

EXECUTIVE SESSION  
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: COREY LEWANDOWSKI

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in Room HVC-304, the Capitol, commencing at 1:03 p.m.

Present: Representatives King, LoBiondo, Rooney, Ros-Lehtinen, Wenstrup, Stewart, Gowdy, Stefanik, Schiff, Himes, Sewell, Carson, Speier,

Quigley, Swalwell, Castro, and Heck.

Appearances:

For the PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE:

[REDACTED]

For COREY LEWANDOWSKI:

PETER CHAVKIN

██████████ Let's get started. I was going to say good morning, but good afternoon. This is a transcribed interview of Mr. Corey Lewandowski. Thank you for speaking to us today. My name is ██████████ I am ██████████ here at the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the majority. There are a number of other members and staffers that will introduce themselves as the proceedings get underway.

But before we begin, I wanted to state a few things for the record. The questioning will be conducted by members and staff. During the course of this interview, members and staff may ask questions during their allotted time period. Some questions may seem basic, but that is because we need to clearly establish facts and understand the situation. Please do not assume we know any facts you have previously disclosed as part of any other investigation or review. This interview will be conducted at the unclassified level. We ask that you give complete and fulsome replies to questions based on your best recollections. If a question is unclear or you are uncertain in your response, please let us know. And if you do not know the answer to a question or cannot remember, simply say so. You are entitled to have counsel present for you during this interview, and I see that you have retained one. At this time, if counsel could please state his or her name for the record.

MR. CHAVKIN: Peter Chavkin, C-h-a-v-k-i-n, of Mince Levin (ph).

██████████ Thank you. The interview will be transcribed. There is a reporter making a record of these proceedings so we can easily consult a compilation of your answers later. Because the reporter cannot record gestures, we ask that you answer verbally. If you forget to do this, you may be reminded to do so. You may also be asked to spell certain terms or unusual phrases.

Consistent with the committee's rules and procedures, you and your counsel, upon request, will have a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of this interview in order to determine whether your answers were correctly transcribed. The transcript will remain in the committee's custody, and the committee reserves the right to request your return for additional questions should the need arise. The process for the interview will be as follows: The minority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions, and the majority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions. Immediately thereafter, we will take a 5-minute break and break at any time during the proceedings that you desire, after which time, the minority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions and then the majority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions. These 15-minute intervals will continue until questioning has been exhausted by all sides. Time limits for the rounds will be kept by myself, and warnings will be given at the 5- and 1-minute marks, respectively. To ensure confidentiality, we ask that you do not discuss the interview with anyone other than your attorney. You are reminded that it is unlawful to deliberately provide false information to Members of Congress or staff. Lastly, the record will reflect that you are voluntarily participating in this interview, which will be under oath.

Mr. Lewandowski, if you could raise your right hand and be sworn, sir. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do.

██████████ Thank you. And just a reminder for both counsel and witness, if you would just make sure the talk button is on so the reporter and all the folks in the room can hear you.

Mr. Chairman, over to you for opening remarks.

MR. ROONEY: Thanks [REDACTED]

Mr. Lewandowski, thank you for coming in today to help us look into Russian active measures during the 2006 election cycle. Our scope here, as [REDACTED] mentioned, is not of a criminal nature, it is of an inquiry to write a report for the Intelligence Community to see what happened during the last election cycle and whether or not the Intelligence Community can do a better job in making sure that, if the Russians were successful in any way in affecting our election process, that we are able to write a report to the Intelligence Community, that we oversee, to try to do a better job. And whatever insight that you can lend to us with regard to things that you may have seen during that campaign is extremely appreciated.

So, with that, I will turn it over to the minority and Ms. Speier for her 45 minutes.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Lewandowski, thank you. Welcome. You have appeared voluntarily. We appreciate that. If we are unable to exhaust all of our questions during the time we have allotted today, it might be necessary to bring you back. Would you agree to come back?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you. I understand that you have not provided us with any document production as requested in the committee's letter. I also understand that your counsel informed my staff that you turned in your cell phone and laptop when you left the campaign. While we have obtained some of your emails from the campaign, we have not received any text messages or other communications. Do you have a personal email account?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do have a personal email account, yes.

MS. SPEIER: How many?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have, if it relates to my tenure during the campaign, one personal email account.

MS. SPEIER: And can you give us that email address?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The email address [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

MS. SPEIER: Have you conducted a search of that account for any emails sent related to campaign activities or other activities relevant to this investigation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did receive the letter, looked at the parameters of what the request was, did a search of my email as well as my phone messages, text messages, and found nothing that I had. Everything was done, to the best of my knowledge, on my work email, which was turned over to the campaign on my last day.

MS. SPEIER: Did you text during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MS. SPEIER: And did you check your text account?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MS. SPEIER: And how would we get access to those?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: So I found no documents that would be relevant or asked for by this committee that would have appeared in a text message.

MS. SPEIER: All right. Do you have a personal cell phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do.

MS. SPEIER: How many do you have?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: One.

MS. SPEIER: Have you conducted a search of your phone records as well?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have.

MS. SPEIER: And you have provided the committee with everything we need in that regard?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Everything the committee has asked for I have provided, yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Have you ever used WhatsApp, Signal Telegram, Snapchat, Twitter, other messaging apps, other social media platforms?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have.

MS. SPEIER: And you have conducted a search of those platforms for messages related to your campaign activities?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have.

MS. SPEIER: And you have found nothing in those various accounts that are relevant to this committee's investigation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That is correct.

MS. SPEIER: Have you been interviewed by other congressional committees investigating Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. election?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Speier, we are, out of respect to this committee and any other entity that is investigating, we are not confirming any other inquiries by any other entity. And as I understood from your parameters, that is something that you all respect. If I may quote, "The committee's inquiry will not, however, impede any ongoing investigation," period, end quote. So it's our view that even disclosing the fact of an interview --

MS. SPEIER: Impedes it?

MR. CHAVKIN: Could. Could. We know that others have said that -- involved in those entities. I should be clear: We are not here at the



request -- we are not making this declination at the request of any of the investigative bodies, but we do understand that some of the investigative bodies do appreciate the fact of confidentiality.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. In some respects, we are already aware of others that have sought your interviews, but we will move on. You were an early arrival on the Trump campaign, were you not?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was.

MS. SPEIER: When did you first meet then Donald Trump, and how did you come to work on his Presidential campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe the first time I met Mr. Trump would have been in April of 2014 at an event I was hosting in New Hampshire, where we had asked for a series of potential Presidential candidates to come to the State and address a group of activists. I think that was April of 2014. Subsequently, approximately November or December of 2014, I was asked by a mutual friend if I would have an interest in going to meet with then Mr. Trump to discuss with him a potential Presidential race.

MS. SPEIER: Who was that mutual friend?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: David Bossie of Citizen United.

MS. SPEIER: Did then-candidate Trump or noncandidate Trump participate in that New Hampshire event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did.

MS. SPEIER: So when did you officially join the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I interviewed with then Mr. Trump in January of 2015, where I was hired during the initial meeting with Mr. Trump. And I don't think it was a legal campaign entity until some 90 or 120 days later.

MS. SPEIER: Were you surprised that he was willing to hire you to run a national Presidential campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MS. SPEIER: So your title was campaign manager, was it not?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was.

MS. SPEIER: So it was really at the very early stages, as you pointed out. It had not yet even been identified as an official campaign with the FEC. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, it is.

MS. SPEIER: So there was no fundraising done during those early months?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: What were you told would be your responsibility as campaign manager?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When I initially started with Mr. Trump, my title was not campaign manager; it was senior political adviser, because there was no campaign entity. And my responsibilities at the time were to design a series of opportunities for Mr. Trump to go out and speak in the three early States, specifically Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina, to gauge the interest of him formally launching a campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So it wasn't clear at that point in time that he would definitely run for President.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Correct.

MS. SPEIER: And were you housed in the Trump Tower at that time?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The office was in Trump Tower, yes.

MS. SPEIER: And is that where your office was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My office was in Trump Tower, yes.

MS. SPEIER: So who did you report to?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I reported to Mr. Trump.

MS. SPEIER: So were you talking to him on a daily basis?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, I was.

MS. SPEIER: How many times a day would you say?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Each day would be different. In particular, the early parts of my tenure with him was less interaction than my latter parts. So, you know, in the middle of a campaign I might talk to him a hundred times a day. At the beginning of the campaign or the beginning of my tenure with Mr. Trump, I may speak to him once, because he was still completely focused on running The Trump Organization at the time.

MS. SPEIER: So when did he actually get seriously engaged in the campaign? I mean when he was spending more than 60 percent of his time on the campaign versus The Trump Organization?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: We formally launched the campaign on June 16th of 2015. So I would think that sometime in the -- to the best of my recollection -- April or May of that year is when we started to do more significant travel and decided that there was an opportunity for him to get into the race.

MS. SPEIER: When you did communicate with him, was it typically in person, by phone, email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Either in person or on the telephone.

MS. SPEIER: When was the last time you talked to the President?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I spoke to the President yesterday.

MS. SPEIER: And did you talk about your testimony here today?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congresswoman Speier, it's Mr. Lewandowski's view, which I share, obviously, that conversations with the President in recent times are not within the parameters of this inquiry. And as we understood it from the letter that we received for the interview of December 22, this interview is going to cover topics that are listed in that December 22 letter, including Russian cyber activities directed against the 2016 U.S. election, potential links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns, and the U.S. Government's response to these Russian active measures, and related leaks of classified information. That is a direct quote from the December 22 letter. And it's Mr. Lewandowski's view, and mine, that we did not prepare for anything outside of these parameters. So, if you wish, at another time we can address those, but not -- those questions that you are proposing, but not today.

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, this question is well within the parameters of our investigation. If the President was counseling this witness as to what he ought to say vis-a-vis the Russia investigation, obviously, that is something this committee needs to know. So it is directly pertinent. There is no privilege to be asserted here, either by Mr. Lewandowski or by the President. So he is going to have to answer the question.

MR. CHAVKIN: Well, Congressman Schiff, as I described, we don't consider that question to be within these parameters. And as I said, you know, with respect to our preparing for those kinds of questions, we are prepared to come back at another time, but not today.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, Counsel, first of all, it's clearly within the parameters, because if they discussed the Russia investigation, then it's obviously within the scope of our investigation. But, second, it's not your determination as to what the

scope of our questions is; that's our determination. Are you saying that your client's going to refuse to answer the question?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My conversation with the President didn't pertain to the committee's request.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you discuss your testimony here with the President?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My conversation with the President yesterday did not pertain to anything to do with the committee or the committee's request.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you are not answering my question, so I am going to presume that it did unless you say otherwise.

MR. CHAVKIN: Can you give us a couple of minutes?

MR. ROONEY: Counsel, I believe -- are we inside 10 minutes with the vote? Does anybody know? So we have to vote. So maybe this would be a good time to take a recess until we get back, if that's okay with you.

MR. CHAVKIN: Perfectly okay.

MR. ROONEY: Let's go on recess until we get back from votes.

[Recess.]

MR. ROONEY: Okay. We will go back on the record. I think Ms. Speier had the time. I have no idea now.

██████ hopefully, you have tracked where we are at.

██████████ You have 30 minutes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: As we left it, I think we were in a dispute as to whether or not Mr. Lewandowski was going to answer our questions. And you wanted to take a recess. Is that correct?

MR. CHAVKIN: That is.

MS. SPEIER: And did you come to any conclusion in that recess?

MR. CHAVKIN: We did, Congresswoman. Our view is that Mr. Lewandowski is here voluntarily to answer any and all of your questions relevant to the stated parameters while he ran the campaign for what was then-candidate Trump. We meticulously prepared for that period. And that is for Mr. Lewandowski's tenure during the campaign for what he heard and what he observed during that period. I disagree with Congressman Schiff about the nature of the inquiry based on the parameters. But whether or not he is right or I am right, we were not prepared for questions in the post-campaign manager period. So he is, as I want to reiterate, he is here today voluntarily; he is here and prepared to answer every single question you have for the period while he was -- that is while Mr. Lewandowski was campaign manager.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier, would you mind?

MS. SPEIER: I certainly will yield.

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, did someone on the committee lead you to believe that you wouldn't be asked questions apart from the campaign period?

MR. CHAVKIN: Well, let me, if I may, Congressman Schiff, the letter that I referred to before, which came from the committee, dated December 22 --

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, I am familiar with the letter.

MR. CHAVKIN: Okay. Well, it specifically talks about those parameters. It does not talk about how the committee is conducting its investigation or --

MR. SCHIFF: So no one from the committee represented that you would only be asked to answer questions about conversations or meetings that took place during the campaign. If there were conversations or meetings that took place after the campaign that are pertinent to the investigation, nobody told you you wouldn't be asked those questions, did they?

Counsel?

MR. CHAVKIN: What I would say, Congressman Schiff, is that that issue just didn't come up.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. So we ran into this situation yesterday. We issued a subpoena in real time, which I will recommend we do if --

MR. ROONEY: Before we go there and start talking about that, with regard to this witness versus yesterday's witness, this witness was asked to come here to talk about his job in the campaign last year and any relevant information he has which would help this committee write its report. He has the letter, which asked him to come and do so in that capacity. His attorney has testified that he is not prepared to testify to anything that was outside of the letter, whether he talked to somebody on the staff here or a member or whatever, what we wrote in the letter to ask him to come testify to, Mr. Schiff, and I just recall something that you did before we recessed, when Mr. Lewandowski answered the question that his phone call with the President yesterday didn't have anything to do with this investigation, to which you responded, "so you are refusing to answer the question," it seemed to me that he answered the question, but you, and I would like to ask you, because I am confused, as is easily done, that anything that we talk about with these witnesses on this committee is not to be discussed outside the parameters of this room and unless the witness refuses to answer. So it seems to me convenient that you interpreted his response as a nonresponse so you are able to talk about it once we leave this room. And if that's the case, then, basically, we can just, if we are not satisfied with any answer, we can say that the witness, whatever witness, is not responding.

I would like to know what exactly the agreement was with the majority on

what can be discussed outside of this room with regard to what a witness testifies or does not testify to.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Rooney, first of all, and I can ask the reporter to read back my questions if you would like. You are not characterizing my questions --

MR. ROONEY: Then characterize it.

MR. SCHIFF: My comment and question was, did you discuss with the President yesterday anything pertaining to your testimony today? We have a right to know whether this witness was counseled by the President as to what his testimony should be.

MR. ROONEY: Right. And I heard him to say that I did not talk to the President about this committee's proceedings today, to which you said --

MR. SCHIFF: No. No. That's not what he said. What he said was: I didn't discuss the parameters of the investigation.

He did not answer the question about whether his conversation dealt with his testimony today.

MR. ROONEY: I am confused. I don't understand how one thing can be separate from the other.

MR. SCHIFF: I don't think it can be.

MR. ROONEY: That's exactly my point. We can literally sit here and parse words until we are blue.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Rooney, reclaiming our time.

MR. ROONEY: I think we are off the clock right now.

MR. SCHIFF: I don't think it can be. But the witness was suggesting that he could distinguish between something that was a very literal interpretation of the parameters of the investigation and a conversation with the President where they



discussed his testimony. I don't think you can distinguish between the two, but the impression was that he was distinguishing. So there is no privilege here. It could be clearly relevant.

MR. ROONEY: I don't think that he was claiming one.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. Well, we can ask him again.

MR. GOWDY: I actually think it's a little clearer than that. I actually think the question is relevant. If there was a conversation yesterday about something that took place during the campaign, of course, it can be asked. There is no question that's relevant. It's also equally apparent to me that the witness and the counselor had a different interpretation of the letter. Therefore, they are not prepared to answer it. They have already said they will come back. There has been no invocation of privilege. He's happy to answer what he did prepare for, and then he will come back and answer the things he did not prepare for. I don't think that's unreasonable. We read the letter differently.

I think if you had a conversation yesterday about what you did during the campaign, that's fair game. But his lawyer didn't prep him for that.

MR. SCHIFF: With due respect, Mr. Gowdy, this is the exact situation we had yesterday.

MR. ROONEY: It is not. It is not at all.

MR. SCHIFF: It is, because the witness yesterday said they were not prepared to discuss anything after the campaign. And if we wanted them to discuss in the campaign, they were going to have to go back to the White House and --

MR. KING: That's not true.

MR. GOWDY: Adam, the witness yesterday wouldn't discuss things during

the transition, during his time at the White House, or afterward. I don't think it's fair to Mr. Lewandowski to compare him to what Steve Bannon did yesterday.

MR. SCHIFF: I believe counsel just said he is prepared to answer questions during the campaign period but not thereafter, which is exactly the same --

MR. GOWDY: Because he didn't prep his witness for it, Adam.

MR. SCHIFF: And, likewise, the explanation we had yesterday was they were not prepared to answer those questions, they had not discussed that issue with the White House.

MR. ROONEY: Can I ask a clarifying? Mr. Lewandowski, did you work in the White House?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. There's the difference. Steve Bannon worked in the White House.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Rooney, there's one important distinction between yesterday and today, and that is staff on the committee yesterday led the witness to believe they would not be asked about things after the campaign. That's a problem of the committee. That's why I asked this counsel whether committee staff similarly misrepresented the questions that would be asked today, and his answer was no.

MR. ROONEY: I don't know anything about that. But before we get too off the rails here, can we take the answer that Mr. Lewandowski gave Ms. Speier with regard to what the phone call was or was not about yesterday with the President and then try to get back on track to what he is actually prepared for? As Mr. Gowdy said, if there's questions about things that happened when he was a private citizen and his conversations with the President after he left the campaign and after he went into the private practice, if we want to tell him that those things are going to be

asked too, then we will have to bring him back. But to sit here and just continually ask questions that he is going to refuse to answer because he is not prepared, just so those things are fair game out in the media, I think is a pretty sorry state of affairs of this committee. Let's get the information from this witness that we know that we can get, and then if we have to readjust fire and come back again, let's do that then. But to sit here, we are now 10 minutes into this debate over one question.

MR. SCHIFF: This isn't an insignificant question.

MR. ROONEY: I am not saying --

MR. SCHIFF: You have the President of the United States in conversation with the witness the day before he comes to testify. That is not an insignificant matter.

MR. ROONEY: And he answered it.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let's ask him again.

MR. KING: Will the gentleman yield on that, though? I think it's unfair to put this in the same category as Bannon. Bannon said he would not testify yesterday, today, or tomorrow unless the White House said he could. That was what he was saying yesterday. Mr. Lewandowski has not said that. He has not said that anyone in the White House told him not to testify. He has not said he won't testify. He just said he is not prepared to testify today. To me, if he is offering to come back another day, he is really being very generous. I think it's unfair, especially if it goes out before the media, that somehow Lewandowski is the same as Steve Bannon. That's just not true.

MR. SCHIFF: You know what I think is a disservice to our investigation is if we are going to take the position that a witness can come into this committee room and say, "Well, I wasn't really prepared to answer questions that are relevant to the

investigation that took place after I left the campaign, even if they concern the campaign, even if they concern" --

MR. KING: He said he is willing to come back and testify. He is willing to come back.

MR. ROONEY: Adam, if we write witnesses a letter saying, "This is what you are going to be asked about," and we ask them something different, then nobody's going to come in here --

MR. SCHIFF: We are not going ask them something different. Where does it say in that letter that the questions will be confined to conversations that took place during the campaign, even if they took place after the campaign and are relevant to the campaign?

MR. KING: What is your problem with him coming back again if he is willing to come back?

MR. GOWDY: Adam, his lawyer gave him counsel that you and I happen to disagree with. That's what happened. His lawyer gave him counsel that he relied upon that you and I happen to disagree with. I think all the lawyer and the witness are asking is: Let me do what I was prepared for. I will come back and do the rest of it, but I am not prepared to do it today.

If you want to blame somebody, blame the damn lawyer, but don't blame the witness.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I agree.

MR. SCHIFF: With all due respect to my colleagues, if we are going to take the position that a witness can come into the committee and say, "I am not going to answer relevant questions because I am not prepared," and we are okay with that and we will let them leave and maybe they will come back and maybe they won't, I

think that's a terrible precedent to set. You are in the majority. You can set that precedent if you like.

But let me ask you this: If the situation was reversed, if we were doing a Benghazi hearing and the witness said they had been called by President Obama the day before and you asked, "Did you discuss your testimony today," and they refused to answer, would you accept that? I don't think you would accept that for a millisecond. I don't think you would say: That's more than reasonable. Counsel misinterpreted. We will have him come back at his convenience.

MR. GOWDY: First of all, Adam, you don't have a clue what I would or would not accept. And I always do find it amazing -- it's a little bit late. Usually Benghazi comes up before noon; today's it's after 2. If a witness says that "I will answer the questions, but my lawyer did not prepare me to answer them today," then what you are asking this witness to do is to proceed without counsel and/or ask the lawyer to commit legal malpractice. Now, let's be really clear, Adam, about what you are asking him to do. You are asking him to testify without the advice of counsel or with a malpracticing counsel. You and I can disagree with the way he interpreted the letter, Adam.

MR. SCHIFF: We just took a half-hour break to vote, long enough time for counsel to ask his client whether they are going to answer the question or not. We are talking about a conversation that took place yesterday.

MR. GOWDY: Let me ask you: Is this the only question that you are going to ask about his life as a private citizen? Is this the end of the line of questioning? Did the President talk to you yesterday about your testimony today? Is that it?

MR. SCHIFF: No.

MR. GOWDY: Okay.

MR. SCHIFF: We intend to ask questions that are relevant to our investigation, which is what you should be doing too, which is what you should be doing too. You should want to know the answer to that question --

MR. KING: That's why we are asking him back.

MR. SCHIFF: -- just as much as we do.

MR. GOWDY: Adam, we are not saying that he is not coming back after today. What we are saying -- and I happen to disagree with the way his lawyer interpreted the letter. I think he's wrong. But I can't fix that now. He prepped him however he prepped him. What you want him to do is to go forward unprepared.

MR. SCHIFF: This is the same letter that has gone out to every witness. Okay? But this is the first witness who said -- well, you know, apart from White House advice, this is the first witness who said: I don't interpret your letter as allowing questions after I left the campaign, so I am not going to answer them. I'm not prepared to answer those questions.

