump's Ukraine shakedown, holding up security and strategic assistance to them until he lied about Joe Biden, that continues to this day in their efforts to cutoff military and economic assistance to the people of Ukraine.

We will be fighting that. I hope that we will be able to get separate legislation, and then the MAGA caucus would not have to vote for it.

But, in any event, the question of Ukraine is a very serious one. And everybody who stands up for democracy, freedom, and the rule of law has got to be on the side of the people of Ukraine.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

One thing I did not hear from my friends across the aisle in their never-ending defense of the Bidens is what exactly the Biden family did to receive the \$20 million. Not one thing.

Today's hearing title is "The Basis for an Impeachment Inquiry of President Joseph R. Biden." My Democrat colleagues have used this hearing to talk about impeachment, not an inquiry, but actual Articles of Impeachment. We are not talking about impeachment today, and they know that.

Unlike Democrats' investigations, this Committee, under my leadership, does not launch investigations based on predetermined conclusions. We have entered an impeachment inquiry because, as our witnesses have testified, the evidence justifies that.

This is how an investigation is supposed to work. I know that some are confused about congressional investigations because Democrat investigations in the past have been about saying a conclusion first and cherry-picking evidence to fit that narrative.

The bottom line is that the Committee has shown the Bidens alone have brought in over \$15 million in their foreign-influence peddling, over \$24 million if you account for their associates' earnings from the schemes.

We have established in the first phase of this investigation where this money has come from: Ukraine, Romania, Russia, Kazakhstan, China. It did not come from selling anything legitimate. It largely went unreported to the IRS. It was funneled through shell companies and third parties to hide the Bidens' fingerprints.

This deserves investigation. This deserves accountability. The American people expect this Committee to investigate public corruption.

Now, we know much of the money goes to Hunter Biden, Hallie Biden, James Biden, Sarah Biden, and other Biden family members and their business entities. What we need to understand is where it goes next. That is the question this Committee seeks to answer. And the evidence supports that next step.

Joe Biden showed up, met with, ate with, talked with, shook hands with, and had meetings with, including in the White House, the foreign individuals sending millions of dollars to his family who sold access to him. This was no illusion of access; they got access.

My Democrat colleagues wanted to spend this hearing defending the President against an impeachment that is not announced. I do wonder if they have predetermined the President's level of participation in these schemes.

Two days ago, this Committee revealed that a wire for over a quarter-million dollars was sent to Joe Biden's home address. As of yesterday, we know Joe Biden was named on the search warrant that was quashed by a Department of Justice employee.

For my colleagues to say there is no evidence of Joe Biden's involvement is not only wrong, but it fails to acknowledge that investigators have been shut down when attempting to explore avenues

that led to the President. That is what the Ways and Means Committee released yesterday.

The witnesses today have all identified the evidence the Committee has uncovered as deserving further inquiry. And that is what this Committee will do, no matter where that evidence leads.

I want to thank the witnesses for their testimony today. It confirms the evidence compiled by this Committee justifies the investigation of Joe Biden's role in his family's international business schemes and justifies the next step of this investigation.

One of those steps is gaining insight into where the Bidens' foreign money ended up, for what purposes. Therefore, today, I will subpoena the bank records of Hunter Biden, James Biden, and their affiliated companies.

And, with that, I yield the remainder of my time to Chairman Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In his deposition, Hunter Biden's business partner was asked this fundamental question: "The request was help"—this is the request from Burisma. "The request was help from the U.S. Government to deal with the pressure they were under from their prosecutor?"

Mr. Archer's response: "Correct."

Later question, a few minutes later: "What did Hunter Biden do after he was given this request?"

Mr. Archer's response: "He called his dad"—someone pretty important in the U.S. Government.

Which then begs the obvious question: What did his dad do? He gets a request from Burisma; he called his dad. What does his dad do? Five days later, he gets on a plane, he flies to Ukraine, and he starts the process of firing that prosecutor.

That is why Mr. Turley said earlier that this is a confirmed corrupt influence-peddling effort. He thinks that is what Joe Biden engaged in.

And, oh, by the way, that all happened even though the Obama Administration had just written the Prosecutor General a few months earlier and said, "We are impressed with the ambitious reform and anti-corruption agenda of your government." Wrote the guy, the very guy Joe Biden decides to deal with.

And you know what he did? He decided on the plane. He decided on the plane. Read *The Washington Post*, September 15. "On the plane . . . Joe Biden 'called an audible,'" quoted. He called a—"It was time for a bigger punch: The loan guarantee was the main point of leverage," Professor Gerhardt.

He used the money of the people I represent in the Fourth District of Ohio to help his family. And anyone with a brain can see that.

"[That] was the point of leverage with Ukraine, the vice president declared, so he instead should tell Poroshenko the loan would not be forthcoming until Shokin was gone."

And guess what. They did not stop there. They made sure the next prosecutor dropped the charges against the very guy who requested this all to happen in the first place—Zlochevsky, the head of Burisma.

That is the case. That is the case. That is why the Chairman wants the bank records. That is why we are doing the impeachment inquiry. It cannot get plainer and simpler than that.

And it all happened—those 5—it all happened in that 5 days. He gets the request, he calls his dad, his dad calls the audible, he uses our money to leverage the change. That is what took place. And, again, I think anyone with common sense can see it.

I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back.

As a housekeeping measure from last week's markup on H.R.s 4428, 4984, 5040, 5527, 5528, and the en bloc postal package, pursuant to House rule XI, clause 2, I ask that Committee Members have the right to file with the clerk of the Committee supplemental, additional, minority, and dissenting views, without objection.

Chairman COMER. Additionally, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the bills, subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

In closing, again, I want to thank our panelists once again for their important and insightful testimony today.

With that, and without objection, all Members will have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and to submit additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their response.

Chairman COMER. If there is no further business, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:13 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