MR. GOWDY: That's fine. Take it out on the lawyer. Don't take it out on the client.

MR. ROONEY: Can we please get back to asking the witness questions? If he is not prepared to answer them, then I guess -- and my question still stands with regard to what your understanding is with the majority that if a witness isn't prepared to answer a question, that you can go out to the press and talk about that but not what he actually talked. That seems so perverted to our system in this country that you can actually talk about what he doesn't answer, but you can't talk about what he does. What is the understanding?

MR. SCHIFF: I will tell you what the understanding is, Mr. Rooney. The understanding is Mr. Lewandowski should not be able to go on television, as he did

yesterday, and say, "I am going to answer every question," which is what he said yesterday, and then come before our committee and refuse to answer very important relevant questions and then leave the impression with the public that he is being fully cooperative. We are not going to stand for that. And you can. But I think your objection really is to the way this committee is behaving being exposed. That is the objection that you have to our making public when witnesses refuse to answer and the majority is willing to go along with it. Now, I was very proud of the committee yesterday because you weren't willing to go along with it.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Schiff, I am prepared to answer any question from my tenure during the Trump campaign from January of 2015 to the day I departed that. I have prepared meticulously to answer all questions that cover that 18- or 20-month window, where if there was any collusion, cooperation, or coordination would have taken place during that time. Unfortunately, I did not prepare for a discussion following my departure of the campaign until today. So I am here prepared and ready to answer any question that I can answer on your behalf or anyone else's as it relates to my tenure during that time where I was employed by the Trump campaign or any preceding entity at that time. I will be happy to come back and answer additional questions, if you would like me to, to discuss from the day I left the Trump campaign until today. It will be my pleasure to do that. But if you give me the privilege of working with counsel to make sure I am prepared for that, as I have prepared for that 18- to 20-month window leading to today, that's all I ask for.

MR. ROONEY: I think it's exemplified by the fact that Ms. Speier's first question was with regard to emails and phone numbers he had during the campaign. Not emails and phone numbers he has had since, because that wasn't

what he was prepared for. And that's not what we were prepared to ask him about. So, if the Trump phone call yesterday, to which I understood that he said that it didn't have anything to do with what we are doing here today, but you had a difference -- regardless of whether or not Trey is right, and that's fair game, I don't understand why, if he is willing to come back, and just as he just said, and testify to the things he has done since he has been a private citizen, which is totally different than Steve Bannon, why we can't move forward with what he is prepared to do. And I still haven't gotten an answer as to what the agreement is with the majority on what we are allowed to talk about.

MR. CASTRO: Mr. Chairman, can I make a statement for the record?

MR. ROONEY: Yeah.

MR. CASTRO: I think this is a significant question, because, in the worst case scenario, you have the President of the United States coaching a witness about his testimony or somehow seeking to influence a witness in his testimony. I also fail to understand what kind of preparation, in terms of memory, for example, would be required to answer the question if the event just happened yesterday. I don't understand preparation to mean time to come up with a good cover story for something. That's not preparation.

MR. ROONEY: If I was his attorney, to be honest with you, it doesn't have to do with what I remember the phone call being; it would revolve around what the legal implications would be and whether or not we are ready to deal with that. So it has nothing to do necessarily with the actual phone call. It has to do with everything that would cascade after that from what he is responsible for being here for after he was campaign manager.

MR. CASTRO: Sure. But you agree that we are supposed to get to the



truth. We are supposed to understand, you know, what actually happened. And then the legal consequences fall from there, whether there are consequences or not.

MR. KING: And the witness is entitled to have counsel.

MR. CASTRO: He is represented by counsel.

MR. KING: Counsel did not prepare him for that so he would not have adequate counsel.

MR. CASTRO: Prepare him to just tell the truth?

MR. KING: That is a demagogic statement and you know it. Otherwise, why bring a lawyer in at all? In that case, you would say no one has to have a lawyer if they are willing to tell the truth. You know as well as I know what traps are, what perjury traps are, and again what kind of traps can be brought out. So I think Mr. Lewandowski is totally within his rights.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, this is no way to conduct an investigation. And as my colleague said, it is a good way to allow a witness to confer with other witnesses to get their stories straight. It's not a good way to conduct an investigation. You hold the gavel. You can make any decision you like, but you have to defend it.

MR. ROONEY: I am happy to defend the fact that we have just spent now half an hour debating over whether or not he answered your question satisfactorily. Whether it's satisfactory to you or not, it has once again shown where we are as a committee and how far we have fallen from where we used to be.

MR. SCHIFF: So there is no doubt, Mr. Rooney: Mr. Lewandowski, in your conversation with the President yesterday, did the subject of your testimony before the committee today come up?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, Congressman Schiff --

MR. SCHIFF: The fact that he is not willing to answer that question --

MR. ROONEY: Can you let him answer?

MR. CHAVKIN: You need to let me, if I may --

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

MR. CHAVKIN: -- reply to what you just asked. First of all, I really take great umbrage at the notion that you think any delay here would be to get stories straight. My client has come in and sworn to tell the truth. And I know him well enough that that will be his mission. And all he is asking to do, as Congressman Gowdy and Congressman King and Congressman Rooney so eloquently said, better than I, is to have time to prepare with his counsel, which is as God given a right in this country as telling the truth, is to have that time and then to come back. There is no privilege invocation. This is just asking for time to prepare.

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, that's not answering my question.

MR. CHAVKIN: Well, I am telling you that that is the preliminary answer to your first insinuation. As to your question, I need only reiterate that he is prepared to talk about --

MR. SCHIFF: That's still not answering my question or Mr. Rooney's.

MR. CHAVKIN: The question that you asked is, what happened in that call? And we are telling you that he is not prepared --

MR. SCHIFF: Will the reporter please read back my question?

[The reporter read back the record as requested.]

MR. CHAVKIN: So, as I was answering, because you were asking about the conversation with the President yesterday, we are not prepared to talk -- Mr. Lewandowski is not prepared to testify about questions that relate to the period after he left the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, my colleague is under the impression that the answer to the question is no, and therefore, there is really no debate here. But I don't hear you saying that, and I don't hear your client saying anything.

MR. GOWDY: Read the answer. We don't have to wonder. We will get Mr. Court Reporter to read back the answer. He actually answered it twice.

MR. SCHIFF: No, I don't believe he did.

MR. GOWDY: Well, the record will speak for itself, Adam. You may not have liked the answer, but he uttered something.

MR. SCHIFF: His counsel's lips moved, but it wasn't an answer.

MR. GOWDY: I disagree.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Reporter, could you please read back his answer?

MR. GOWDY: If Mr. Lewandowski answered that question either of the times it was posed, can you read that back for us, Mr. Court Reporter?

MR. ROONEY: This may have been before we recessed.

MR. GOWDY: It was definitely before we recessed.

MR. SCHIFF: I am talking about the question I just asked.

MR. ROONEY: And we are going to see what he said.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski didn't say anything when I asked the question.

MR. GOWDY: The court reporter cannot look for the answer if we keep talking.

[The reporter read back the record as requested.]

MR. GOWDY: That's an answer, Adam. You may not like that answer. You may want to ask followup questions. I am not through yet, Adam. I am not through yet. This is one of the conversations that he had after he became a private

citizen. We both know there may have been hundreds of them. And you are going to go through every one of them. So do not misrepresent the record that he can't recall a single conversation when you are prepared to ask about every damn one he had.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Gowdy, let's ask the witness: Did you mean by that answer, Mr. Lewandowski, that the subject of your testimony did not come up in your conversation with the President yesterday?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Schiff, we are going to revert to our prior answer on that.

MR. SCHIFF: Does that answer your question, Mr. Gowdy?

MR. GOWDY: It actually does. He read it twice, and I understood his answer to be the subject matter of his testimony today did not come up yesterday with the President. You are entitled to ask a followup question.

MR. SCHIFF: And I have. And I have to clarify that. But, clearly, the witness does not want to answer that question. He does not want us left with the impression that you would take from that.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. So what's the deal you have with the majority of what you can talk about to the press after we leave here? What exactly are we allowed to discuss with the media with regard to what a witness testifies to or doesn't?

MR. SCHIFF: This seems to be your preoccupation.

MR. ROONEY: It is my preoccupation because this is --

MR. SCHIFF: I would rather your preoccupation was getting an answer to our questions of the committee.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Reclaiming my time, Counsel, with any questions

with regard to Mr. Lewandowski's private conversations with anybody after he left the campaign, will you be prepared to come back and ask questions with regard to Mr. Lewandowski's interactions with anybody after he became a private citizen at a future date?

MR. CHAVKIN: Assuming they are relevant to the parameters, yes, Congressman.

MR. ROONEY: Thank you.

Ms. Speier.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So you will return to speak with us. Let me just ask you, since it's current now, who initiated the call yesterday?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congresswoman Speier --

MS. SPEIER: That's unrelated to the content of the conversation that took place. And I don't want to forget it at a subsequent hearing. So who initiated the call?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, I think we are getting into the realm of private conversations that occurred after Mr. Lewandowski left as campaign manager. And our prior answer stands on that.

MS. SPEIER: So you will be prepared to answer that question after you have provided counsel to him, and Mr. Lewandowski will be prepared to answer that question at a later date?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, as I said to Congressman Rooney, to the extent any question you ask is relevant to the parameters of this inquiry, including what you are asking about, Mr. Lewandowski's current intention is to return and to give you as much time as you need, within reason, to ask the questions you consider relevant.

MS. SPEIER: I believe that's a relevant question, so you will be prepared to counsel him on how he should answer that?

MR. CHAVKIN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Mr. Lewandowski, did you sign a nondisclosure agreement when you joined the Trump campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MS. SPEIER: And you realize, of course, that that has no bearing on this hearing and that you are expected to answer all the questions we ask regardless of what that agreement stands for?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Have you been in conversation with the White House counsel?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, are you talking about after he left as campaign manager?

MS. SPEIER: I am.

MR. CHAVKIN: Then it's the same point that we were making before. We did not prepare for conversations --

MS. SPEIER: All right. Be prepared to answer that question at a subsequent hearing.

MR. CHAVKIN: What is the question?

MS. SPEIER: Did Mr. Lewandowski speak with anyone in the White House Counsel's Office?

MR. CHAVKIN: About?

MS. SPEIER: About his testimony and about the parameters of this investigation.

Let's move on then. Were you paid when you were the senior political adviser to candidate Donald Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: What were you paid?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: A salary.

MS. SPEIER: And you were paid as a campaign manager as well?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was.

MS. SPEIER: What did then-candidate Trump communicate to you about his principal foreign policy objectives?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: America first.

MS. SPEIER: Did you have any conversations about restoring a more -- a relationship with Russia that had greater comity, c-o-m-i-t-y?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, the only conversation we had were the public statements that then-candidate Trump made about having a potential relationship with Russia to decimate ISIS and ISIL in Syria.

MS. SPEIER: So no references to a better relationship with President Putin or reducing the sanctions or thawing the relationship?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, we never discussed the reduction of sanctions. And the conversation as it related to a better relationship with Russia, again, was the mutual benefit of destroying our mutual enemy in a foreign country.

MS. SPEIER: So, as you discussed the issue of Russia with the candidate, how much time would you say you spent discussing that issue?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: One one-hundredth of 1 percent.

MS. SPEIER: So, during the first 6 months that you were both senior

political adviser and campaign manager, what did you spend your time doing?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Congresswoman, just to clarify, I was senior campaign -- senior political adviser until the candidate launched the campaign, and then my position and title changed, just to be clear. So they were not synonymous. It was a binary -- the day he became a candidate, my position changed from senior political adviser to the campaign manager. Just for a point of clarification.

MS. SPEIER: So, from January to June, you were senior political adviser, and upon his announcement, you became campaign manager.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So, during that first 6 months as senior political adviser, you spent time doing what?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Potentially preparing a candidate to make a decision if he was going to formally enter the race. And that would have included scheduling, staffing, starting to begin the process of looking if it was feasible for him to have a path to victory.

MS. SPEIER: And did you travel with him during that timeframe?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So how much time would you say you spent with the candidate?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: In that timeframe or in total?

MS. SPEIER: In that timeframe.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The early on, the first 3 months of that, I would have spent less time because we didn't travel as much in those January-to-March timeframe. But probably by April and then through June, significantly more time than in the first 3 months.



MS. SPEIER: So, in the New York magazine, on August 6, 2015, the entire political staff consisted of, according to this article, Michael Cohen, Roger Stone, and Sam Nunberg (ph). Do you recall that being the case?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MS. SPEIER: All right. What was the staff at that time?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: On August 6th of 2015?

MS. SPEIER: That's when the article appeared. During the early months of the campaign, who was on staff then? Why don't we start there.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Michael Cohen, to the best of my knowledge, was never a campaign employee. So that's a factual inaccuracy.

MS. SPEIER: Well, by employee, do you mean a paid employee or was he --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Michael Cohen was an employee, to the best of my knowledge, of The Trump Organization, and had no direct or indirect role or responsibility to the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So he didn't spend any time in strategy sessions relative to the potential campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MS. SPEIER: So did Roger Stone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Roger Stone at that period of time was a contractor to the campaign and was primarily residing in the State of Florida and was not involved in the day-to-day operations of the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: Was he a strategist for the campaign then?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: For a brief period, you could say he was a strategist.

MS. SPEIER: So how did he engage? By phone then?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: His primary point of communication was via telephone through Sam Nunberg (ph).

MS. SPEIER: And did he directly talk to candidate Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were occasions when Mr. Stone spoke to Mr. Trump, yes.

MS. SPEIER: And Sam Nunberg (ph). What was his role in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Sam Nunberg (ph) served initially as a policy adviser to the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: On what issues?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: All.

MS. SPEIER: What is his background?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He is an attorney by trade.

MS. SPEIER: In New York?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So was there anyone else who worked on the campaign during those early months?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am. By August of 2016 --

MS. SPEIER: Let's say January through June.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: January through June, look, I believe Alan (ph) Cobb, who was an attorney from Kansas, was brought on board at that time to help in the early stages. Mr. Dan Scavino was potentially brought onboard on or about that time. We had some junior staff which would have come onboard. Megan Powers I believe was brought onboard in that timeframe. You know, Ms. Hicks was not a campaign staffer at the time but was working fairly closely with us through her position at The Trump Organization, drafting and dealing with communication

strategies. Ms. Miller (ph), who was also from The Trump Organization, somewhat involved in the early stages of the campaign, although not a campaign employee, was involved in the communications component of it and the marketing side. And there may have been, forgive me, a few other lesser known individuals. I believe at that point we had made an offer and had Chuck Laudner (ph) from Iowa working as our State director in the State of Iowa. I believe, by August, July, August, we had some advance staff. We had Kevin Chmielewski (ph), who was doing advance work for us. We had George Jujicos (ph), who was doing some advance work for us. And then in the State of New Hampshire, I believe Matt Zyvoloski (ph) had been brought onboard by then. And in South Carolina, both Ed McMullen (ph) and Jim Merrill (ph) had very likely been onboard, to the best of my recollection, by the time the campaign actually launched. And of course, on or about that time or in that timeframe, by July or August of 2015, Dr. Sam Clovis would have been with us as well.

MS. SPEIER: And how did Sam Clovis come to be involved with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was referred to us by Chuck Laudner (ph), who was serving as our Iowa State director.

MS. SPEIER: So when did you first meet Ivanka Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, I would have met Ivanka Trump in January of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: And what did you understand her role in the campaign to be?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: None.

MS. SPEIER: So did she have any responsibility or interest in bringing on members of the foreign policy team?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not in the months of January to June of 2015.

Ivanka Trump had no role in the campaign whatsoever.

MS. SPEIER: So after that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, Ivanka Trump was not making recommendations for the foreign policy team.

MS. SPEIER: But was she engaged in the campaign after the June kickoff?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ivanka Trump introduced her father at the June 16th announcement, and then, by and large, until approximately October or November of that year was not an active participant in the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So she became an active participant after that October date?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Approximately October or November of 2015, the family -- and I use that term to include the three grown children, which would be Ivanka, Donny, and Eric -- and then Mr. Kushner became much more active in the campaign, particularly as the February 1st primary in the State of Iowa approached.

MS. SPEIER: Did Hope Hicks work for Ms. Trump prior to joining the Trump campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I am not sure of her exact employment. I believe she was an employee of a public relations firm by the name of Hilsic Communications (ph) in New York, who was a contractor at some degree to the Ivanka Trump brand, but I couldn't speak directly to her employment status.

MS. SPEIER: So when did she become part of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Informally, Ms. Hicks became a part of the campaign -- I believe she made a trip with us in January of 2015 to South Carolina was the first trip that Ms. Hicks attended. But I don't believe she became a formal member of the campaign until the early fall of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: So what did you understand her role to be in the Trump campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Her role was to coordinate communications activities and work on forward-facing, external-facing communications.

MS. SPEIER: Were you responsible for bringing her on?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ultimately, the answer to that question would be yes.

MS. SPEIER: Was she recommended to you as a staff person?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It wasn't a formal interview process. It was just almost by acclamation. Ms. Hicks had been part of The Trump Organization, began traveling with then what was the precursor to the campaign, and then ultimately I think we formally made her a contractor to the campaign in the beginning part of the early fall of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: So how often did you communicate with Ms. Hicks?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Daily.

MS. SPEIER: Multiple times during the day?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: A previous witness has testified that Hope Hicks was and is the closest person to Donald Trump by an order of magnitude, far beyond even his relationship with his children. Do you share that assessment?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MS. SPEIER: So, among the persons involved in the campaign, how would you rank her as being critical to the operation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ms. Hicks played a very important function as it related to communications.

MS. SPEIER: So you would not say that she was the closest person to Donald Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: During the campaign?

MS. SPEIER: During the campaign.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would not.

MS. SPEIER: Who would you say was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't think it's fair for me to say, but you have asked my opinion on Ms. Hicks, and I don't think she was the closest to candidate Trump.

MS. SPEIER: I am asking your opinion as to who you think was.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know if there is one answer. You could very easily say that Mr. Schiller, who had been by Mr. Trump's side for 19 years, was the closest. You could argue that I was closer to the candidate and spent more time with him than Ms. Hicks did. And you could also argue that his wife was probably the closest to him.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. In your book, you and David Bossie have said that Ms. Hicks is smart and has a nearly photographic memory. What do you mean by that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I mean Ms. Hicks has the opportunity to recall dates and recall exactly where we were on a specific date and the function that we attended on any given time.

MS. SPEIER: Mr. Kushner. When did you first meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I met Mr. Kushner also in January of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: And what did you understand his role to be in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Kushner had no role in the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: During the time in which you were leading it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: In January of 2015, when I met Mr. Kushner, he had no role in the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: No, I am saying more broadly now. During the entirety of the campaign in which you were the campaign manager.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Kushner's role evolved over a course of many months, where he originally had no interaction with the candidate or the campaign or strategy that related to either, to being much more involved in the day-to-day operations of the campaign as the campaign progressed.

MS. SPEIER: So when would you say he became more involved in the campaign, from zero to 75 percent?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think Mr. Kushner has stated publicly that his first trip with the campaign was a trip to Michigan that we took. And that would have been the fall of 2015. And that I believe was his first time ever traveling. Other than to the announcement on June 16th, that was the only time that I could recall that Mr. Kushner ever traveled with us to go to an event. And following that event, in the fall of 2015, Mr. Kushner began to engage with our team on ideas on ways to improve the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: What kinds of ideas did he offer?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Kushner was specifically focused on increasing our social media access through Facebook and working with Mr. Scavino to ensure that the Facebook and website activity were much more active and much more up to date.

MS. SPEIER: So when would you say that he became fully engaged with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think Mr. Kushner was fully engaged in the campaign by February 1st of 2016.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. And what was his role then?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Again, Mr. Kushner's role evolved from not being involved at all, to originally being involved with the digital operation and the marketing side, to continuously taking more and more responsibility and making more and more strategic recommendations, as well as more traveling with the campaign and the candidate. And so he became an active surrogate in the State of Iowa for the Iowa caucuses. And that primary was February 1st of 2016.

MS. SPEIER: Did he have any role in bringing onboard members of the foreign policy team?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe Mr. Kushner had communicated with Dr. Clovis about members of the team.

MS. SPEIER: Who did he recommend?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that.



[2:45 p.m.]

MS. SPEIER: When did you first meet Donald Trump Jr.?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, it would have also been in January of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: And what was his role in his father's campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Again, like his sister, his brother, and his brother-in-law, their roles evolved over a period of time.

Initially, in January of 2015, he had no role, and by the time I departed the campaign in June of 2016, he was actively involved in the strategy and execution of a series of activities at the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: Eric Trump, when did you first meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe January of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: And what was his role in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: His role would have been equal to what his brother and sister had, which was no formal role at the campaign until we were engaged in the primary election fight, where Eric also became a surrogate for his father on the campaign?

MS. SPEIER: So would you say that both Don Jr. and Eric equally engaged in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would.

MS. SPEIER: And Ivanka, as well, or any one of them more so than the others?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Of those three, I think Don Jr. and Eric were more forward facing, particularly in the early part of the campaign, than Ms. Trump was.

MS. SPEIER: On June 16th, Donald Trump first announced that he would

run for President. It appears from emails that Steve Bannon was one of the first persons to introduce Michael Flynn to the campaign around August of 2015.

When did you first meet Michael Flynn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would have met General Flynn approximately August of -- August to September of 2015, to the best of my recollection.

MS. SPEIER: So was it triggered by the email that Steve Bannon had sent to the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe it was.

MS. SPEIER: And what were the circumstances under which you met him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Flynn, I believe I coordinated a discussion with his son, and we arranged for Mr. Flynn to come to New York City and have a brief meeting with myself and then with Mr. Trump.

MS. SPEIER: So that meeting took place in September with then candidate Trump. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am, on or about September, yes.

MS. SPEIER: And at what point did Mr. Flynn become part of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe Mr. Flynn formally joined the campaign in July of 2016.

██████████ Five minutes.

MS. SPEIER: So when you say "formally," does that mean he was being paid?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe -- I couldn't speak to Mr. Flynn's compensation, but I believe General Flynn signed a nondisclosure agreement sometime in or about July of 2016, after then candidate Trump was officially the

Republican nominee.

MS. SPEIER: So what do you understand -- or what did you understand -- Mr. Flynn's interest in the campaign to be?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Congresswoman, my tenure did not overlap with General Flynn's at the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So when you first met him, did you have a conversation about his interest in the campaign and in the candidate?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MS. SPEIER: And what was the nature of that conversation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Part of the conversation was, at the time, Mr. Trump, candidate Trump was receiving briefings from a series of security professionals. And General Flynn was recommended to come in and provide a discussion, have a discussion with Mr. Trump. And I believe he had two discussions with Mr. Trump on or about August or September of 2015, and then again potentially in either September or October of 2015.

MS. SPEIER: And were you present at those briefings?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not present during.

MS. SPEIER: Who was present? Do you know?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe just Mr. Trump and General Flynn.

MS. SPEIER: Did you have any discussions with Mr. Flynn during the campaign about his views towards Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not that I recall.

MS. SPEIER: During the campaign, how often did you talk to Mr. Flynn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I spoke with General Flynn during my tenure at the campaign probably a dozen to 15 times.

MS. SPEIER: And what was the context of those conversations?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was primarily recommending to General Flynn not to make an endorsement for one of our opponents and that he should endorse the Trump campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So he had not yet made a commitment to the campaign until July of 2016?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am. By the time candidate Trump became the de facto nominee and had secured enough delegates, Mr. Flynn had now openly supported the candidate, but he hadn't joined the candidate or the campaign by signing a nondisclosure agreement, had not traveled with the candidate, to the best of my recollection, prior to that.

MS. SPEIER: So in the 12 or 15 times that you communicated with Mr. Flynn, I presume that was by phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Any of those in person?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I met with Mr. Flynn -- General Flynn -- at least on two occasions in Trump Tower preceding his meetings with candidate Trump, and as well as after his meetings with candidate Trump, I met with General Flynn then. And I think there was one other occasion where I spoke to Mr. Flynn in person. But primarily on the telephone.

MS. SPEIER: And when you had these conversations urging him to endorse candidate Trump, what did General Flynn say to you? Was there reluctance?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There was, particularly early on in February of 2016. In March of 2016, General Flynn had not decided who he was going to support in

the race, and it was by no means a foregone conclusion that Mr. Trump would be the Republican nominee at that time.

I remember a specific conversation with General Flynn just prior to the Nevada caucuses, which would have been the fourth caucus of the cycle, and General Flynn had still not decided.

As you may recall, Mr. Trump had come in second place in Iowa, won New Hampshire, won South Carolina, and was on our way to Nevada, and speaking to General Flynn prior to that, he was still trying to decide if he was going to endorse Senator Cruz or if he was going to support the Trump campaign.

██████████ One minute.

MS. SPEIER: And when he would come to brief the candidate, those took place in August, September, and then a couple more. You said on two occasions you actually met with him. When were those two occasions?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met with General Flynn immediately prior to him briefing the candidate.

MS. SPEIER: In each of those occasions?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And yet you didn't sit in on those briefings?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Did you and Flynn ever discuss travel to Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my recollection, no.

MS. SPEIER: His meeting with Russian officials, meeting with Russian business people?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So when he went to Russia for that RT gala, he did not

communicate to you that he was going?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MS. SPEIER: So when was the first time you became aware of that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I became aware of it only through press accounts. I don't believe General Flynn and I ever had a conversation about it. And he had no role in the campaign. I don't even know when that took place. But he had no role in the campaign, so I didn't really care where he went.

MS. SPEIER: Okay.

██████████ Time.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Lewandowski, as part of our investigation the four parameters which we are trying to write our report on are the following. And I'd like you to comment with regard to what your impression was of why you're supposed to be here, according to the letter or your attorney, during the time of your employment in the campaign to the best of your ability.

During the campaign, were you aware of Russian cyber activity and other active measures that were directed against the United States and its allies?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. ROONEY: So if you were not, were you -- I'm just asking as a followup. If the answer is "no," that's fine. If there were any discussions that you'd have about the Russians' attempt to hack into the DNC server or Mr. Podesta's server or advertised on Facebook or through RT or what have you, any of those type of active measures, do you recall any discussions you had with anybody in the campaign about those things?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. ROONEY: During the campaign, Russian -- we are looking into

whether or not Russian active measures included links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns or other U.S. persons -- that includes you -- or whether or not you are aware of anybody in the Trump campaign who saw or were aware of collusion, conspiracy, or coordination between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign to influence the Russian -- or the U.S. election to defeat Hillary Clinton.

Were you aware of any collusion, coordination, or conspiracy by people on your campaign to work with the Russian Government to collude, conspire, or coordinate to beat Hillary Clinton?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. ROONEY: During the campaign, were you aware of the U.S. Government's response or what the U.S. Government's response would be to Russian active measures and what the U.S. Government would need to do in the future to protect ourselves or our allies? Was there any discussions that you're aware of during the campaign as to, if Mr. Trump was elected, what you would do as a response?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were none.

MR. ROONEY: Finally, are you aware or do you have any comment on the possible leaks of classified information that took place related to the Intelligence Community assessment and what the Trump administration knew about those leaks?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no information about that?

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Gowdy.

MR. GOWDY: Thank you, Chairman Rooney.

Mr. Lewandowski, for you and for your attorney, I want to be really clear why

I do think questions about your tenure after the campaign are relevant.

There are allegations that either then-candidate Trump and/or his campaign colluded, conspired, confederated, coordinated with Russians to impact, interfere with, otherwise influence the 2016 election cycle.

A conspiracy is an agreement, tacit or otherwise, between two or more persons to commit an unlawful act, and some conspiracies require an overt act and some conspiracies do not require an overt act. But statements made even after a conspiracy has, quote, "ended," can be relevant to intent, absence of mistake, motive.

So the notion that the election is over or that your service, your time with the President is over, if there were a conversation that reverted to actions taken or not taken during the relevant time period, that's why I do believe they are relevant.

I appreciate the fact that your attorney read the letter differently. Reasonable minds, I assume, can differ. That's beside the point. You were not prepared today to answer those questions, and I appreciate your willingness to come back.

But I wanted you to know at least my perspective on why those conversations, even if you had a conversation today, if it involved something that happened in 2016, it may be relevant.

So against that backdrop, we're looking at what did Russia do, with whom did they do it, what was the U.S. Government's response, and then the issue of classified material and the dissemination thereof.

My friend from California went through a list of some names and asked when you met them and to the extent which you knew them, and I will finish up a list that I have.



George Papadopoulos, when did you meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I met Mr. Papadopoulos at the now famous meeting that candidate Trump attended at the Old Post Office, which I think took place in the summer of 2016, early. Not the summer. That would have been March, I believe, of 2016, there and/or about.

MR. GOWDY: Did you have a role in bringing him onto the campaign as an adviser, official, or otherwise?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My only function would have been to review the final list of names presented for consideration to serve on an advisory committee, but had no role or relationship with Mr. Papadopoulos prior to that.

MR. GOWDY: After you met him, what was the full extent of your relationship with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I have a series of email exchanges where Mr. Papadopoulos is asking the campaign to do things, but because I didn't have a day-to-day interaction with him, I was traditionally cc'ed on those emails, and they were sent to somebody else.

MR. GOWDY: Paul Manafort, when did you meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met Mr. Manafort, I believe, in March or April of 2016.

MR. GOWDY: And what was the extent of your relationship with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Paul served in three different capacities in the campaign, first as the surrogate, the delegate individual, and then as the campaign convention chairman, and then ultimately as the campaign chairman.

MR. GOWDY: Carter Page.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My interaction with Carter Page, to the best of my

recollection, is via email communication.

MR. GOWDY: You never met him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall meeting Mr. Page in person. It's very possible I did, but I don't recall the interaction.

MR. GOWDY: And other than emails that the committee may have a copy of, you don't recall any other interactions you would have had with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall ever speaking to Mr. Page on the telephone. I don't recall any text exchanges ever with Mr. Page. I believe, to the best of my knowledge, all of my communication with Mr. Page was via email, other than potentially meeting him in a larger environment and not remembering the interaction.

MR. GOWDY: I think you have answered this question, but I didn't write down the answer. When did your tenure as campaign manager come to an end?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was terminated from the campaign on June 20th, 2016.

MR. GOWDY: Did you maintain a cordial relationship with then-candidate Trump after your separation from service?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. GOWDY: Have you continued to be in contact with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: Did you volunteer or do other tasks that he assigned you with respect to the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When I left the employment of the campaign, I became a CNN contributor, which severely limited what I could do because of the contractual obligations to CNN on behalf of the campaign.

MR. GOWDY: And how long did that contract with CNN last?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I left CNN in December of 2016.

MR. GOWDY: So from June the 20th, 2015, until December of 2016, you were a CNN contributor. Did you have other sources of income?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I also received, for a portion of that time, compensation, which had been prenegotiated with the Trump campaign, for severance.

MR. GOWDY: Is it fair to say that one of the conditions of your being a CNN contributor is that you could not have an active role on one of the Presidential campaigns?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, it is.

MR. GOWDY: How about an inactive role?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Much more difficult to define. However, I believe CNN saw the value proposition of me being on air giving their viewers an inside account of what was taking place just because of my understanding of how things transpired.

MR. GOWDY: All right. I want to direct your attention to kind of three what I call pivot points or three data points.

Number one is the intrusion into the DNC server. Did you have any pre-knowledge or foreknowledge that the DNC server would be accessed unlawfully?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Gowdy, would you be able to date, put a date around that?

MR. GOWDY: If I had it, I would. I think there's only one and --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no knowledge of that, sir. I had no -- no information prior to that happening, zero.

MR. GOWDY: Here's the deal I'll make with your lawyer. If you were part of some intrusions and I'm wrong on the date, I'll get you the date of the ones that you were part of but not the ones you weren't part of.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I wasn't part of any, so I'm okay.

MR. GOWDY: All right. We're good on the DNC server.

How about the hacking of the John Podesta email, did you have any pre-knowledge or foreknowledge of that.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Zero, none.

MR. GOWDY: All right. When I use the word "collude, conspire, coordinate," do those words have appreciably the same meaning to you, or are they different?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think I'd put all three in the same relative category, to try and do something that shouldn't be done.

MR. GOWDY: Well, you and I can coordinate to go to lunch. There is nothing wrong about that. So coordination is not inherently wrong. Conspiracy is just an agreement between two or more people. Collude, I will agree with you, does have a negative connotation.

Here is what I'll do. I'll ask you the question, and if the answer is different for the word "collude" or "conspire" or "coordinate," then you can say it is accurate for one of those words but not the other two, all right? I'll use them in a series, and if you think I'm wrong, then you can correct me, okay?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence, regardless of the source and

regardless, frankly, of whether or not you even believed the evidence -- in other words, I'm giving you license to repeat hearsay, triple hearsay -- any evidence of collusion, coordination, conspiracy between Donald Trump and whoever intruded on the DNC server?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never, none.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence, regardless of the source and regardless of whether or not you believed it at the time or now, any evidence of collusion, coordination, or conspiracy between Donald Trump and anyone else, Russian or otherwise, to access John Podesta's emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never, none.

MR. GOWDY: Same question, collusion, coordination, conspiracy, members of the Trump campaign not named Donald Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never, none.

MR. GOWDY: Same question, collusion, coordination, conspiracy, those not officially connected with the campaign but have represented themselves as being so? Kind of wannabes, hangers-on, people who thought that they were close to the candidate even though they had no formal role. Any evidence of collusion, coordination, conspiracy to, with the Russians or anyone else, access John Podesta's email or the DNC server?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no information on any of that other than what has been publicly reported, which I would refer to you to Mr. Stone's statements that something was going to come out at some point. But I had no previous knowledge of Mr. Stone's statement to that and was only made aware of Mr. Stone's statement about that when it was reported in the media.

MR. GOWDY: Do you recall when Mr. Stone made that comment?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. GOWDY: Had you separated from service with the campaign at the time he made it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did, and Mr. Stone was terminated from service at the campaign some time in mid-2015. Almost immediately following Mr. Trump's announcement that he was going to run, I terminated Mr. Stone's employment with the campaign, and I subsequently terminated Mr. Nunberg's (ph) employment with the campaign.

MR. GOWDY: For what purpose did you terminate Mr. Stone's employment with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I didn't believe he brought any value to the organization any longer.

MR. GOWDY: All right. We've gone through the accessing the DNC server. We've gone through the accessing of John Podesta's email.

Third data point. Do you have any evidence, regardless of the source, of coordination between Donald Trump, the Trump campaign, or anyone officially or unofficially connected with the Trump campaign to coordinate social media campaigns with any foreign state actor?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, none.

MR. GOWDY: Fourth data point would be the dissemination of what was acquired during those two intrusions, the intrusion to the DNC server and the accessing of John Podesta's email.

The committee is in possession of a couple of emails that I want to discuss with you. We'll do them in the opposite order.

August of 2016, you were no longer with the campaign at that point, right.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Correct.

MR. GOWDY: But that email, if memory serves me correctly, and I think it does, makes reference to something that happened two months earlier, which would have been June of 2016, and you would have still been with the campaign at that point?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It would depend on which day in June, sir.

MR. GOWDY: All right. And the difficulty there is the email just says, "approximately 2 months ago," so sometime in June, if the email is correct.

It references an outreach by Cambridge Analytica to Julian Assange to secure access to hacked emails. Did you know anything about that? Have you heard anything about anyone connected with the campaign reaching out to Julian Assange?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My only knowledge of that is again what has been publicly reported, that Cambridge Analytica attempted to have a communication Mr. Assange asking if they could provide emails.

I had spoken during my tenure at the campaign with Mr. Nix from Cambridge Analytica on three separate occasions where he offered his services to the campaign, and I summarily rejected them.

So during my tenure at the campaign, Cambridge Analytica was not a vendor or contractor to the campaign.

MR. GOWDY: Do you know whether or not they subsequently became a vendor or contractor with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Public reports have indicated they have been, but I have not independently verified that.

MR. GOWDY: Do you know why the decision would have been made to

bring him on after you left or who would have made that decision?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can only speculate to how that decision was made, sir.

MR. GOWDY: Well, I don't want us to speculate. Let's see if we can do it this way.

Do you know the Steve Bannon has any pecuniary interest in Cambridge Analytica?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is my understanding that Steve Bannon, through his relationship, formal or informal, with Rebekah Mercer, who I believe is a shareholder in Cambridge Analytica, was someone who would have influence in selecting the vendor to come to the campaign.

MR. GOWDY: So to summarize, you did not engage Cambridge Analytica when you were the campaign manager?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Correct.

MR. GOWDY: You were not there in August of 2016 when the email that I made reference to was generated?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Correct.

MR. GOWDY: And you heard nothing about any efforts to reach out to Julian Assange when you were the campaign manager?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. GOWDY: You may have still been the campaign manager when there was a meeting at Trump Tower with Donald Trump Jr., Paul Manafort, Jared Kushner, a Russian lawyer named Natalia Veselnitskaya, and others. Do you recall that meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was still the campaign manager at that time. I was



only made aware of the meeting recently through the public accounts.

MR. GOWDY: Why would Paul Manafort have been invited to that meeting and not you?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, just so we're clear, you're asking him to speculate about that.

MR. GOWDY: Unless he knows. If he knows, it wouldn't be speculation.

MR. CHAVKIN: That's true.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know, other than to say that meeting took place approximately 1 week before my departure from the campaign, and Paul was in the process of seizing operational control of the campaign. And so it's possible that he was invited to that meeting and not me as the person who was trying to take over the campaign.

MR. GOWDY: Did you know that your tenure as campaign manager was drawing nigh?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: How did you know that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Because I have no other skills. I'm in politics, and you can just read it. You knew it was coming. You could tell by the interaction with the family members, in my opinion, and I could also tell through just my day-to-day interaction with the candidate.

MR. GOWDY: So even though this meeting took place while you were still the campaign manager, your testimony is you knew nothing about it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: And you learned about it how and from whom?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I only learned about it through the public accounts,

and that would have been a news broadcast, and I couldn't recall if it was FOX News or CNN, but only through the public record.

MR. GOWDY: Had any other offers of information on behalf of the Russian Government come to you when you were the campaign manager?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. GOWDY: Well, you know, the reason people hate lawyers is because they can seize on these little phrases that the rest of the world wouldn't seize on. And I can't help but think that you would remember if someone connected with the Russian Government offered you information when you were the campaign manager.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Gowdy, I just would point out that there could be people he interacted with who were acting on behalf of Russia that he didn't know.

MR. GOWDY: That's why I asked, whether it was brought to his attention.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, all I know, I never communicated with anybody from Russia, anyone from the Russian Government, anyone acting on behalf of the Russian Government. That's to the best of my knowledge.

If there was a person who reached out to me who was a emissary or a member of the Russian Government and I didn't know that and I had a conversation, I suppose that's always possible. But I never had any indication that anyone affiliated with the Russian Government ever reached out to me ever.

MR. GOWDY: Given your expertise in politics, how does opposition research, how does negative information about political candidates, how does that work? From what sources does it come?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It comes from a wide variety of sources. But it's very important to stipulate for the record that our campaign never did opposition research on any of the other 15 primary opponents that we had and didn't conduct an opposition research packet on the Clinton campaign under my tenure.

MR. GOWDY: Wouldn't that be unusual for even a non-major campaign, even a county council race? They generally Google to see what negative information there is out there about their political opponents. Why was a decision made not to do opposition research on Secretary Clinton?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To be fair, sir, under my tenure, we didn't engage in opposition research file. The Republican National Committee provided a fairly substantial file to us as we became the de facto nominee, but that was a document that they compiled and turned over to us on a flash drive.

MR. GOWDY: Were you still the campaign manager when you learned that the DNC had been hacked and that John Podesta's email had been hacked?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that, sir. I don't recall having a conversation about those two topics, which would lead me to believe I had left the campaign at that time. But I'm not 100 percent certain of the date. I'm sorry.

MR. GOWDY: You anticipated my next question, which is whether or not you were party to or have any knowledge of any conversations within the campaign on how to take advantage of the fact that that material may exist.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir. To the best of my knowledge, never had a conversation about that ever.

MR. GOWDY: So if there is an allegation of coordination, collusion, conspiracy between the Trump campaign and the holders of the hacked emails, you

weren't aware of it while you were the campaign manager?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, I was not.

MR. GOWDY: Do you know Steve Bannon?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: When did you meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met Steve Bannon in probably 2014.

MR. GOWDY: He is quoted as saying that there is a zero percent chance that the -- those involved in the June 2016 Trump Tower meeting with Natalia Veselnitskaya and others, zero percent chance that they were not walked up to see then-candidate Donald Trump.

Zero is a pretty all-encompassing number. I have guess stated differently, there is 100 percent chance that they were.

Do you have any information, evidence, knowledge, regardless of the source, as to whether or not Donald Trump, the candidate, was aware that that meeting was taking place?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have none.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any information, evidence, regardless of the source, regardless of whether or not you even believe it, other than Steve Bannon's quote, that they were walked up to candidate Trump after the meeting took place?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no indication that that ever took place whatsoever, none. And at that time, I would have been spending approximately 10 to 14 hours a day next to candidate Trump.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence that even if it weren't that day, that the meeting was brought to his attention and the offer of incriminating information against Hillary Clinton by the Russians would have been communicated

to then-candidate Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: None, sir, none.

MR. GOWDY: I think those are all the questions I have, Chairman.

MR. ROONEY: [REDACTED] how much time does the majority have left?

[REDACTED] About 14, 15 minutes, sir.

MR. ROONEY: Anybody else from the majority have any questions?

Would the witness and counsel like to take a break before we get into 15-minute rounds?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: If you wouldn't mind, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROONEY: Yes, sir.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Use the facilities.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.

[Recess.]

MR. ROONEY: Okay. Counsel, are you ready?

MR. CHAVKIN: We are, Congressman. Thank you.

MR. ROONEY: I recognize the minority for 15 minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, before I turn back to my colleague, Mr. Castro, I want to state my objections on the record to your decision not to answer questions after the campaign.

Yesterday, Mr. Lewandowski said on FOX News that he would answer every question posed by the committee. Yesterday, also, Steve Bannon testified and declined to answer questions after the campaign. That became public.

Yesterday, Mr. Lewandowski spoke with the President, and, today, Mr. Lewandowski is refusing to answer questions after the campaign.

And we don't know whether those events are related to each other, but we need to find out. And the relevance of Mr. Lewandowski's conversation with the President obviously is directly pertinent if they discussed his testimony. Or if they discussed future employment in the administration, that would be relevant to as well, and in terms of any bias this witness might have.

So the answer that he didn't discuss the parameters of the campaign is a very specific answer that does not include many possibilities that are very relevant to our investigation.

And I, for one, don't find it the least bit credible that counsel would come into an investigative hearing of this nature and not anticipate that his client would be asked questions about conversations related to the Russia investigation whenever they took place.

It would be as if you went into a courtroom and the witness is on the stand and the witness is asked questions about a robbery that happened in the past and the attorney said to the judge, "I didn't prepare my client to answer those questions, so we're not ready to answer those questions." That would be unimaginable.

I think counsel and Mr. Lewandowski came here prepared to refuse to answer questions that pertained to communications and conversations after the campaign, and that was a conscious decision and one that we should not respect as it will undermine our investigation.

So those are my concerns and my objections. But, again, the majority holds the gavel, and if that's the kind of investigation the majority decides to run, that's the kind of investigation the majority decides to run.

And with that, I'll yield back to Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: Thank you.

Ms. Speier, before we turned time over to the majority, was asking you about General Flynn, and I have a few followup questions as we pick up on our side of the questioning with respect to General Flynn.

Do you recall whether there was any due diligence conducted on General Flynn before he helped the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, sir, there was not.

MR. CASTRO: Who decided to bring him on? Do you recall?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mister -- General Flynn came on following my departure, so I cannot speak to who made that decision, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Was he around the campaign at all while you were there?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes. General Flynn had briefed candidate Trump on at least two or three occasions and had been an individual who I had spoken to on a number of occasions, maybe a dozen or so times, again, specifically trying to get him to endorse the candidate.

MR. CASTRO: And were you aware or do you know whether the campaign was aware of the work that General Flynn did in 2015 for Kaspersky Labs?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not aware of it. I couldn't speak to anybody else on the campaign who may or may not be aware of it.

MR. CASTRO: Were you aware that General Flynn was a regular contributor on RT?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Let me ask you about Sam Clovis.

When did you first meet Sam Clovis?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met Dr. Clovis on a trip to Iowa in early to mid-2015.

MR. CASTRO: And how did he come to be part of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Dr. Clovis was a professor at a local college in Iowa. Candidate Trump did a townhall meeting there that Dr. Clovis served as the emcee for. And some time on or about June or July of 2015, Dr. Clovis took a sabbatical from his institution of higher learning, and Chuck Laudner (ph), who was our Iowa State director, recommended we bring Sam on full time to both help us in Iowa and start to build up the policy team.

MR. CASTRO: So he joined in the summer of 2015, the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's about correct, sir.

MR. CASTRO: What was his formal role?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: His title, I believe, was the co-chairman of the campaign -- national co-chairman, I think, specifically

MR. CASTRO: Was that role paid, as far as you know?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was compensated, yes.

MR. CASTRO: Would you say he was a coffee boy?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Would you call him a major player in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The early part of the campaign, Dr. Clovis was instrumental in helping, yes.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Let me ask you about Rick Dearborn.

When did you first meet Rick Dearborn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I probably met Mr. Dearborn in early to mid-2015.

MR. CASTRO: And under what circumstances did you meet him?



MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was, at the time, the chief of staff to U.S. Senator Jeff Sessions from Alabama.

MR. CASTRO: Did you approach him because you were wanting him to be part of the campaign or wanting Senator Sessions to be part of the campaign? How did this -- how did he come to be part of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, Mr. Dearborn came to us. We were courting Senator Sessions' endorsement for candidate Trump.

MR. CASTRO: And he was one of the early endorsers, as far as a legislator.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was the only endorser of the candidate from the Senate side. And in August of 2015, we held a large rally in Mobile, Alabama, where Senator Sessions attended that with us.

In January of 2016, I believe, to the best of my recollection, I hired Stephen Miller, who was, at the time, Senator Sessions' policy adviser, to come to the campaign full time and had been working on and off with Mr. Dearborn for a series of months to try and solicit Senator Sessions' endorsement for candidate Trump.

MR. CASTRO: So you approved the hiring of Mr. Miller. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did, yes.

MR. CASTRO: Did you approve the hiring of Mr. Dearborn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I guess ultimately I did, but at that time, when Mr. Dearborn was brought on board, is when Mr. Manafort was attempting to stand up a D.C. policy office, which would have been housed down here, that Mr. Dearborn was going to oversee.

MR. CASTRO: Do you recall how much Rick Dearborn was paid?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Was Rick Dearborn a coffee boy?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my recollection, no.

MR. CASTRO: How about Stephen Miller?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Stephen Miller was an active member of the campaign.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Let me ask you about Paul Manafort.

We understand Paul Manafort joined the campaign in March 2016. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe so, yes.

MR. CASTRO: How did his joining the campaign come about?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Tom Barrack, who is a friend of the President, sent an email to Ivanka Trump, cc'ed to Jared Kushner, recommending that Mr. Manafort, who had a residence in 43G of Trump Tower, come on board and help with the delegate process for a potential contested convention.

MR. CASTRO: Would it surprise you to learn that Roger Stone claimed that he referred Mr. Manafort to Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That would not surprise me at all.

MR. CASTRO: Well, who was right? Was it Tom Barrack or was it Roger Stone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The email from Tom Barrack is accurate. Roger Stone is a liar.

MR. CASTRO: About that or everything?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just in general, but about that specifically, I'm sure.

MR. CASTRO: Well, thank you for your candor.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm here to tell the truth.

MR. CASTRO: According to a March 31st, 2016, New York Times article,

Mr. Trump brought on Mr. Manafort to lead his delegate corralling efforts at the Republican Convention. Is that your recollection?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is.

MR. CASTRO: And as campaign manager, what role did you play in bringing on Mr. Manafort? Did you vet him? Did you interview him? Did you have any choice in the matter?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Three separate questions, and can I take them independently?

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When Mr. Barrack made the recommendation to Ivanka Trump to have her father meet with Paul Manafort, that email was sent to me, and Mr. Trump asked me to get in touch and arrange a meeting with Paul Manafort.

I arranged that meeting.

MR. CASTRO: Can I interrupt you just for a second? As far as you knew at the time, were you aware whether Mr. Trump knew Mr. Manafort or did Mr. Trump indicate to you whether he had a previous association with Mr. Manafort?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Trump handed me the email which Tom Barrack wrote to Ivanka and cc'ed Jared, handed me the email asking me to set up a meeting. And I took that email, contacted Mr. Manafort, and asked him when he'd be available to meet with candidate Trump.

We arranged a dinner at Mar-a-Lago in I believe it was March of 2016. Four people attended that dinner, myself, Mr. Trump, Paul Manafort, and Ms. Hicks.

Following that, I believe that dinner took place on a Saturday evening in March, and then by Monday morning Mr. Manafort had leaked that he'd be joining

the campaign, to the media.

MR. CASTRO: What makes you think he leaked it to the media?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were only four people at the meeting, and I know three of them didn't talk, so there's only one other person.

MR. CASTRO: I thought Hope Hicks was the one with the media connections, though.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Well, I can tell you this. I spent 15 months next to Hope Hicks as a communications professional, and in that period of time Ms. Hicks never leaked a story, that I was aware of, from March of 2015 until March of 2016. To the best of my knowledge, there were no leaks from the campaign at that time.

MR. CASTRO: So what type of due diligence did you conduct on Mr. Manafort and his background?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: None.

MR. CASTRO: No due diligence at all, just hired him carte blanche?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was a recommendation from a friend of the President for 30 years.

MR. CASTRO: Are you aware of whether anybody in the campaign did any due diligence on him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can't speak for anybody else. I can only speak for me. There was no due diligence done prior to Mr. Manafort having dinner with us at Mar-a-Lago.

And then part of the email, which I'm sure you have access to, indicates that Mr. Manafort had a residence in Trump Tower, had been involved in Republican Party politics over the last 30 years, including the Dole campaign in '96 and going all the way back to the Reagan years of the '76 contested convention fight, and that Mr.

Manafort was willing to work free of charge.

██████████ Five minutes

MR. CASTRO: Were you aware of his past work in Ukraine? And were you aware of his work for Victor Yanukovich and the Party of Regions (ph)?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not aware of it.

MR. CHAVKIN: Excuse me, the question is being about before Manafort was hired or subsequently?

MR. CASTRO: Either one.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I've been made aware of that information, but prior to Mr. Manafort formally joining the campaign, I was not aware of any of his previous business dealings.

MR. CASTRO: And, again, made no attempt to vet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Was it your sense that when Mr. Manafort was brought onto the campaign in March, that he would eventually take over the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was not.

MR. CASTRO: According to press reports, within weeks of joining the campaign, Manafort made clear his vision for the future of the campaign. Reportedly, at an April 16th meeting, Manafort laid out his vision for the campaign that included increasing spending and hiring more staff.

Do you recall that meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall the specific meeting, but I do recall Mr. Manafort outlining those ideas.

MR. CASTRO: And Manafort was reportedly promoted to campaign

chairman and chief strategist on May 19th whereby he effectively took control of the campaign.

Would you say that's an accurate assessment of what transpired?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would say it's fairly close, yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: However, you didn't leave the campaign until the following month. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is.

MR. CASTRO: So for about 3 weeks or a month, there was an overlap where he had effectively taken over control but you were still the campaign manager in name. Is that fair to say?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There was a -- there was a delineation of responsibilities on the campaign at that point. Mr. Manafort had responsibility for direct mail, television advertising, and some State operations, and I had operational control over the candidate's schedule, travel. And we actually had two separate budgets at the campaign, one that Mr. Manafort was responsible for and one that I was responsible for.

MR. CASTRO: And was this arrangement at the time supposed to go on through the end of the campaign, as far as you were aware back then?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: On March 21st, 2016, then-candidate Trump announced his foreign policy team during an interview with The Washington Post editorial board. The team would be led by Jeff Sessions and include Walid Phares, George Papadopoulos, Joe Schmitz, Carter Page, and Lieutenant General Keith Kellogg.

What did you understand to be your role vis-à-vis campaign foreign policy?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My role was to instruct the team to put together a

foreign policy team to rebut the press accounts that candidate Trump was not being briefed by any foreign policy experts.

MR. CASTRO: Did you have any formal or informal affiliation with the foreign policy advisers team run by then Senator Sessions, and if so, what was your role?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I had an informal relationship as I was at the meeting that took place at the Old Post Office, and I would have provided a review of the individuals who were being recommended to be on that committee.

██████████ One minute.

MR. CASTRO: How often did you communicate with others on that team, including Sessions, Rick Dearborn, J.D. Gordon, Michael Flynn, Carter Page, George Papadopoulos, Rick Gates, Walid Phares, Sam Clovis, et cetera?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Dr. Clovis and I were in regular communication as at that point in the campaign he was now stationed almost exclusively in Trump Tower, working out of our offices there, as opposed to being in Iowa. The rest of those individuals, I don't believe, had -- I did not have consistent communication with them like I would have with Dr. Clovis.

MR. CASTRO: I yield.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Lewandowski, what was the reason for your leaving the campaign? I don't know if you've already been asked that, so I apologize, but just for the sake of the --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: So the reason -- it's a great question, Congressman. I wish I could give you the ultimate reason.

The way I have understood it was that on Father's Day weekend, not specifically on Father's Day of 2016, the grown children, which collectively include

Don, Ivanka, and Jared and Eric Trump, met with candidate Trump and told him that I no longer had the ability to drive the campaign in the direction that they thought it was going to be necessary to win.

And so on that particular day, June 19th of that 2016, I happened to be in my residence in New Hampshire. I spoke to then-candidate Trump on three different occasions that day, once in morning, once midday, and once late in the evening about 10:00 p.m.

And Mr. Trump had said to me, "Corey, they're killing us," and he meant specifically referring to the media. And he said, "They hate you, so they hate me."

And I said, "No, sir, they hate you all on your own. I'm just here for the ride."

And then I traveled to New York on the 6 a.m. flight the next morning, conducted what was a series of traditional conference calls on a Monday morning. Between 6 and 8 a.m. I was in the office. And then every Monday there is something called the "Family Meeting."

I'm trying to answer your question, so I apologize. There's a family meeting, which is the grown children, comprised of myself, Hope Hicks, Paul Manafort, and Rick Gates, and then the grown children.

And just prior to that meeting beginning, Don Jr. asked me to go and sit with him in the conference room where he then told me I was no longer allowed to be part of the campaign. And when I asked for the reason, he just said the campaign is going to move in a different direction.

When I pled my case, that we had won 38 primaries and caucuses and candidate Trump had received more votes than any candidate in the history of the Republican Party, and I wanted to know why I was being asked to leave, he said it was just a family decision.



MR. ROONEY: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BY [REDACTED]

Q Mr. Lewandowski, just a couple of quick questions regarding some things that are out there in the media.

Have you in any way, either directly or indirectly, directed this committee on how it should conduct its investigation into the 2016 election?

A Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

Q And are you, after being on the Trump campaign and the senior political adviser for as long as you were, do you have any information about anyone on the campaign or who is now in the administration that directed this committee in how to conduct the 2016 investigation that we are doing?

A No, sir.

[REDACTED] No further questions, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gowdy.

MR. ROONEY: We owe 15 minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: Excuse me, if I could, before we resume, Mr. Castro.

Those questions go obviously well beyond the confines of the campaign. I just want to point out, again, the inconsistency. There have been a number of questions about leaks and about other things that took place, or the witness' knowledge of those events or nonevents after the campaign, so even that standard is being inconsistently applied.

Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: Thank you.

Mr. Lewandowski, I want to ask you a question real quick about Hope Hicks, and then we'll get back to my other line of questioning.

You wrote a book not too long ago. Is that right?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: What was the title of that book?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: "Let Trump Be Trump."

MR. CASTRO: And in that book, do you recall praising Hope Hicks as being smart?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do.

MR. CASTRO: Do you recall saying that she has, quote, "nearly a photographic memory"?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Thank you.

I was asking you about the foreign policy working group and your relationship to that before we switched over. So picking that back up.

Did you attend any of their events, for example, dinners at the Capitol Hill Club, breakfast, a March 26th meeting with Donald Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was present for the foreign policy committee meeting that took place at the Old Post Office, I believe, in March of 2016, with candidate Trump. I did not attend any breakfast at the Capitol Hill Club. If that group met there, I did not attend any, and don't recall being part of any other discussions.

MR. CASTRO: Any other preparatory meetings for their work that you attended?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my recollection, no.

MR. CASTRO: All right.

Who did you regularly discuss foreign policy with? Donald Trump, Jared

Kushner, Paul Manafort, Michael Flynn, Jeff Sessions, anyone else?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Dr. Clovis would have been one of the individuals who would have had part of those conversations.

To a lesser extent, but not excluding Mr. Stephen Miller, who was in charge of domestic policy but was also helping on the foreign policy side because of his previous relationship with Senator Sessions.

MR. CASTRO: How about Jared Kushner?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Kushner would have had conversations, yes.

MR. CASTRO: Paul Manafort?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Michael Flynn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe at the time Mr. Flynn would have been consulted, particularly not in March of 2016, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Jeff Sessions.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I spoke directly with Senator Sessions about the matter. I would have much more --

MR. CASTRO: Rick Dearborn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Rick Dearborn, yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. And What did you understand to be the goals of the foreign policy team, and specifically with respect to Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The goal of the foreign policy team, sir, with all due candor, was to stop the media from saying we didn't have a foreign policy team.

MR. CASTRO: Do you recall the team taking a position on U.S. relations with Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not.

MR. CASTRO: So you don't recall any discussions about the United States-Russia relationship?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, the only direction that either candidate Trump or myself would have had on that is having a better relationship with Russia to potentially defeat an enemy in Syria.

MR. CASTRO: And did you ever discuss foreign policy outreach with the diplomatic outreach team, for example?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I have ever spoken to a diplomatic outreach team, sir.

MR. CASTRO: I guess let me ask this. Were you part of or who do you know that was part of the campaign's outreach team to either other foreign policy experts, diplomats, anybody in the foreign policy world?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that both Mr. Kushner and Mr. Clovis would have very likely been the lead for any of those contacts.

MR. CASTRO: Kushner and Clovis. Anybody else involved? George Papadopoulos?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Acting on behalf of the campaign? My primary points of contact on that issue of foreign policy outreach would have gone through Dr. Clovis, Mr. Kushner, and potentially, although I don't recall a direct conversation with him, Mr. Dearborn.

MR. CASTRO: How about Carter Page?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Both Mr. Page and Mr. Papadopoulos contacted the campaign and multiple campaign officials attempting to make recommendations as to foreign policy matters.

MR. CASTRO: Did you speak to both those gentlemen during the campaign

about foreign policy matters or any other matters?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall ever having a telephone or an in-person conversation with Mr. Page. There were a series of emails that were sent to me by him.

And my best recollection of my interaction with Mr. Papadopoulos took place at the Trump hotel meeting where the foreign policy team met, and then anything further from that would have been in writing.

MR. CASTRO: In writing you mean --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: In emails.

MR. CASTRO: -- by email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

During the campaign, how would you characterize candidate Trump's view of what U.S. policy toward Russia should be? More accommodating towards Russia? Less accommodating towards Russia? What was your understanding?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My conversations with Mr. Trump, again, revolved around the opportunity to potentially have a better relationship with Russia so that we could have a joint effort for a mutual enemy.

MR. CASTRO: And based on those conversations, how would that be achieved, a better relationship with Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, we never discussed the specifics how that would be achieved.

MR. CASTRO: During the campaign, how much was President Trump engaged on foreign policy with respect to Russia?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It would have been a very insignificant fraction of his

time, in my opinion.

MR. CASTRO: And I'd like to show you a picture. I think we've got it for you over there. Your attorney may have it.

On March -- and we'll mark it as exhibit 1, I believe.

[Lewandowski Exhibit No. 1

Was marked for identification.]

MR. CASTRO: On March 31st, 2016, the campaign held a meeting of the Foreign Policy Advisory Committee.

Are you familiar with this committee?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Did you attend the meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. CASTRO: Are you pictured there?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Where were you in this frame, in this picture? I'm sorry, where were you in the room?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: This particular meeting took place over a course of approximately 30 minutes. And I was both in and out of the room during this meeting, but I would have been seated on the far side over candidate Trump's left shoulder.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. And one of the reasons that I gave you the visual is really for my next question, and that is, I'd like you to name everybody who attended, both those pictured and those not pictured. And we'll give you a second because I know it's --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Well, they've got all the names next to them here, so

I'll just read these aloud, if that's easier.

MS. SPEIER: There's others there that aren't --

MR. CASTRO: Well, but whoever else you know was there that also is not accounted for by name.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Look, I believe, and I could be wrong, to Jeff Sessions, Senator Jeff Sessions' right, that might be James Cafarno (sic) from the Heritage Foundation. It could not be, but I believe he might have been at that meeting.

MR. CASTRO: You're talking about the gentleman that seems to be balding up top there?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think that's -- yeah. I was trying to be kind.

MR. CASTRO: Please, can you spell his name to the best of your ability?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think it's Cafarno (sic), C-a-f-a-r-n-o (sic). Dr. James Cafarno (sic), I believe, was at that meeting. He's a resident at the Heritage Foundation.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. And the person next to him who also is not named?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah, I'm not sure who that is.

MS. SPEIER: We know who that is.

MR. ROONEY: The most important person there.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's the most important person there?

MR. ROONEY: Yeah.

MR. CASTRO: You want to tell him who that is?

MS. SPEIER: That's what happens to us after we leave here.

MR. LOBIONDO: Committee member Jeff Miller.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: From Florida, of course. Mr. Chairman, we called

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

him at the time, right, from the VA? Wasn't he chairman of the VA Committee at the time? As a matter of fact, I remember he gave me his card on that day.

Looks like Admiral Kubic is listed there.

MS. SPEIER: There's someone in between.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm not sure. I can't make who that person is by the ear. If you can -- that's pretty good if you can get that one. I don't know.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



[4:01 p.m.]

MR. CASTRO: Well, let me ask you, anybody who's not named here?

Anybody else you recall being in that meeting, in that room?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Sure.

MR. CASTRO: Who else?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Miller would have been present. Stephen Miller would have been present at that meeting.

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: As was Mr. Dearborn. He was present at least for a portion of this meeting.

Other people who would have been at that event that day, whether they were physically in the room but they were definitely there, Ms. Hicks was at that event. Mr. Schiller, Keith Schiller was at that event. Mr. Scavino would have been traveling with us that day. A series of Secret Service officers at that time.

And then there would have been some individuals who were employed by the Trump Hotel, just because we were at their facility. Whether they were in that room or not, people would come and go.

MR. CASTRO: But you are talking about perhaps waiters or waitresses, managers, and so forth?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, the building wasn't open yet, so it would have been general manager of the facility. And I believe on that particular day, to the best of my recollection, a reporter was in town, and Don Jr. brought her over to the facility to say hello to her -- to his father.

MR. CASTRO: So Don Jr. was in the meeting briefly or stepped in?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was not in the meeting. He arrived after the

meeting was over. Because to the best of my recollection there were actually three meetings that occurred on this day, all in the same facility.

So this one, which would have been the national security meeting as it is defined here by the campaign, there was a second to a potentially preceding meeting, which was a series of lobbyists in Washington, D.C., who were meeting with Donald Trump for the first time, by and large.

And then, I believe it was the same day, the third and final meeting which took place was a meeting with Bob Woodward and Bob Costa of The Washington Post.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Who's the gentleman in between Mr. Mizusawa and Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I couldn't -- I don't know the answer.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

██████████ Five minutes.

MR. CASTRO: All right.

Are you aware what Mr. Trump conveyed about Russia and Ukraine at this meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I am.

MR. CASTRO: Are you aware of what anybody, any participant, conveyed to Mr. Trump about Russia or Ukraine at this meeting?

MR. CHAVKIN: Outside of press reports?

MR. CASTRO: Yeah. Your personal experience that day.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I only am aware of what has been made public following the release of this, where somebody claimed they made a recommendation on Russia. I don't recall being in the room and hearing that

conversation and I couldn't speak to it.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

George Papadopoulos said in his plea agreement that during this meeting he relayed that he, quote, "had connections that could arrange a meeting between then-candidate Trump and President Putin." Do you recall hearing about this offer?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I only recall it through the media accounts, but don't recall it contemporaneously at the time.

MR. CASTRO: Were you aware of any responses to Mr. Papadopoulos at the meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CASTRO: All right.

Let me ask you, when did you first -- I am going to ask you some questions about Carter Page, and then I will yield here in a second to the majority. But when did you first meet Carter Page?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe Mr. Page was introduced to me via email from the former chairman of the New York Republican Party, GOP. That would have been --

MR. CASTRO: And who was that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: His name is Mr. Ed Cox. And that would have been in or about December of 2015.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Let me go back just for a second. After the Trump Hotel meeting with candidate Trump, was there a followup meeting of the group later that day, perhaps over dinner, or any other kind of followup meeting you recall with any of the members of that group?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, candidate Trump and myself and our small team departed from that hotel and traveled outside Washington, D.C., immediately following that. So I could not speak to if a meeting occurred after we were gone.

MR. CASTRO: You never heard that, hey, five or six of us are going to get together after this or later on or anything?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. All right.

With respect to Mr. Page -- I'm sorry, let me ask you again, when did you first meet him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I was introduced to him via email in or about December of 2015.

MR. CASTRO: December 2015. And how did it come that he joined the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Well, just as a point of clarification, he never joined the campaign, sir. So he was never a campaign employee, never had a campaign email address, and was never an active member of the campaign.

MR. CASTRO: Well, all of us have been involved in campaigns here, including yourself, and there are some people who are part of a campaign and are paid and others who are simply volunteers. My first campaign, in fact all of my campaigns have had volunteers who have worked a lot and been very important to my campaigning but were never paid anything, just volunteered their labor.

So how did he come to be associated with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Chairman Cox, Chairman Ed Cox with the New York GOP, asked me if I could meet with Mr. Page as a person who he had known for a

long period of time, had an office in the IBM Building, which is the building which connects to Trump Tower in New York. And at the recommendation of the chairman of the New York GOP, I said, yes, I would be happy to meet with him.

MR. CASTRO: Before -- after that, as he became associated with the campaign, did you ever vet Carter Page?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I had very little interaction with Mr. Page other than some email exchange. I did not vet him.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. As far as you know, did anybody else in the campaign, including candidate Trump or anyone else, did they vet Carter Page?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no, sir.

MR. CASTRO: So was the policy of the campaign, "Hey, some friend recommends some guy and we are not going to worry about their background, they are part of the campaign if they want to be"? I mean, was that the policy of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, but the individuals who were making recommendations on behalf of other individuals were known commodities to the campaign. Chairman of the New York GOP is a well known --

MR. CASTRO: So you are saying Carter Page got a high level recommendation to be part of the campaign, therefore he didn't need to be vetted.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: What I am saying is I didn't vet him, nor did anyone else with the campaign to the best of my knowledge, because --

MR. CASTRO: But you were the campaign manager.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was. And in January of 2016, we were in a 16-way way race for President of the United States and trying to win our first primary in the State of Iowa.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. CASTRO: Okay. I have any time or do I need to yield?

MR. ROONEY: We'll yield back. I will just say, as the chairman of Little Marco's campaign in Florida, we had a lot of vetting and it didn't seem to matter. So with that, we yield.

MR. CASTRO: Thank you.

MS. SPEIER: So Carter Page wasn't -- you just didn't meet with him, you put him on an advisory committee, correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I didn't put him on the advisory committee, no, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Well, who did?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that would have been Dr. Clovis.

MS. SPEIER: So the reference that Mr. Castro made to this email from Mr. Page to Sam Clovis and Michael Glassner actually copied you. And it says, "As I have alluded to before, there's no question that a Trump visit to Moscow and related meetings with Putin would prove to be the most important campaign event in the history of U.S. politics."

And you were copied on that. So you don't recall this at all?

MR. CHAVKIN: That's not what he had said previously. Mr. Lewandowski did say there were a number of emails with Mr. Papadopoulos and with Mr. Page about Russia outreach.

MS. SPEIER: I am just asking, on this particular email, did you ever respond to anyone about a Trump visit to Moscow and related meetings with President Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge.

MS. SPEIER: So Mr. Page made repeated offers to help arrange a meeting

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

with Mr. Putin and candidate Trump. I mean, that's kind of a big deal when you're trying to distinguish yourself from a cast of 17 candidates and it's January and the Iowa Caucuses are about to happen and you are the strategist and the campaign manager. Did you not even at least give it a thought?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not.

MS. SPEIER: On February 12th, Mr. Page emailed Mr. Clovis and Mr. Glassner with the subject: "Trump-Putin and the possible end of the second Cold War."

And it read: "It was a pleasure to meet each of you today upon Corey's introduction. As promised, and related to a few of the points I briefly alluded to, for your information, a short article I recently wrote which shows part of the huge potential upside for a new detente with Moscow that was recently initiated under Mr. Trump's emerging leadership position."

So it looks like on that particular day you met with him and then you introduced him to Sam Clovis. So when you introduced him to Sam Clovis, what did you tell him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe I met him electronically and introduced him to Mr. Glassner and Mr. Clovis electronically.

MS. SPEIER: So the introduction by you was electronically?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, yes. And I wouldn't have needed Carter Page if Donald Trump wanted to see Vladimir Putin.

MS. SPEIER: What do you mean by that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: If candidate Trump had a desire to go to Russia to meet with Vladimir Putin, Carter Page would have not been the individual who we would have worked through to try and accomplish that.

MS. SPEIER: Who would you worked through?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Donald Trump.

MS. SPEIER: And you think that then-candidate Trump would have gotten a meeting with President Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do.

MS. SPEIER: And why do you say that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Because he's Donald Trump.

MS. SPEIER: Well, Donald Trump went to Russia and had the Miss Universe pageant and was very anxious to have President Putin there and President Putin never came.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's my assessment as the campaign manager and chief strategist that if Mr. Trump wanted to meet with Mr. Putin we would have arranged that directly with Mr. Putin's team.

MS. SPEIER: Did you attempt to arrange meetings with any other heads of state?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: President Pena Nieto. We went to Mexico, you may recall, to meet with him.

MS. SPEIER: And anyone else?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There was a brief period of consideration of traveling to Israel to meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu, but we did not travel.

MS. SPEIER: You could not travel?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: We did not.

MS. SPEIER: You did not.

So there was a contemplated meeting with Netanyahu, and you did meet with the president of Mexico, but you never contemplated meeting with Putin.



MR. LEWANDOWSKI: During my tenure in the campaign, we never contemplated, to the best of my knowledge, traveling outside the country to do any foreign travel other than a brief opportunity to go and potentially meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu. But then we made the strategic decision not to go there.

MS. SPEIER: But wasn't there a need to kind of develop his foreign relation credentials?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not when you're trying to win an election in the United States.

MS. SPEIER: Well, you created the committee, and you said by your own -- the reason why you created this -- one of these committees was to stop the media from saying, we don't have a foreign policy team. So it sounds like this whole gathering was for show and for a photo op. Is that a fair comment?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That might not be an unfair assessment.

MS. SPEIER: Okay.

██████████ Five minutes.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congresswoman, may we just have 1 minute?

MS. SPEIER: Certainly.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.

MS. SPEIER: So this introduction that you made electronically to Mr. Clovis and Mr. Glassner, I mean normally when I forward something to members of my staff I say -- there's some instructions associated with it.

What were the instructions that you -- or what were the comments in the email that you sent to them relative to Mr. Page?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Without the privilege of having the email directly in

front of me, the best I can recall it would say, "Please follow up."

MS. SPEIER: Please follow up? So you are doing -- do you have copies of your emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So you are doing all of this by recollection?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Well, I have had the privilege of reviewing some emails prior to being here.

MS. SPEIER: And how did you do that?

MR. CHAVKIN: We are not going to get into attorney-client communications here.

MS. SPEIER: Well, no, this is not -- we're talking about his work product when he was the campaign manager during the time of the campaign. I am just -- he says he's been able to review them. I'm curious, because he didn't produce any documents for us.

MR. CHAVKIN: That's correct.

MS. SPEIER: So we're kind of flying dark here, or blind. And yet he's turned everything over. I mean the rationale for not giving us production was that he turned over his phone and email and computer to the campaign and didn't have access to it. So his recollection has become pretty sharp. And when I asked him just now, he said he was able to review them.

So I'm asking a simple question, where did you review them?

MR. CHAVKIN: We're not going to get into attorney-client communications, but I can tell you that the source of the emails were not Mr. Lewandowski -- was not Mr. Lewandowski.

MS. SPEIER: I yield.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

Mr. Lewandowski, did you review documents in preparation for your testimony today that you did not receive from your counsel?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

MR. ROONEY: I will say, if you'll yield, if there are documents that or emails that were requested with regard to the parameters of this investigation, and you do have those, or you find them, I think that what Ms. Speier was asking is a fair question. And I request that they would be produced.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: So to be clear, I have no access or product from those emails. I have no access to them. I have no copies of them.

MS. SPEIER: Your counsel has just indicated that he has access to documents. You reviewed those documents. They deal with this investigation. We asked for you to produce documents, and you've produced nothing.

MR. CHAVKIN: The question that was asked was whether -- in the letter -- was whether Mr. Lewandowski had any documents relevant to the parameters stated in the letter. He does not have any of those documents.

What his counsel may have is not his. And those are -- and I think Congressman Schiff was asking the correct question, which is whether Mr. Lewandowski has seen documents from outside of whatever his counsel may have shown him. And the answer is, as he said, no, as best he can recall.

And by the way, with respect to the chairman's point, we completely agree.

MR. ROONEY: I'm not really sure -- I'm not really sure how -- I'd have to research or ask for counsel's guidance with regard to I understand that you may have documents that he doesn't have possession of that he was able to review to

help refresh his recollection, that those weren't in his possession, and that they might be attorney-client --

MR. CHAVKIN: No, Mr. Chairman, it's not that he had the documents and turned them over to me so he --

MR. ROONEY: No, I wasn't implying that. It seems you are saying that you had them. And that's a work product between you and him.

I don't know how to rule, if I was ruling, other than to say, if they are of assistance to this committee and it's a report, then we would request that they would be turned over.

Go ahead.

MS. SPEIER: So, again, when you forwarded Carter Page's email to Mr. Clovis and Mr. Glassner and your instructions were -- go ahead. Take your time.

MR. CHAVKIN: I apologize.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. CHAVKIN: May I just help here a bit? I hope this helps.

MS. SPEIER: Certainly.

MR. CHAVKIN: I have no reason to think, as I sit here today, although I should go back and double check, no reason to think that you -- that we have some document you don't have. And, in fact, the emails that you have been reading from, which I would urge if you would consider providing us a copy of if you are going to question him on that, those are emails that would fall into the category of what you were asking about, about other documents he has seen.

So I believe, in answer to both yours and the chair's question, that you've got all the documents.

MR. ROONEY: Right. We've done that before. If you have copies of

what you want to ask him and ask him about what he's reading to refresh his recollection, we've done that before.

MS. SPEIER: We are happy to present you with these documents if you would like them. It's just -- it's very important for us to have production by those that we interview. I think you can understand that, counsel. And, you know, to say that, well, we don't have any documents that you haven't already gotten from the campaign, how do you know what we have and what we don't have in? And how do we know that the campaign has been fulsome in coming forward?

MR. CHAVKIN: Because I have every reason to believe that the campaign has made productions in response to your subpoenas that would be -- that would include and be greater than whatever we've seen.

MR. CASTRO: But, counsel, at that point you are relying on the good faith of another party.

MR. CHAVKIN: Yeah.

MR. CASTRO: But that's not the role of the counsel, to rely on the good faith of another party unrelated to your interview?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Castro, you are not entitled, in my view, to subpoena me for my documents. Mr. Lewandowski does not have any documents. And that's the end of it.

MR. SCHIFF: If I could, I think what, presuming what is going on here is this is not a situation in which Mr. Lewandowski has documents and he is merely presuming that we have them because we have documents from the campaign. It sounds like Mr. Lewandowski's counsel has obtained documents from counsel for the campaign that he shared with his client to prepare him.

And so that's a very different situation than we have had encountered with

other witnesses who have simply -- who do have documents, but presume that we already have them and therefore they have no obligation to turn them over. Am I on the right track, counsel.

MR. CHAVKIN: If I may, Congressman Schiff, so that I don't impinge on the privilege, if you describe the situation that you just described as a hypothetical, I would agree completely with it.

MR. ROONEY: But, again, if Ms. Speier wants to provide him with a copy of what she wants to ask him about and see if he can remember those specific emails, I don't have a problem with doing that.

MR. SCHIFF: Of course.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. So let's try this one more time. So follow up, which is what you evidently said in your email introduction of Carter Page, is that code for something, or what would Sam Clovis think to do with a followup? It turns out that he ends up on an advisory committee to the President, then candidate, and has a very focused interest in the Russia relationship with the United States.

MR. CHAVKIN: So, Congresswoman Speier, just to be clear, he can't speculate about what Sam Clovis would have thought. He can certainly tell you what he would have intended by those words as he hears them today --

MS. SPEIER: Fair enough.

MR. CHAVKIN: -- knowing that he doesn't remember the email, but is --

MS. SPEIER: Fair enough.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would hope Sam Clovis would follow up, meaning contact the individual who was presumably on the below email chain and have a conversation.

MS. SPEIER: So in July of 2016, Mr. Page discussed in testimony before

this committee last month that he gave a graduation speech at the New Economic School in Moscow. He acknowledged having met with members of the Russian Government, including Deputy Prime Minister Arkady Dvorkovich. He also testified that in advance of this trip he informed several members of the campaign about the trip.

Do you recall Mr. Page mentioning this trip to you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, Mr. Page sent me an email on or about June 19th asking for permission or telling me that he wanted to go there and providing me a draft of his speech, and in the body of that email indicated at the same location that Barack Obama spoke at in 2009.

MS. SPEIER: So what did you respond to in that email? Do you recall?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my ability, to paraphrase, I said, I don't care what you do, as long as you don't go and pretend that you represent the campaign.

MR. ROONEY: Jackie, excuse me. We're voting at 4:45. And I was just going to yield to you until we go to vote.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Thank you.

In fact, it suggests that you said: Carter, if you want to do this it would be outside of your role with DJT for President Campaign. I am certain Mr. Trump will not be able to attend. Thanks, Corey.

So you did in fact interact with Carter Page on a personal level. I mean he had your email. You were able to communicate with him, correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was not a personal level, it was a professional level.

MS. SPEIER: Excuse me. Professional level.

But it wasn't just a pass to Sam Clovis. At some point, he was able to access your email, was communicating with you on a professional level about his ability to assist the campaign as it related to Russia, it would appear, correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Page had included me on a series of emails that were originally to other participants, but cc'ed me on them.

MS. SPEIER: Well, this one would suggest that he emailed you, J.D. Gordon, and Hope Hicks.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that to be accurate, yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Were you aware that J.D. Gordon had previously advised against Mr. Page's trip?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MS. SPEIER: Any concern about Page making this trip given his affiliation with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was not affiliated with the campaign in my mind, and so I had no concern.

MS. SPEIER: He did have an advisory position with the campaign, did he not?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He had a volunteer position for a committee which met exactly one time, that he did not attend.

MS. SPEIER: And it was the national security committee?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that's right, which Mr. Page did not attend that meeting.

MS. SPEIER: Correct. There was a subsequent meeting, though, was there not?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my recollection.



MS. SPEIER: Would it surprise you to learn that the Russians became interested in hosting Page as a commencement speaker after learning of his affiliation with the Trump campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no knowledge of their interaction with Mr. Page at all.

MS. SPEIER: Were you aware that Mr. Page solicited feedback from campaign officials on how best to tailor his remarks in Moscow?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe Mr. Page provided me a copy of his proposed speech that he was going to give.

MS. SPEIER: Would you be surprised to learn that Mr. Page submitted an executive summary of his trip to Russia in the campaign format to the foreign policy team?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not -- I don't believe I was ever made privy to that information and was not part of that email exchange.

MS. SPEIER: All right. Let's move on to George Papadopoulos.

How would you describe George Papadopoulos's role in the campaign's foreign policy advisory team?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He was a participant in, to the best of my knowledge, the one meeting when the foreign policy team met in Washington, D.C.

MS. SPEIER: Was that the first time you met him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe it was, yes.

MS. SPEIER: The committee has become aware of extensive activity by Mr. Papadopoulos as a surrogate during the campaign, through the transition, and even immediately after the inauguration.

As campaign chair or manager, to what extent were you involved with or

knowledgeable about Mr. Papadopoulos' activities?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I had extremely limited personal interaction with Mr. Papadopoulos. I think to the best of my knowledge I only met him that one time at the hotel in March of 2016 during the foreign policy meeting. And then the rest of my communication or contact with Mr. Papadopoulos would have been via email.

MS. SPEIER: So you did give him your email account -- address, I should say?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Well, everybody had it. It was [REDACTED], [REDACTED], which was the same standard deviation for every person on the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: Did you give him your email address?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Papadopoulos?

MS. SPEIER: Yes.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's possible I provided him a business card. But I couldn't speak to that specifically.

MS. SPEIER: So Mr. Papadopoulos kept you apprised of his meetings and media appearances by email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, I don't think that would be a fair statement, that he kept me apprised of his media appearances. That wouldn't have fallen under my day-to-day responsibility of understanding when a potential surrogate would be on television.

So I am not -- I would have to go back and look at the number of emails that Mr. Papadopoulos sent me. But in the course of the approximately 282,000 emails I received over an 18-month window, a very small fraction of those would have come from Mr. Papadopoulos.

MS. SPEIER: So have you reviewed all 282,000 of those emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MS. SPEIER: What percentage would you say you've reviewed?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I couldn't speak to that. A very small percentage.

MS. SPEIER: But you do recall him sending you an email and keeping you apprised of meetings he was having.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would need to, again, review the email in question to make sure I can speak accurately towards it.

MS. SPEIER: I yield to Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: You mentioned that you may have received or sent and received 282,000 emails as part of the Trump campaign. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's what I have been told, yes.

MR. CASTRO: And upon your departure from the campaign, did you delete those emails or leave them on the server? How did you handle that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When I terminated my relationship with the campaign, I provided them my laptop, which was my work-issued laptop, that had all of my emails on it, and they kept, physically kept the laptop computer and any emails. And I have never had access from the day of June 20th, 2016, forward to that server again.

MR. CASTRO: But prior to leaving the campaign, did you go through and delete any of those emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, not to the best of my knowledge.

MR. CASTRO: Did you transfer any of those emails to any other account, a personal account or any other account? Did you forward any of those emails, any of them?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Of the 282,000?

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would say it's entirely possible that there was an email forwarded to a personal account on some type of information.

MR. CASTRO: About how many? Any idea?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MS. SPEIER: So did Mr. Papadopoulos seek any authority from you or others prior to meeting with foreign officials?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe he sought authority from me, and I don't think I could speak accurately to who he may have sought, if there was someone other than me.

MS. SPEIER: Did he seek any guidance from you or others on which meetings to pursue and which countries to visit and what to say?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe that he asked my specific guidance on what he would say. And, again, I would not have been Mr. Papadopoulos' primary point of contact at the campaign. That would have been driven by potentially Mr. Clovis or someone, Mr. Gordon, depending on what time of the campaign we were talking about.

So as the campaign became more intense, I just wasn't interacting with a Mr. Papadopoulos or a Mr. Page with any type of regular frequency because I was trying to oversee the staff that was now built in 40 States and all the staff at the campaign headquarters.

MS. SPEIER: So were you with the candidate Trump when he met with the editorial board, I believe it was with The Washington Post, and he was asked about who his foreign affairs advisory team included?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was present for that meeting, yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And if I recall correctly, correct me if I'm wrong, one of the names he mentioned was George Papadopoulos. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe candidate Trump mentioned two or three names that were at the top of the document and read those out loud to the editorial board, yes.

MS. SPEIER: So George Papadopoulos was one of those names?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that's accurate.

MS. SPEIER: Now, more recently he has been referred to I think by maybe even the President and others as the coffee boy. Is that an unfair assessment of his role?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MS. SPEIER: You think it is a fair assessment of his role?

MR. CHAVKIN: Just 1 minute.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think I would characterize Mr. Papadopoulos' role at the campaign as very limited in scope and very limited with any type of direct interaction with the candidate and myself.

MS. SPEIER: But not a coffee boy?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm not sure if Mr. Papadopoulos drinks coffee or not. He never worked in the campaign headquarters.

MS. SPEIER: Coffee boy would be someone bringing coffee to someone else.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe Mr. Papadopoulos ever worked in our campaign headquarters. I don't believe Mr. Papadopoulos ever spent any time in

the campaign headquarters.

And, again, I think the only interaction I ever had with Mr. Papadopoulos face-to-face was on March 31st at the Trump hotel. And I can't speak for candidate Trump, but during my tenure with him that would be, to the best of my recollection, the only time Mr. Trump ever met George Papadopoulos as well.

MS. SPEIER: So who prepped the candidate Trump with the document that he had before him when he was meeting with the editorial board that had Mr. Papadopoulos' name on it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Clovis assembled that document.

MS. SPEIER: So Mr. Clovis thought enough of Mr. Papadopoulos to put him on a list that the candidate Trump would refer to as part of his foreign policy team, but you are suggesting he had a very limited and restricted role within the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So it was a lot of smoke and mirrors?

MR. CHAVKIN: What was a lot of smoke and mirrors?

MS. SPEIER: The presentation by then-candidate Trump to the editorial board.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can't speak to what Mr. Trump thought about it. But Mr. Trump was provided a list of individuals who Mr. Clovis compiled to serve on a board. And I believe at the time at least some of those individuals, if not the plurality, Mr. Trump had had no previous interaction with.

MS. SPEIER: Did Mr. Papadopoulos ever meet with candidate Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe they met at the Trump hotel on the day of the foreign policy meeting.

MS. SPEIER: Do you recall if they had any conversation independent of the meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I cannot recall it, no.

MS. SPEIER: Did Mr. Papadopoulos say anything at the meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: As I testified to earlier, I was in and out of that meeting, and I don't recall any conversation or discussion that Mr. Papadopoulos would have had that took place at that time.

MS. SPEIER: Did Mr. Papadopoulos ever share with you his interactions with Russian officials or Russia-linked persons?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my recollection, but if there is an email exchange that would say otherwise I would be willing to review that. But to the best of my knowledge, I don't recall it.

MS. SPEIER: In the statement of the offense, Mr. Papadopoulos admits that on or about April 26th he met with "the Professor," quote-unquote, "for breakfast at a London hotel. During this meeting, the Professor told Mr. Papadopoulos that he had just returned from a trip to Moscow where he had met with high-level Russian Government officials" and "learned that Russia had obtained 'dirt' on then-candidate Clinton," described as the Russians "have dirt on her"; "the Russians had emails of Clinton"; "they have thousands of emails."

Mr. Papadopoulos was thus informed before the public had any knowledge that Russia had secured thousands of emails relating to Clinton.

This is kind of big news. Did Mr. Papadopoulos tell you about these emails?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congresswoman, it would really expedite, and in fairness to the witness, if you are reading from something, we'd appreciate your showing it to him so he can look at it and then respond to you.

MS. SPEIER: This is the statement of the offense, which we're happy to provide you with.

MR. CHAVKIN: Terrific.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have never seen that document.

MS. SPEIER: So this is what he is admitting to.

MR. ROONEY: What was the source of that again?

MS. SPEIER: This is the statement of the offense.

MR. ROONEY: From where?

MS. SPEIER: For his admitting guilt.

MR. ROONEY: Oh, to the special prosecutor?

MS. SPEIER: To the court.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: You know, Congresswoman, just to be clear, I don't believe I have ever been given any indication that he would have access to information or Russians would have access to information of Hillary Clinton's emails. I was never made aware of that, to the best of my knowledge, ever.

MS. SPEIER: So he did not tell you about these emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

MS. SPEIER: And he never referenced this professor who had come back from a Russian trip and had dirt on Hillary Clinton?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Again, not to the best of my knowledge. I was never made aware of any professor.

MS. SPEIER: So you never had knowledge of any of this conversation that took place between the professor and Mr. Papadopoulos?

MR. CHAVKIN: Outside of press reports.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That would be accurate. I have no knowledge, had



no knowledge of those conversations, to the best of my recollection, zero.

MS. SPEIER: Were you aware of Mr. Papadopoulos' international travel and outreach during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not follow his travel schedule.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. There is an email here which we can make available to you, 21107-8.

While they are getting that particular email, let me ask you some questions unrelated to the email.

To your knowledge, did Papadopoulos develop and maintain relationships with any Trump campaign officials, Mr. Kushner, Mr. Bannon, Ms. Hicks, Mr. Miller, Mr. Flynn?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To my knowledge, Mr. Papadopoulos' primary point of contact at the campaign would have been Dr. Clovis. He would have also had an opportunity to have an email exchange or multiple email exchanges with Ms. Hicks.

I cannot speak to any interaction he would have had with General Flynn, as General Flynn and my time did not overlap, nor did my time with Mr. Bannon overlap at the campaign.

MS. SPEIER: So it would have been Ms. Hicks and whom else? I am sorry?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Dr. Clovis. Potentially other members of the team. You know, J.D. Gordon or Rick Dearborn or other. But I couldn't speak to anything that wasn't part of when I was there.

MS. SPEIER: All right.

So does this look familiar to you now?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And when you received that, that would suggest that Mr. Papadopoulos was now in Israel and had met with high ranking officials and was happy to try and arrange for a meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It does say that, yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Was this part of your contemplation of creating that opportunity for candidate Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And did you respond to this?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, I don't recall. If I did, it would have been on this chain. But I don't believe I did.

MS. SPEIER: Are you aware of campaign officials who might have traveled with Mr. Papadopoulos during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I am aware of none.

MS. SPEIER: To your knowledge, when did President Trump learn that Mr. Papadopoulos had been arrested and interrogated by the FBI?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I have no idea, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: When were you made aware?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Whenever the public report was.

MS. SPEIER: To your knowledge, how did President Trump react upon learning of Papadopoulos' arrest and later guilty plea?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm fully prepared to answer anything, and I'm happy to come back, that pertains to my tenure from January 1st through June 20th of 2016. I'm fully prepared to answer all of those questions about anything that had to do with my time at the Trump campaign.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MS. SPEIER: Well, this was during your time at the Trump campaign.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am, it was not.

MS. SPEIER: The Papadopoulos -- most of this happened in May and --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Papadopoulos' arrest took place in 2017, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Well, I know, but his engagement with the campaign was during the time that you were the campaign manager.

MR. CHAVKIN: Right, but your question was how the President reacted to the arrest, if I'm not mistaken.

MS. SPEIER: That's correct.

MR. CHAVKIN: And that's well after.

MS. SPEIER: That is after, but it does deal with Mr. Papadopoulos, who was associated with the campaign when Mr. Lewandowski was there. So that's part of this ongoing discussion that we're going to probably have to come back and talk about.

MR. CHAVKIN: Sure. No, we understand, and I want to make absolutely clear for the record, Mr. Lewandowski is perfectly prepared to come back and answer those questions.

MR. SCHIFF: May I, if I could?

MS. SPEIER: I yield.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, were you instructed by anyone at the White House not to answer questions after the end of the campaign?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman Schiff, if he answers that question, can we have an agreement that that doesn't open the floodgates to asking about every conversation he may have had?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SCHIFF: Counsel, I'm not prepared to reach any agreement to allow the witness not to answer relevant questions about the investigation. And I don't want to parse words and have him say he wasn't instructed, but we didn't ask if he was asked.

So, no, I'm not going to allow a lawyerly answer to that question because we got a lawyerly answer already to an earlier question about the parameters of the investigation, which really didn't respond to my inquiry.

MR. CHAVKIN: Right. I think we disagree about whether this was a lawyerly answer to your question. I think we have a dispute, I hope it's a good faith dispute, about what we understood this interview was going to relate to and what we prepared for.

And as I said before and will say again, this is not a refusal to answer those questions. It is a decision to come prepared to answer those questions truthfully at a future time.

MR. SCHIFF: It's a refusal to answer those questions today.

I will yield back to Ms. Speier.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's just grandstanding, Congressman. I've said I will answer any question that pertains to what I have prepared for, which is my tenure at the campaign for 18 months. I'm prepared to sit here all night and do that.

So if you want to step out and have a conversation with the media that says I'm not answering the questions, that's dishonest. You want to sit here all night and go through the questions, I'll be happy to do it.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, I will fairly characterize your position, which is today you would not answer any questions concerning any communications or any other meetings or discussions relevant to our investigation if

they took place after the day you left your campaign. You have expressed a willingness to come back at some date in the future. But today you refused to answer questions.

Yesterday, you promised to answer every question we had, and today you refused. So you can justify that if you wish. My colleagues can justify that if they wish. I can't justify that. And I'm not going to allow you to hide behind closed doors and represent yesterday --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Then let's do this in public, Congressman. I'll be happy to have this conversation in public. Let's do a full hearing any time you want in public. I'm all onboard.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, if you want to live up to what you said yesterday publicly, you have every opportunity to do that today.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Great. And what I -- no, this is not public, Congressman. This is behind closed doors.

MR. SCHIFF: And yesterday, Mr. Lewandowski, did you say on FOX News that you were going to answer any question, but up until the end of the campaign?

MR. ROONEY: I think that we have litigated the fact that Mr. Lewandowski said that he was going to come here and answer questions with regard to what his impression of the request was and that he is prepared to do that. And whether we interpret that's what he said on TV yesterday or not is debatable.

I don't think that anybody's going to win this argument here, just as you and I, we're never going to come to a meeting of the minds as to what the impression was of what the witness was going to testify to.

If you want to go outside and say that the witness is refusing to answer questions, have at it. You've done it before. I'm sure you'll do it again.

He said that he would come back once he's prepared to answer the questions with regard to everything after he left the campaign, which I think is more than gracious.

But we have 10 minutes left to vote. So with that, let's --

MR. SCHIFF: That's fine, Mr. Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. SCHIFF: And you can go out and explain why --

MR. ROONEY: I don't go out and explain anything, Adam, as you know, I don't talk to the press.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, that's not true either. That's not true.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. If I ever say anything with regards --

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Rooney, it is our time, it is our time with the mike.

MR. ROONEY: Well, it really isn't. I gave Jackie more than 15 minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: I was trying to yield back to Jackie when you interrupted.

So --

MR. ROONEY: Well, we're going to recess anyway. So we'll be back once these votes are over.

[Recess.]

[5:57 p.m.]

MR. STEWART: I'm Congressman Stewart. We're just tag-teaming today. We would like to make this as convenient for you. We appreciate the fact you're staying, and we would like to, as I'm sure you would, finish this in 1 day rather than have to have you come back.

So, Ms. Speier, I'll turn the time over to you. I believe it's --

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Let's move onto April 26, 2016. This is the Mayflower event. So the Center for National Interest is a Washington, D.C.-based think tank. Why did you select that particular think tank to be the sponsor of the event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just for clarification, ma'am, I did not select them. Mr. Kushner selected them.

MS. SPEIER: And did you have a conversation with Mr. Kushner as to why they were selected?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Kushner indicated that he had a relationship with someone at the think tank, and they had offered to host candidate Trump to give a foreign policy speech.

MS. SPEIER: Was that person Dmitri Simes?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Which is the person that runs the Center for National Interest. He's a Russian emigre with close ties to the Russian Government, and CNI has promoted pro-Russian Government policies in the United States for years. So that organization wasn't necessarily vetted because it came from the son-in-law of the candidate?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, ma'am. Mr. Kushner ran point on that

particular event, including working directly with Dmitri. And I did not run point on that particular event.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Did you attend the event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And what was your role in planning the event then?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My only role in that event was looking at the logistics of where the event would potentially be held. And there was a discussion just prior to the event taking place that we would move the venue.

There was an original discussion that the event would take place at The Press Club in Washington, and then there was a discussion at the Mayflower, and there was also a discussion that the event would take place in Virginia at Mr. Trump's golf course.

MS. SPEIER: And so you opted for the Mayflower?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: Did you help in drafting the speech or making edits to it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe -- while I had a draft of the speech, there might have been some modifications that were made. And I believe I would have, to the best of my recollection, sent that speech over to another individual for their review, and I believe that individual was Admiral Chuck Kubic.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. So there is a Bates No. 10898-10900. Do we have a copy of that available? While we're getting that for you, do you know who Admiral Kubic is? Obviously, you do because you sent it to him. So who is he, and why was he selected to read the draft?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Retired Admiral Chuck Kubic was a member of our foreign policy team and an individual who we relied on for some foreign policy



discussions.

MS. SPEIER: Was he in that picture?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe he was, ma'am, yes.

MS. SPEIER: So there's some people in that picture that you relied on more heavily than others, it would seem, if Mr. Kubic was an important person that you relied on and Mr. Papadopoulos was not.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, Admiral Kubic was someone who we relied on; General Mitsuzawa, also a person who we relied on from the foreign policy team, who was also in this picture; Walid Phares, probably a person who we spent some more time talking to than others; and, obviously, Senator Sessions.

MS. SPEIER: So, as we're still trying to get the email for you to look at -- you don't have it? So who was involved in drafting the original speech? Was it Jared Kushner? Rick Dearborn? Dmitri Simes?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know who drafted the original version of the speech. It had gone through, I believe, a series of edits with Dr. Clovis involved, Mr. Kushner involved, Mr. Simes involved. There were potentially others who -- but I can't say who drafted the original portion. I'm sorry.

MS. SPEIER: So I'm -- we're going to present you with this document Bates 10898-10900 for you to take a couple minutes to look at. This is an email you sent.

Have you read it?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: So it would appear that you -- this is an email from you, and you emailed Paul and Governor Christie and copied Steve Miller. And you make it clear that you're having Admiral Kubic -- working with him, proposing some fairly significant edits to all three documents. And you reference the attachment.

So, based on who you emailed, does that help you determine who might have done the original draft?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I -- again, ma'am, I don't know who composed the original draft, if that was Mr. Miller or Mr. Kushner, or if someone from the think tank provided them the draft, and then they edited it before I saw it.

So I can't say the original draft. I received a copy of a proposed speech, of which I shared with Admiral Kubic and went through a series of potential changes to that.

MS. SPEIER: So you said -- you've made some fairly significant edits. What were the kinds of edits that you made to the speech with his assistance?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would -- again, I would need to go back and familiarize myself with the red line edits, which, you know, the email here is from April of 2016. So I don't feel I could tell you, looking back now almost 2 full years, what those edits were on that particular document.

MS. SPEIER: But you were trying -- this was a very significant speech that then-candidate Trump was making. You wanted to convey a certain message. There were significant edits made to this speech. So what was the intent to convey and what was the final product, in your mind, that you were able to produce that conveyed the kind of message you wanted produced?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: During this period of time at the campaign was a time where Paul and Jared begin to inject themselves into more matters. And what I was trying to do was to demonstrate the ability to bring in some outside sources to provide additional information.

And that's why I solicited the advice of Admiral Kubic in this and asked him originally to make those changes and then sent this email to Governor Christie and

Paul with a cc to Jared Kushner and Stephen Miller so that we could potentially all have one talking point, one discussion point of where we would move forward because there were multiple people involved in the drafting of it.

MS. SPEIER: So, when you said that Paul Manafort was injecting himself into the campaign more assertively, do you think his policy bent was something that he was injecting into the speech and that's why you sent it off to Admiral Kubic to have these major changes to the speech made?

██████████ Four minutes.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My inclination to send to Admiral Kubic was just a well-respected Navy admiral who has a vast wealth of experience, which I didn't have, on foreign policy matters, and I wanted him to look at it with a critical eye. And I can't speak to what, if anything, Mr. Manafort was trying to put into the speech.

MS. SPEIER: Can you explain the sequence of events at the Mayflower that day?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: As it relates to -- so I'll be happy to go through to the best of my recollection. It included -- I believe we landed the Trump plane at Reagan National Airport that morning. I traveled in a motorcade with candidate Trump. It was a fairly small motorcade.

We had Secret Service protection at the time, but we arrived through the side door of the Mayflower Hotel. We entered, walked down about four stairs where there was a large conference area with high-top tables and some food trays set up on the far right side.

And then off of that room, there was a small conference room where there was a private reception taking place, and we came out of that conference room. You'd walk back, coming out of that door to the left, which would have been my right.

You'd go around a corner where there was a large blue rope -- curtain set up.

There were three or four chairs behind that, a teleprompter was set there. And when you walked around that front, forward part of the blue curtain is where the podium was set for the candidate to speak from, and there were probably a series of between 40 and 100 chairs set for guests who were going to come and listen to Mr. Trump make those prepared remarks.

MS. SPEIER: So who developed the guest list for the speech?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The guest list was developed by Mr. Manafort, Mr. Kushner, in consultation with the host committee, the host entity, Dmitri.

MS. SPEIER: So this was Dmitri Simes who had -- who promoted Russian Government policies in the United States for years?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: And when you arrived, did you, you and candidate Trump, go directly to the reception?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When we arrived, we pulled in in the motorcades, and candidate Trump came down the stairs, went -- almost immediately was met -- Mr. Manafort and Mr. Kushner had met us there. They did not travel with us, I believe. I may be mistaken. Mr. Kushner might have been with us, but Mr. Manafort, I believe, met us there at the hotel that day.

They attended, walked into what was then a small, private reception, with a handful of people, maybe a dozen, maybe slightly more than that. There was a brief meet-and-greet, to the best of my recollection. Those individuals left the room, and then Mr. Trump came to the backside of that blue curtain. He made a couple modifications to a copy of the speech that Mr. Gaetz (ph) handed him.

He took out a black pen, made some modifications. Those modifications

were then added to the teleprompter. And then Mr. Trump came around, gave that speech, and then we immediately departed the Mayflower Hotel.

MS. SPEIER: So you said there was just a dozen or half dozen? How many people were at that reception?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, less than 20, more than 12.

MS. SPEIER: More than 12 and less than 20. And was Ambassador Kislyak at that reception?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I am told he was, yes.

MS. SPEIER: You're told he was. Do you have knowledge that he was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just the public reports. I did not attend that reception, as I was dealing with another campaign matter at the time, so I did not go into that room and have a conversation with any of the participants.

MS. SPEIER: But how did you know there were 12 to 20 people in the room?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I could physically see them. But I had never met, to the best of my knowledge, Ambassador Kislyak and wouldn't have known him if he was there. I believe I was provided an email of --

MS. SPEIER: The guests.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: -- the attendees, who would be attending, yes.

MS. SPEIER: And that was an email that the campaign should have, and therefore, we should have. Is that correct?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can't -- I can just tell you that I was sent an email, I believe at some point, of the individuals, the number of ambassadors who would be in attendance of Mr. Trump's speech that day. And there were probably six to eight

ambassadors from various countries.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. Who was with the candidate at that reception since you had stepped away to carry -- to deal with another issue?

██████████ One minute.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Schiller would have been with us that day.

MS. SPEIER: Anyone else? Was Hope Hicks with you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ms. Hicks would have been there. Mr. Scavino was with us.

MS. SPEIER: So Ms. Hicks could have been in the room with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can't speak to where she was that day.

MS. SPEIER: But she was, in fact, part of the motorcade that came in?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

MS. SPEIER: All right. So time, okay.

MR. STEWART: All right. Thank you.

Mr. King.

MR. KING: Thank you. Unfortunately, I'm going to have to leave at about 6:30, but I did want to, before I go, first of all, thank you for your testimony today. It's probably more detail than we've got from any other witness, and I appreciate you doing it.

And I also appreciate the fact you said you're more than willing to come back and answer all questions. And I think you should get credit for good faith for that, and don't expect it, but I think you deserve it.

I really only have one question. You probably spent more body time with the candidate during that -- certainly from -- well, let's say, from June of '15 to at least April or May of 2016.

During that time, on the plane, in casual conversations where you're just sitting around BSing, was there ever any talk at all of any special overtures to Russia or any reaching out to Russia or any thought of getting cooperation from Russia, even in casual conversation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never. The only conversation, to the best of my knowledge, that we ever had as it related to Russia was twofold: One, where candidate Trump said, "Wouldn't it be great to have a better relationship with Russia so we could work together to rid ourselves of ISIS and Syria," and that was a statement that he had made very publicly, many, many times. And the other time was where he responded to a comment that President Putin made about Donald Trump and Mr. Trump dictated a response, which was then publicly shared from the campaign, on Mr. Putin.

MR. KING: Do you recall what that was, the statement was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would need to summarize it, but it was something along the lines of: Having a strong leader in Russia is a good thing, and I'm thankful that he recognized me for my strong leadership -- or some of that -- and please, don't quote me, but it was something of that nature. And that statement was, I believe, in or about December of 2015.

MR. KING: And -- okay. Go ahead.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: And then the only other conversation, again, to the best of my recollection, we ever had with Russia was originally there was some discussion fairly early on in the campaign about making a television commercial for the campaign. And it was going to originally be filmed at Mar-a-Lago, and it was going to be a series of Russians around a conference table. It was supposed to be election night.

And in the background was going to be a television, on and it was going to flash, "Donald Trump wins." And we were going to do this early. And the Russians were going to throw their, you know, hats off and say, "I can't believe we -- they now have a tough leader, tougher than us. What are we ever going to do?" So -- but we scrapped that idea.

MR. KING: Okay. And, again, I guess you answered this before, but names like Papadopoulos, was that ever brought up on the plane or in the hotel or when you were eating McDonalds?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Papadopoulos was not a topic of conversation I ever remember having with Mr. Trump. It just never happened. And the same is very true, to the best of my knowledge, with Mr. Page. They were just not individuals who I was interacting with and, by extension, because I was with the candidate, he was interacting with on any type of normal frequency.

MR. KING: Okay. And thank you again for your testimony.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman, before you leave, because you've been so gracious, I also want to make sure with Congressman Schiff here that we make this very clear: Without going down a road that we haven't prepared on, what Mr. Lewandowski can categorically say is that no one told or suggested -- and these are not lawyer-like words, Congressman -- no one told or suggested to him that he not answer any of your questions.

MR. KING: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: We appreciate that. And we understand that this is, you know, that these can be long. They can be tiring. We appreciate your patience with it.



So the majority side has no more questions. We'll turn the time over to Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you.

I appreciate the clarification, Counsel. And I'm not going to hold you to commitment to answer this question because of the clarification, but I want to make sure, you're not saying though that he didn't discuss his testimony today with people in the White House, including the President?

MR. CHAVKIN: Again, we've made clear our position on that. Happy to come back after we've prepared on all conversations. But we want to just make clear that no one connected to the White House or otherwise has instructed, told, or suggested to Mr. Lewandowski that he not answer any of your questions.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. Mr. Lewandowski, what was the nature of your relationship with Mr. Manafort during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I describe it as adversarial.

MR. SCHIFF: And was it that way throughout?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Only after the first meeting.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. I would say that's throughout.

We have had testimony about this so I want to ask you as well, did it ever come to your attention that you thought Mr. Manafort might be engaged in unlawful activity during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did have some concerns about Mr. Manafort's activity during his tenure at the campaign that would have been involved with illegal activity, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And what were those concerns?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Specifically, I was concerned about Mr. Manafort's

ability to steal money from the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: And what raised those concerns with you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The system which the campaign had in place would preclude any individual at the campaign at any time from writing a check, obviously. So there was checks and balances, there was a comptroller, invoices would get paid, et cetera.

Mr. Manafort was exceptionally insistent on having his own pot of money which I would not be responsible for or have authority to look at, which raised a massive red flag for me, because we'd had a system in place where there was a check and balance and a treasurer who signed off on everything. There was a system that you entered for payments.

And there was a period of time where Mr. Manafort was seeking payment for things that I thought were either questionable or not actually being delivered from vendors.

MR. SCHIFF: And what was the amount of the fund or the transaction that concerned you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were two separate and distinct transactions: The first was a relatively small number. It was under \$20,000, I think, was the first transaction; the second amount was \$730,000.

MR. SCHIFF: And the 730,000, what was that designated for?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was an invoice which was paid to a firm by the name of Left Hand Enterprise (ph), which was supposed to be designated for direct mail in specific early primary States.

MR. SCHIFF: And did Mr. Manafort have a financial stake in Left Hand (ph)?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer because the company was set up 24 hours before we wired it the money.

MR. SCHIFF: And how did this wire transaction come to your attention?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Through the Fair Elections Commission report.

MR. SCHIFF: And did someone read the report and spot that, or did you spot that when you read the report?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, what happened was a disbursement of that size, even on a Presidential campaign, would draw a fair amount of scrutiny because we had an exceptionally low-budget campaign, relative to some of the other candidates.

And I believe a reporter flagged the fact that there was a disbursement to this particular entity called Left Hand Enterprise (ph) in the amount of \$730,000, which at the time, particularly in the primary process, still would have made it one of the top three or four vendors that the campaign had ever used at that point.

MR. SCHIFF: And who identified this item on the FEC report to you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe it was a reporter through a public record.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you raise it with Mr. Manafort, or how did you go about finding out what that expenditure was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I didn't raise it with Mr. Manafort. I raised it with an individual by the name of Allen Weiselberg (ph) and the campaign attorney Don McGahn.

MR. SCHIFF: And how did you later learn what that was for?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was told that it was for -- I believe -- I'd have to clarify it -- on the FEC report it indicated that it was for direct mail expenses. And my experience has been with direct mail vendors that they provide you copies of the

product they put out so that you could verify that this is going out the door, and there were postage receipts and all of those things.

And when we started to inquire, when I specifically started to inquire into this, what would have been a substantial amount of money at the time, brought it to Mr. McGahn's attention and Mr. Weiselberg (ph), and they were going to conduct an investigation into where that money was spent and how it was allocated.

MR. SCHIFF: And what did you learn from that investigation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: You know, I have learned -- the investigation was completed after I departed the campaign, but there was a conversation that I had that Mr. McGahn indicated that they were going to look into where the money was.

And there were multiple occasions wherein Mr. Trump, after the public reports, wanted to know where the money went. And there was some real concern of whether the product was ever delivered. And Mr. Kushner was involved also in the investigative process.

MR. SCHIFF: And were you informed during the time of this investigation, during the time you were on the campaign that this expenditure had been authorized by Mr. Manafort?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was authorized by Mr. Manafort, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And who informed you of that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe Mr. Weiselberg told me of that.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you ever confront Mr. Manafort about this?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not, but I also raised my concern on the day that I left the campaign with -- a Matt Calamari, Sr. (Ph) at The Trump Organization and raised the concern of Mr. Manafort's ability to have full and unlimited access to campaign funds.

MR. SCHIFF: In addition to this transaction, are you aware of other transactions involving Mr. Manafort that concerned you about the lawfulness of the transaction?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I've only been made aware of a potential transaction which was not executed. Although I didn't have firsthand account, I have information from a person who had firsthand account.

MR. SCHIFF: Is that a \$5 million transaction?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is.

MR. SCHIFF: Were there any other activities of Mr. Manafort that raised a legal concern in the time you overlapped?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think those three are the most prominent that would relate to financial improprieties that I would be aware of.

MR. SCHIFF: Are there improprieties of a different nature that you became aware of?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just the public accounts afterwards of his relationships overseas.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you have any foreign travel during your tenure on the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did travel to Aruba on a family vacation.

MR. SCHIFF: And I take it you discussed no campaign business with anyone in Aruba?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just the guy who brought drinks to the pool. No, there was no campaign business talking there.

MR. SCHIFF: Who brought you the drinks wasn't named Boris, was he?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think it was Juan maybe. No, that was a

preplanned family vacation. That was the only travel outside the country I did during that tenure.

MR. SCHIFF: Let me ask you a couple questions, and I apologize if these duplicate some of the questions that were asked of you earlier when I was outside the room.

In a February 17 email -- and we can provide it to you, although my questions are very brief -- from Mr. Page to Mr. Clovis in which you're copied, Mr. Page says at the end of the email: Feel free to call me on my UAE mobile number.

Do you have any understanding why Mr. Page had a UAE cell phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Page has discussed the graduation with us and publicly the graduation speech he gave at the New Economic School in Moscow and meetings that he had while he was there. When did you become aware that Mr. Page wanted to travel to Moscow?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my recollection, I believe he notified me on June 19 of 2016 that he had been invited to go and give a speech there.

MR. SCHIFF: So was that by email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: And that's the email that you replied to saying: Carter, if you want to do this, it would be outside of your role with the DJT for President campaign. I'm certain Mr. Trump would not be able to attend. Thanks, Corey.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Were you aware of whether Mr. Gordon had previously advised Mr. Page against the trip?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not made aware that Mr. Gordon had told him

he was not able to make the trip. I had not been privy to that information prior to that email from Mr. Page.

MR. SCHIFF: And I take it, by the time he went on the trip, you had already left the campaign. Is that right?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: So you never would have been privy to any readout that he sent back about his trip?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. SCHIFF: Is there anything more you can tell us about your knowledge of his plans while you were with the campaign vis-à-vis the trip?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir. I believe my interaction with him as it related to that trip is detailed in that email exchange.

MR. SCHIFF: Who did Mr. Papadopoulos report to on the campaign, to your knowledge?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think his principal point of contact would have been Dr. Clovis, but not as a direct report or an indirect report, just as a principal point of contact.

MR. SCHIFF: According to, I believe, the statement in his -- the statement of the offense, Mr. Papadopoulos states: I'm willing to make the trip off the record if it's in the interest of Mr. Trump and the campaign to meet specific people.

This is posited as a statement that he made to a high-ranking campaign official. Were you that high-ranking campaign official?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman, could you just point us to the paragraph? I think we have the statement from you.

MR. SCHIFF: I believe it is -- let's see here -- -- I don't know whether we

have -- this comes from his statement of the offense. And do we have a copy of that handy?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: We do here.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congresswoman Speier gave it to us.

MR. SCHIFF: I don't have it in front of me to be able to point out to you where that appears, but I can quickly find it for you, I think. There are a couple passages I want to refer to.

MR. CHAVKIN: If you could repeat a couple of the words from your quote, we may be able to find it.

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah. There are two references I wanted to ask you about, Mr. Lewandowski. And, actually, in chronological order, the first takes place on April 25th pursuant to the statement of the offense.

On April 25th, Mr. Papadopoulos emailed a senior campaign adviser and said there was, quote, an open invitation by Putin for Mr. Trump to meet when he is ready. And so I wanted to ask you if you were that senior campaign adviser.

MR. CHAVKIN: Policy adviser, no? Or --

MR. SCHIFF: You know, I don't have the exact language in front of me.

MR. CHAVKIN: Yeah, it actually -- in the statement it says senior policy adviser.

MR. SCHIFF: Senior policy adviser. So, with respect to the April 25th statement, Mr. Lewandowski, are you the senior policy adviser? Or I'm sorry, what is the language?

MR. CHAVKIN: No, you've got it perfectly. Senior policy adviser.

MR. SCHIFF: Were you the senior policy adviser that he's referring to in the statement of the offense?



MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I was, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Did he ever inform you that there was an open invitation by Putin for Mr. Trump to meet when he was ready?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's possible that Mr. Page sent that.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Papadopoulos?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm sorry. Mr. Papadopoulos. It's possible he sent that indication over, but I don't have a direct recollection of it, no.

MR. SCHIFF: The statement of the offense also says that Mr. Papadopoulos asked -- and I believe it's a high-ranking campaign official, although you may have a more specific language -- about arranging a Putin/Trump meeting stating, quote, I am willing to make the trip off the record if it's in the interest of Mr. Trump and the campaign to meet specific people.

Are you the high-ranking campaign official referred to there?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is very possible, but I can't say with 100 percent certainty.

MR. SCHIFF: And why do you say that's very possible?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That would be based on the document I have here, much more inclined as opposed to the earlier statement, which refers to someone as a senior policy adviser. I don't think that would be an accurate representation of who I would have been. And I don't have the email in front of me, but it's possible that that would have been directed towards me and others.

MR. SCHIFF: I'll need to take a look at that statement to see whether it makes any indication of whether this is in person or in writing.

To the best of your recollection, did Mr. Papadopoulos ever tell you he was willing to make a trip to meet with the Russians off the record if that's in the interest

of Mr. Trump and the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Again, sir, I think my only interaction with Mr. Papadopoulos, to the best of my recollection, in person was at the March 31st, 2016, meeting, which took place in the Old Post Office. And so, if this was somehow directed towards me, which is possible, that would have been done via email.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let me, if I could, read from the statement of the offense.

MR. CHAVKIN: Where you were reading from before was 21(a).

MR. SCHIFF: 21(a), okay. Let me back up a little prior to that though. On page 7 of the statement of the offense, the document provides: On or about May 4, 2016, the Russian MFA connection sent an email to defendant Papadopoulos and the professor that stated: I have just talked to my colleagues from the MFA. They are open for cooperation. One option is to take -- to make a meeting for you at the North America desk if you are in Moscow.

It later goes on to say, the next day -- same paragraph: The next day, on or about May 5, 2016, defendant Papadopoulos had a phone call with the campaign supervisor and then forwarded the May 4 MFA email to him, adding to the top of the email, quote, "Russia updates."

Now, that's describing him as campaign supervisor. Would that have been you, Mr. Lewandowski?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe that was me, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Paragraph 17 says: On May 13th, professor emailed Papadopoulos with an update.

Paragraph 18 says: The next day, May 14, 2016, defendant Papadopoulos emailed the high-ranking campaign official and stated that the Russian Government

has also relayed to me they're interested in hosting Mr. Trump.

Are you the high-ranking campaign official referred to in paragraph 18?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I cannot say with certainty that I am, but it is possible.

MR. SCHIFF: Paragraph 19 says: On or about May 21, defendant Papadopoulos emailed another high-ranking campaign official --

MR. STEWART: One minute.

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah. Sorry. Oh, I thought you were saying -- okay. I thought you wanted to interject.

So paragraph 19, defendant Papadopoulos emailed another high-ranking campaign official with the subject line, request from Russia to meet Mr. Trump. The email included the May 4 MFA email and added: Russia has been eager to meet Mr. Trump for quite some time and have been reaching out to me to discuss.

Are you the other high-ranking campaign official referred to in paragraph 19?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe so, but I would need to have a recollection of the email in front of me. It's possible, but I don't believe I am that other high-ranking official.

MR. SCHIFF: I have the impression, Mr. Lewandowski, that you think it's more likely if you're one of these that you are the former, not the latter. Is that fair?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That would be a fair statement, sir, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And why is it that you feel that you're more likely to be the one than the other?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just through my brief recollection of any potential email exchanges that I would have had, I think it would have been more likely I was the former as opposed to another high-ranking campaign official. I don't think I

would have been -- I don't speak for Mr. Papadopoulos, but I don't think I would have been classified or categorized as another high-ranking campaign official.

MR. CHAVKIN: You know, I would also add, Congressman, that to the extent we've been able to compare emails to these assertions, there's a pretty good correlation. So, if you have the underlying emails from those dates, you can match up who is the "to" and who is the "from."

MR. SCHIFF: Well, by that, Counsel, are you suggesting that the emails make clear that he is one of the high-ranking officials we're talking about?

MR. CHAVKIN: I think what you would find is that the emails help drive you in the direction that Mr. Lewandowski has testified.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, I need to make sure that we do, in fact, have all the emails.

MR. STEWART: And that's time.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay.

MR. STEWART: I'm going to follow up with just a couple things, if we could, Mr. Manafort, regarding your concerns -- I'm sorry, Mr. Lewandowski, regarding your concerns about Mr. Manafort. And you mention a couple transactions that were brought to your attention that you were curious about or concerned about. Can you tell us the deposition of those concerns? Was there any investigation that followed? Was anything untoward or illegal determined to have happened?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The first transaction there was not much of an investigation. It was a fairly insignificant amount of money. The second transaction was investigated, and the campaign counsel believed, based on the totality of evidence he saw, that ultimately the mail that was supposed to go out the door went out the door.

MR. STEWART: So, even though you did have concerns in this -- in these cases or instances, apparently, there was nothing illegal or unethical that took place. Is that true?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That was the finding of the campaign counsel, yes, sir.

MR. STEWART: So it's curious to me -- and I don't mean to cover ground, because we'd all like to, you know, not be here all night. So I don't want to repeat or -- and not having had the advantage of being here earlier, I wouldn't want to, you know, replot that ground.

But in the time I've listened to you, it would seem to me that you were a bit of a hands-on manager. Would you describe yourself that way? You weren't a big picture guy. You were down in the details of the campaign. Is that a fair observation?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. STEWART: And I imagine you would consider yourself a conscientious manager. You approached this professionally and were trying to protect the integrity of the campaign. Is that true as well?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It is, sir.

MR. STEWART: And it seems like you had your radar up for anything that was kind of out of the ordinary or unusual?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir, I did.

MR. STEWART: And then would you -- my impression of your campaign was it was smaller than most presidential campaigns at that point, I mean, maybe earlier on in the campaign there were smaller. But at this point that we're describing or later on in the campaign it was still smaller than, say, Hillary Clinton's

campaign or other presidential campaigns who were in the final stage of campaigning. Is that a fair --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Very accurate, yes.

MR. STEWART: So taken together that you were a hands-on manager who did have your radar up and were looking for things that were unusual, do you think it's likely that someone could have been colluding with Russians and you not have any indication of that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. STEWART: And yet, once again, to repeat what Peter asked you, what Representative King asked you, you have no knowledge, no information, no indication at all that anyone that you know in the campaign was colluding or collaborating or coordinating with Russia or Russian agents?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct, sir.

MR. STEWART: All right. And we'll turn the time back over to the minority then. Mr. Schiff.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: If I could just ask what the timeframe would be for, you Mr. Schiff, so I could just understand, please?

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah. I would think that it will probably be another hour. It may be a bit more. It may be a bit less, but I'm hoping that it's not going to be much more than that. So --

MR. STEWART: And, Mr. Swalwell, do you expect to take time as well and give us an idea how long?

MR. SWALWELL: I will probably just let Mr. Schiff finish.

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah, I was saying how -- cumulatively.

MR. STEWART: Okay. All right. Are you okay with that, Corey?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah. I'm okay.

MR. CHAVKIN: Yeah, we are. I do have to try to get back to New York tonight, so I appreciate.

MR. STEWART: Do either of you need to take a break?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. CHAVKIN: We're good right now.

MR. STEWART: Okay. We'll press ahead then. Thank you.

MR. SCHIFF: We're trying to see if we can pull up these emails to the degree we have them, but let me just do my best to go through these expeditiously to the best of your recollection without having anything but the statement of offense in front of us.

Paragraph 20 provides, on or about June 1, defendant Papadopoulos emailed the high-ranking campaign official and asked about Russia. The high ranking campaign official referred him to the campaign supervisor before he was running point. Are you the high-ranking campaign official referenced in paragraph 20?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, I think that would be accurate.

MR. SCHIFF: And the campaign supervisor that you would have referred him to, would that be Sam Clovis?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe it would be.

MR. SCHIFF: With respect to -- I'm looking for the paragraph here -- the previous message that I referenced in the statement of offense where Mr. Papadopoulos is offering to -- let me see if I can find it here.

MR. CHAVKIN: 21(a).

MR. SCHIFF: 21(a), yes. Thank you. Where he is willing to make the trip off the record if it's in the interest of Mr. Trump and the campaign, do you recall responding to that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall writing a response, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know whether anyone else responded to that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I could not speak to another response. I don't believe I was part of a response chain on that, but I could be wrong. It was some time ago.

MR. CHAVKIN: Can you give us a minute?

MR. SCHIFF: Yes.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: From what I have been informed, there may have been a response that said, it is very unlikely that DJT will make the trip.

MR. SCHIFF: And that response would have come from you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: In that response, did you waive Mr. Papadopoulos off in making the trip himself?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that was the totality of my response was just that statement I just provided, so no additional information was provided, I believe.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you view this request in the same way you viewed the Carter Page request?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: In the sense of I didn't take it seriously?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, in any sense.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: For me, this request was not one which would have



been taken seriously as a potential individual going to represent the campaign. And I believe, as Exhibit 21(a) states here, this statement of offense states, June 19, 2016 was the day before my termination.

MR. SCHIFF: Does it seem unusual to you that two out of the five foreign policy advisers on this team would both be proposing trips to Russia, let alone meetings between the candidate and Mr. Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: At that particular time in the campaign, I was not focused on any type of overseas travel or what individuals who were not directly working for me on a day-to-day basis were doing, because I was being maligned in the press on a regular basis.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, in the statement of offense, Mr. Papadopoulos acknowledges being informed by professor with connections to high-level Russian Government officials that those Russian officials had dirt on Hillary Clinton in the form of thousands of emails. I believe you testified earlier that Mr. Papadopoulos never communicated that to you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that's accurate, yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Did anyone else from the campaign communicate that to you, that is that the Russians were in possession of dirt on Hillary Clinton?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe so, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Is that something you would remember if it happened?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would think it would -- I would remember it, and I don't remember ever, to the best of my recollection, having someone bring that to my attention saying a foreign government has a series of emails that we'd either like to share with you or you'll have access to.

MR. SCHIFF: Were you present for any discussion of the Hillary Clinton

emails and who might be in possession of them?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SCHIFF: And same question for any DNC or Podesta-hacked emails. Did anyone ever discuss with you or in your presence whether the Russians might have possession of any Clinton, DNC, Podesta or other stolen emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe so, no, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Lewandowski, do you know who Paul Erickson is?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't think I do, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: In May of 2016, Mr. Erickson emailed Rick Dearborn a document subject -- an email subject line, "Kremlin connection," in which he advises Mr. Dearborn that, through the international reach of the NRA, he is in a position to cultivate a back channel to President Putin. Did either that email or Mr. Erickson's connection with the Kremlin ever come to your attention?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. SCHIFF: In this email, Mr. Erickson relates that President Putin's emissary on this front has arranged to attend next week's NRA annual meeting in Louisville, Kentucky. He is attending a small, private reception that Mr. Trump has allegedly committed to on Thursday night, May 19, in order to make first contact.

Did you attend an NRA function on May 19?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did travel with candidate Trump to the NRA convention. I'm not sure if May 19 was the specific date, but we did attend a function in Kentucky for the NRA convention, yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: And you don't recall meeting Mr. Erickson at that function?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you recognize the name Alexander Torshin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Torshin was the deputy head of the Central Bank of Russia and was reportedly in attendance as a part of this potential back channel. Did you ever meet Mr. Torshin at that event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, I did not.

MR. SCHIFF: And who attended the NRA event in addition to yourself and Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Trump's two grown, adult children were there, Don Jr. and Eric. Mr. Scavino was there, Ms. Hicks. I believe Mr. Schiller traveled with us. Mr. Kushner might have been traveling with us, if I recall, that day as well.

MR. SCHIFF: And was there any discussion in your presence during that NRA trip of establishing either a channel of communication with Russia or arranging for a meeting between Mr. Trump and Mr. Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Was there a private dinner at the NRA convention?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know, sir. We did not stay for dinner. We arrived at the venue. Candidate Trump went into the hold room. In that room Senate Leader McConnell was there and a few other dignitaries, Members who were scheduled to speak at the convention.

We held for probably 5 to 10 minutes, walked out of the hold room, walked up a ramp. Mr. Trump was behind the stage. There were some dignitaries from the NRA there. I think Chris Cox was there, who is one of the senior leadership team over there.

Mr. Trump shook some hands, walked onto the front of the stage, delivered his remarks, came back, walked off the stage. We walked up the ramp, took some

pictures on the way out, and departed the venue immediately.

MR. SCHIFF: And so how long would you say you were present at the event, you and Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think a conservative overestimation would be 90 minutes.

MR. SCHIFF: And do you know whether Mr. Trump ever met Mr. Torshin at the event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not know.

MR. SCHIFF: And did the President's adult sons arrive with him and leave with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: They did not. They arrived prior to our arrival, and we departed with the same team that we had arrived with. And neither of his grown children traveled with us that day.

MR. SCHIFF: The following month was the June 9 meeting in Trump Tower. I think you testified earlier that the first you learned of that meeting was when you read about it in the press over a year later. Is that right?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. SCHIFF: Did the President's son ever tell you that he was meeting with any Russians during the course of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MR. CHAVKIN: Which President's son? Which son? I'm sorry.

MR. SCHIFF: Oh, I'm sorry, Donald Jr.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Neither ever told me they were meeting with Russians during the course of my tenure at the campaign, just to be clear.

MR. SCHIFF: And, I take it, it would be your testimony that neither ever

informed you that they had been told that the Russians were offering dirt on Hillary Clinton?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, never informed me.

MR. SCHIFF: Did Mr. Manafort ever tell you that he was going to be meeting with Russian nationals during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MR. SCHIFF: And how about Jared Kushner?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, did not.

MR. SCHIFF: So Mr. Kushner never told you, nor did it come to your attention, that he was ever going to take a meeting with any Russian bankers, Russian lawyers, Russian Government officials, or Russian nationals?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's accurate, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know who Natalia Veselnitskaya is?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: If you'll indulge me, I believe it's the Russian lawyer who is now claimed to have been at Trump Tower, if that's the name that's accurate.

MR. SCHIFF: Correct. Knowing now who she is, have you ever met her?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Prior to the press reports, did it ever come to your attention that she was coming to Trump Tower to meet with anyone in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never.

[6:55 p.m.]

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know who Rinat Akhmetshin is?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not.

MR. SCHIFF: And I take it the same is true of Anatoli Samochornov?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not know that person.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know who Ike Kaveladze is?

MR. CHAVKIN: If you would give us just 1 minute.

MR. SCHIFF: Yeah.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall ever meeting anybody by that name ever.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know who Rob Goldstone is?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I know of him to be, through press accounts, the individual who reached out to Don Jr. to facilitate the meeting, but I don't believe I've ever met him.

MR. SCHIFF: And you didn't receive any communication from him during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you have any interaction with either Emin or Aras Agalarov?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir, I don't believe so.

MR. SCHIFF: So you never met them during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not that I know of, no.

MR. SCHIFF: And had no communication with them?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: I know my colleague asked you this, but I just want to make sure I'm clear on it. The meeting at Trump Tower took place with Paul Manafort, Jared Kushner, Donald Trump Jr. in terms of the campaign representatives. The outreach was made to Don Jr. Understanding what you do about how the campaign was running and the nature of the relationship between people in the campaign, why did Don Jr. choose, if you can tell us, to have Mr. Manafort and Mr. Kushner there and not to have you there?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, this would have been in early June. What was the nature of your relationship at that time with Don Jr., and to the best that you could tell us, the relationship between Don Jr. and Mr. Manafort?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My relationship with Don Jr. in June of 2016 I would describe as strained, and Mr. Manafort's relationship with Don Jr. I would describe as collegial.

MR. SCHIFF: Is there any reason why you believe that Don Jr. might have deliberately kept you out of this loop?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, on June 7th -- this would have been 4 days after Don Jr. received the emails and accepted the invitation to meet with these Russians in Trump Tower -- Mr. Trump gave a speech in which he previewed a speech he was going to give days later.

Mr. Trump said on June 7th, quote, "I'm going to give a major speech on probably Monday of next week, and we're going to be discussing all the things that have taken place with the Clintons. I think you're going to find it very informative and very, very interesting."

Do you know what the President was referring to in that speech?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not.

MR. SCHIFF: So this would have been your last month on the campaign, the candidate is teasing a speech about very interesting information on the Clintons, does that refresh your recollection at all about what he might have been referring to?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The candidate and I, you may not believe this, but sometimes he goes off script and says what he wants to.

MR. SCHIFF: I'm sure it's true, and there are probably others times where he brainstorms with you how to handle an issue or what to say in his speech, no?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No. Candidate Trump would, particularly during my tenure, speak extemporaneously all the time without notes and without prepared remarks.

MR. SCHIFF: But here he's previewing a speech he's going to give with some very interesting information about the Clintons, creating the perception that this is going to be new.

Do you know whether he was referring to information he hoped to obtain at the meeting his son was taking with the Russians?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not know.

MR. SCHIFF: Did the President ever tell you that he was aware of the Trump Tower meeting contemporaneous with the meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you ever ask Mr. Trump what he meant when he previewed the very informative and very, very interesting information about the Clintons?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.



MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Emin Agalarov's email previewed something -- quote, previewed, quote, something very interesting, nearly identical language to the President's.

Do you have any reason to believe that that -- the two are related to each other?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: On the same day of the Trump Tower meeting, about 10 minutes after that meeting ended, the President tweeted a tweet, it appears, at Hillary Clinton. "How long did it take your staff of 823 people to think that up?" and "Where are your 33,000 emails that you deleted?"

Do you know the genesis of that tweet?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you discuss it with him at the time?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did, no.

MR. SCHIFF: How much interaction did you have with Steve Bannon during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I spoke with Mr. Bannon infrequently during the initial part of the campaign, and then probably some time where it seemed to be fairly certain that candidate Trump was going to be the Republican nominee, I would have been in more regular communication with Mr. Bannon. That would be considered maybe once a week at that time.

MR. SCHIFF: And that would have been beginning around June?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Probably mid to late May to the beginning of June, yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: And what was the nature of his role in the campaign

compared to the nature of your role in the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Steve had no role in the campaign when I was there other than to serve as a person who would call with advice. He had no formal role in the campaign at all.

MR. SCHIFF: Did he travel with the candidate?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MR. SCHIFF: And when you would talk with him, was it generally by phone or was it in person?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met with Mr. Bannon in New York on at least a couple of occasions, but primarily it was telephone calls.

MR. SCHIFF: And what were the nature of those calls? Was he going to give you the advice he had given candidate Trump, or what was the nature of your conversations?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yeah, part of the conversations with Steve is particularly when a crisis would be consumed to the campaign, which there weren't many, but there were a couple, he would call and give his strategic advice of what he thought we should do.

MR. SCHIFF: And how often were you in agreement with that advice?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not too often.

MR. SCHIFF: Was that the nature, as you understood it, of his role, he could call you, he would call the candidate and offer his advice?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm not certain. Mr. Bannon had direct access to the candidate at the time.

MR. SCHIFF: At the time --

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Before he formally joined the campaign. I don't

believe Mr. Bannon had Mr. Trump's cell phone number at that time, which would have been a primary communications tool, and so I would have, by and large, been the individual that Mr. Bannon was speaking with at the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: And how much, if any overlap, did you have or you had no overlap?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There was no overlap between us.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you and Mr. Bannon ever discuss Mr. Manafort?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I've discussed Mr. Manafort many times with Mr. Bannon.

MR. SCHIFF: My understanding is that you're not going to relate conversations with Mr. Manafort after he left the campaign. What were the nature of your conversations with Mr. Manafort -- with Mr. Bannon about Mr. Manafort prior to your leaving the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Bannon and I were aligned with -- we believed Paul's views to be that of the "globalist" agenda and not necessarily the America First agenda and discussed, on numerous occasions, Mr. Manafort's television appearances from South Hampton.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you ever discuss with Mr. Bannon your concerns about potential financial improprieties of Mr. Manafort with respect to campaign dollars?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not.

MR. SCHIFF: And did he ever raise it with you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did not.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you have any role in the preparation for the Republican National Convention? I understand that you had left the campaign by that time?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: My role was limited to conversations prior to my

departure on June 20th. The convention took place about a month or so after that, after I had departed the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, there were references made by J.D. Gordon, vis-à-vis, the Ukraine debate during the convention, that concerns had been raised about defensive weapons back in March, presumably at the March Foreign Policy Advisory Committee meeting. Were you present for those concerns?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not. I don't believe I was.

MR. SCHIFF: Were you present for any discussion of whether defense weapons ought to be provided to the Ukraine?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SCHIFF: On June 15th, and this is Bate stamped DJTFP...2470, are the last four digits. Could we pull that for Mr. Lewandowski.

While they're pulling that, let me just refer to it. Then if you need to see it, we'll get it for you.

On June 15th, Eric Trump sent an email to you, Hope Hicks, Paul Manafort, Rick Gates, and Jared Kushner, with a subject line, "DNC Opposition Research on Trump." It appears that Eric Trump is forwarding an email he received from Lynn Patton containing DNC documents. Ms. Patton's email says, quote, "DNC strategy, LOL."

Mr. Trump appears to have changed the subject line of the email and written: "Team, have you seen this? This is 200 pages of opposition research from the DNC. This was just sent to us. Eric."

Do you recall that email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I recall receiving that email, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And what did you do with that information? Did you respond

to the email? Did you discuss the receipt of this material with any of the people who were copied on the email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did either.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you ever learn where this DNC opposition research came from?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did.

MR. SCHIFF: And you don't recall having any conversation with anyone about the DNC information referenced in the email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Or taking any action upon this information?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know if the campaign established a searchable platform for hacked emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know that occurred, no.

MR. SCHIFF: Do you know Peter Smith?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe he might have been the reporter who was killed or died, but I don't have any direct, that I know of, interaction or have never met the individual.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, let me give you a little background on the Peter Smith I'm talking about. It's a pretty common first name, pretty common last name. The Peter Smith I'm referring to is the individual who was sought to find, authenticate, and release Hillary Clinton's missing emails, and was engaged in a search on the dark web to try to find them and potentially in communication with Russians on the dark web.

Did you ever, to your knowledge, have any contact with that Peter Smith?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not to the best of my knowledge, no, never.

MR. SCHIFF: Were you aware of that effort to obtain these Hillary Clinton emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SCHIFF: And you don't know whether Mr. Smith was in communication with others on the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I do not, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: During the campaign, did you have contact with Cambridge Analytica?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: And when did that begin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Fairly early in the process of Mr. Trump seeking to become a candidate. To the best of my knowledge, it was probably March or April of 2015 the first time I had a conversation with someone from Cambridge Analytica.

MR. SCHIFF: And how did that come about? Who introduced you to in Cambridge Analytica?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't recall exactly, but I believe it might have been a direct outreach, via email, from Alexander Nix asking if he could come in and speak to me about their campaign platform and their desire to work with the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you ever meet with Mr. Nix prior to his firm being retained?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I met with Mr. Nix on three occasions, sir.

MR. SCHIFF: And tell us about those three occasions.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Three separate occasions from early January 15

through probably May or June of 2016, Mr. Nix had attempted to have the campaign hire Cambridge Analytica for their data work.

And on three occasions, after meeting with Mr. Nix, either because of a contract dispute of the compensation or just my desire not to do it, we chose not to hire that company under my tenure. I chose, specifically.

MR. SCHIFF: And was Kellyanne Conway involved in making that connection?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe Ms. Conway was the conduit for the relationship with Alexander Nix to begin with, but she was a person who was at least contracted through the Mercers to do work on the Ted Cruz Super Pac and was familiar with Alexander.

MR. SCHIFF: I can try to find this for you, and I apologize that these aren't really available, but Mr. Nix wrote an email to you on June 8th, 2015, asking for a meeting. In the email, he states: "I understand from Kellyanne Conway that you very kindly agreed to meet us again to continue discussing how we could use behavioral analytics to help Mr. Trump build his base."

Was she enrolled at some later point then in trying to cement the deal?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ms. Conway privately recommended to me against using Cambridge Analytica.

MR. SCHIFF: So was she telling Cambridge Analytica something polite, and then telling you, "don't hire them"?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I can't speak to what she told those guys.

MR. SCHIFF: And why were you reluctant to hire Cambridge Analytica?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I looked at the technology and had skepticism of what they claim they were able to achieve. That, coupled with the fact that I believe

that they were working with other candidates already in the race.

MR. SCHIFF: And so Cambridge Analytica wasn't brought on during your tenure. That took place some time thereafter?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, at some point, Mr. Nix makes outreach to Julian Assange in an effort to try to obtain the stolen DNC or other emails. To your knowledge, did that take place during your tenure on the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, it did not take place during that time.

MR. SCHIFF: And when did you first learn about that effort by Mr. Nix to communicate with Julian Assange?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Just through the public accounts, which were fairly recently.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you have any interaction with Erik Prince during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did.

MR. SCHIFF: I'm going to yield to Mr. Swalwell.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you. Mr. Lewandowski, during your tenure on the campaign, was it practice to have individuals sign nondisclosure agreements who were volunteers or employees of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was.

MR. SWALWELL: Who was responsible for collecting, disseminating, and then -- or disseminating and then receiving back those agreements?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That responsibility changed throughout the course of the campaign, and ultimately resided with what became the human resources



department of the campaign.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Can you just tell me who was responsible, the different individuals you have knowledge of as being responsible?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Throughout different functions in times of the campaign, to the best of my knowledge, Megan Powers had some responsibility for it, Campbell Burr had some responsibility for it, and then Annie Donaldson, and Jones Day had some responsibility for it before we had a full-time human resources department.

MR. SWALWELL: Was Michael Cohen ever involved in the NDAs?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you first meet Michael Cohen?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: To the best of my knowledge, I believe I met Michael Cohen on the day I was hired by Mr. Trump in January of 2015.

MR. SWALWELL: What was his involvement with the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He had no formal role in the campaign. He served as a executive vice president to the Trump organization as Mr. Trump's personal attorney.

MR. SWALWELL: When Mr. Cohen would appear on television and speak about candidate Trump, was he doing that on his own or was he running that through the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Primarily, Michael did that on his own.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you ever see Michael Cohen at the -- which floor were you on at Trump Tower?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were -- again, it depends on the time of the campaign. The campaign began, preannouncement, on the 24th floor. Mr.

Cohen's office was on the 26th floor. Then we moved the office down to what was the fifth floor, and ultimately settled on the 14th.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you ever see Mr. Cohen, throughout your time on the campaign, in any of the campaign offices?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: What was he doing?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: At different parts of the campaign, he would come down and try and inject ideas into the campaign.

MR. SWALWELL: How were they received?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: We respected Michael's positions but didn't necessarily act on his recommendations.

MR. SWALWELL: So December of 2015, that's the time that you were a part of the campaign, right?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you familiar with efforts at that time by Michael Cohen and Donald Trump to put a Trump Tower in Moscow?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SWALWELL: Was that anything Michael Cohen had ever discussed in your presence?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Did candidate Trump ever talk about efforts at that time to put a Trump Tower in Moscow?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe he ever spoke to me about that, never.

MR. SWALWELL: Anyone you were around when you were with the

campaign talk about ongoing efforts to put a Trump Tower in Moscow?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not that I recall, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever meet Felix Sater when Michael Cohen would come around?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe so, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever met him before?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you familiar with October through December 2015 correspondence back and forth between Michael Cohen about two things: one, putting a Trump Tower in Moscow but also arranging a meeting between Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin?

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman, correspondence between Cohen and?

MR. SWALWELL: Sater.

MR. CHAVKIN: Sater.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not privy to any discussions that Mr. Cohen would have had with Mr. Sater or others about the Trump organization side of things and any business exchanges. I wasn't part of that or privy to that.

And the second part of it is I never met Mr. Sater and was not aware of Mr. Cohen attempting to facilitate a meeting.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever observe Mr. Cohen talking Trump organization business with candidate Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. How often would that occur?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Cohen had all but unlimited access to candidate Trump as his office was literally, you know, down the hallway on the same floor, and

so they would engage in business-related conversations on a daily basis.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you familiar with any Visa applications that Mr. Cohen was in possession of in the summer of 2016 for Mr. Trump to travel over to Moscow for an economic summit?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever see Mr. Cohen talk to Mr. Trump about Russia or hear?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe so, no.

MR. SWALWELL: How close was Donald -- sorry. How close was Donald Trump, Jr.'s office to candidate Trump's?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: They were one floor apart. Donald Trump, Jr.'s office is located on the 25th floor of Trump Tower.

MR. SWALWELL: On occasion, were you ever on the 26th floor, once the campaign offices had been moved down?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: And did you ever, when you were on the 26th floor, observe Donald Trump, Jr. and his father talking, hanging out?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe their father/son relationship?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Probably like any father/son relationship, good days and bad days.

MR. SWALWELL: But did they appear pretty close throughout? Was the concept that they were close?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's hard for me to judge because they had not only a personal relationship but a business relationship, and Donald Trump, Jr. was

responsible for the business side of decisions and candidate Trump didn't always agree with those decisions.

MR. SWALWELL: Was Donald Trump, Jr. ever authorized, from your observations, to make a business decision without running it by his father?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I am aware of business decisions that Donald Trump, Jr. made that were not run by his father, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Donald Trump, Jr. also assisted the campaign; is that right?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: He did, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: If Donald Trump, Jr. were to go out across the country on behalf of the campaign or speak on behalf of the campaign, who would he clear that through?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Depending on, again, different times of the campaign, I would work directly with Don Jr., or Eric, or Ivanka for surrogate work and just be looped into where they'd be traveling, but as the campaign progressed, we actually had a designated, you know, team that worked with what we call the super surrogates, those individuals like Rudy Giuliani and the grown children and, you know, Chris Christie and other high-profile people who would be traveling on behalf of the candidate, you know, ultimately, Vice President Pence.

MR. SWALWELL: Did Donald Trump, Jr. have authority to go out on his own and represent the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know if he had that authority, but it would be very difficult to tell Donald Trump, Jr. he can't go out and represent the campaign.

MR. SWALWELL: Would he go out without telling anyone that he was representing the campaign and indeed do that?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were a number of occasions where Donald Trump, Jr. made statements on the record that I only found out about in public afterwards, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And when you would observe Donald Trump, Jr. and his father together, did you ever see Donald Trump, Jr. reporting back to his father work he had done on behalf of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever see candidate Trump have telephone conversations with Donald Trump, Jr. about the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Is it fair to say that it was routine for Donald Trump, Jr. to report back to his father campaign activities or meetings he was involved in?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: As the campaign progressed and he had a larger role and did more travel, he would have direct conversations with his father about his activities, yes.

MR. CHAVKIN: Just 1 minute.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. SWALWELL: How would you reach candidate Trump during the time you were on the campaign if you needed to get ahold of him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Traditionally, I would call his cell phone.

MR. SWALWELL: You had his cell phone number?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: And what number was he using during the course of the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was a 212 New York area code number.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know the full number?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't have -- I don't know it off the top of my head.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you still have it on your phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's very possible, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Could you check on that and report back to us, and we would redact that from our transcript?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, happy to.

MR. SWALWELL: Does he still use that number today?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. SWALWELL: How do you reach him today?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't contact the President directly.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. White House switchboard?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not exactly.

MR. SWALWELL: Who?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not the White House switchboard.

MR. SWALWELL: Who do you go through?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It just depends on the issue that I want to talk about.

MR. SWALWELL: Who are the people that are in that menu of options?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's a series of people who work in and around the building that you would be relevant, including, if I thought it was important, I would reach out to a family member.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And who are the nonfamily members you reach out to?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Now or then?

MR. SWALWELL: Today.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know. I mean, I don't -- I don't attempt to reach the President.

MR. SWALWELL: So he attempts to reach you now?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: What I can say is there is a clear process and protocol in the White House. If someone wants to speak to the President, that protocol is in place and is well defined.

MR. SWALWELL: So if you cannot reach the President during the -- if you cannot reach candidate Trump during the course of the campaign, who would you go to? If you couldn't reach him by cell phone, who would you go to?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I never had that issue.

MR. SWALWELL: If you called, he answered?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he ever text?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Never?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never.

MR. SWALWELL: How about email?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Never.

MR. SWALWELL: Why is that? Why do you think?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. SWALWELL: He ever talk about it? You ever said: "Sir, come on, get with the times, get an email address"?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I think he's prolific with twitter. That keeps him up with the times.

MR. SWALWELL: Right.



UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. CHAVKIN: Could we go off the record, Mr. Chairman?

MR. STEWART: Can we go off the record, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Sure.

MR. CHAVKIN: Just for the facilities. Stay. I'll be back.

[Recess.]

MR. SWALWELL: Back on the record.

Mr. Lewandowski --

MR. STEWART: I'm going to take a chairman's inquiry. It's been about an hour. Since you all thought it would be about an hour, can you give us an idea of how you're feeling about the timing?

MR. SWALWELL: I've got about 25 minutes left, and I know Mr. Castro may have some.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Schiff, have you concluded?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, if -- unless I hear something in response to a question.

MR. STEWART: Okay. And we're just going to, again, cede our time to you. If I have something, I might interject and reclaim the time, but I'm trying to keep it expeditious. We'll just the time on your side.

MR. SCHIFF: We'll be pretty expeditious.

MR. STEWART: Let you keep going then, thank you.

MR. SWALWELL: Mr. Lewandowski, if candidate Trump called you during that time period, would the numbers show up as what you had in the phone or would it show up as a blocked number?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I'm sorry, sir, you mean while I was at the campaign?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Trump's number from his cell phone would show up as the number from his cell phone. It would actually show up as Donald J. Trump in my phone.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he ever call you and it show up as a blocked number?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: His primary residence has a blocked line.

MR. SWALWELL: And is that a number that you also know?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And again, we'll ask you to provide that as well. Can you provide that, once you check?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I will, yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: June 9th, 2016, where were you?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: Is it knowable?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: June 9th, 2016?

MR. SWALWELL: Is it knowable? Is it something that you could go back and check records, calendar, phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would think there's probably -- if candidate Trump had a public event that day, I would say there is a high probability I was traveling with him, but I don't recall where we would have been specifically on that day, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you first learn of the June 9th meeting?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I learned of the June 9th meeting through public reports. Best recollection, less than 60 days ago.

MR. SWALWELL: And the public reports were July 2017. And so after the public reports came out, did you make any efforts to at least go back and find out

where you were and where your boss was at the time?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I did, no.

MR. SWALWELL: And is that something that you can also commit to us that you can check on, your records, and see if you have a recollection of where you were, whether it's through calendars or going through text messages you were sending at that time, but just to try and understand where you were?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I will do that for sure. I believe, and my memory may not be 100 percent, so I apologize. I believe we overnighted that night in Florida at Mar-a-lago, for some reason, and maybe not, but I believe.

MR. SWALWELL: So overnighted the night of the 9th and then work up in Florida on the 10th?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that's right, but I would need to have some type of independent verification on that.

MR. SWALWELL: And is it fair to say that wherever Donald Trump was on June 9th, you would have been with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Excluding his primary residence, if he was home, that morning, and potentially in his 26th floor office, if we were on the road traveling, there is a very high probability I would have been with him at that time, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: If Mr. Schiller was at Trump Tower on June 9th, does that help you at all, based on your observations of Mr. Schiller and how his coverage worked, would that help you at all as to where Mr. Trump was?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: If Mr. Schiller was in Trump Tower on June 9th, then I would draw an educated guess that Mr. Trump was also in Trump Tower for at least some portion of that time.

MR. SWALWELL: And is that because, during that time period, wherever

Mr. Trump would go, Mr. Schiller would be with him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not exclusively but almost at that point, yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Is it fair to say that other than you as the campaign manager at that time, the people who spent the most time with Mr. Trump, other than his family, were Mr. Schiller, Ms. Hicks, and Rhona Graff?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Ms. Graff didn't travel. Ms. Graff almost never -- I can't actually think of any time Ms. Graff ever traveled with us.

MR. SWALWELL: So Ms. Hicks and Mr. Schiller?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Is there anyone else that you'd put in the same category as Ms. Hicks, Mr. Schiller, and yourself?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: At that time of the campaign, Mr. Miller was traveling with us very consistently, Mr. Scavino was traveling with us very consistently and had been for a series of months and maybe even by that time a year. And then that was the primary group of individuals who would travel on a very consistent basis.

Mr. Glassner, to a lesser extent, but also had a significant amount of travel time.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe the relationship between Donald Trump and Mr. Schiller?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It's a very good relationship

MR. SWALWELL: Would you say they're friends?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I would.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe the relationship between Donald Trump and Rhona Graff?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Boss to employee, very good relationship.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe the professionalism of Ms. Graff?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Unquestionable.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe her knowledge of Mr. Trump throughout the decades she's worked for him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: She has a very strong understanding of Mr. Trump.

MR. SWALWELL: And would that understanding include a very deep memory and knowledge of who's important and who's not to him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, I believe it would.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Roger Stone and Donald Trump, how would you describe that relationship?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Long.

MR. SWALWELL: During your time on the campaign, would Mr. Stone come to Trump Tower to meet with Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: There were times when Mr. Stone, when he was in New York, would come to Trump Tower. Mr. Stone primarily, particularly during the early parts of the campaign, resided in Florida and was having some work done, so he wasn't able to travel. And Mr. Stone really left traveling to Trump Tower, that I was aware of, during my tenure, by August when I had fired both Mr. Stone and Mr. Nunberg (ph).

MR. SWALWELL: Would Mr. Stone ever meet alone with Mr. Trump at Trump Tower?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Stone would have had access to Mr. Trump in Trump Tower should he have asked for a meeting, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Is that something that you ever saw occur?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I was ever in a meeting with Mr. Stone and Mr. Trump. Mr. Stone and I chose not to cross paths.

MR. SWALWELL: But my question was: Did you ever see or know of Mr. Trump taking a meeting with just Mr. Stone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know of a specific instance, but I would not be surprised if Mr. Trump had a one-on-one meeting with Mr. Stone over the course of a series of months or whenever it may be.

MR. SWALWELL: How about phone calls. Did you ever see Mr. Trump take phone calls from Mr. Stone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. SWALWELL: How often?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mr. Stone would contact Mr. Trump, again, different parts of the campaign, maybe once a month or once every 6 to 8 weeks.

MR. SWALWELL: Would Mr. Trump ever initiate contact with Mr. Stone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Not traditionally, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever see Mr. Stone and Mr. Trump during your time with the campaign interact with each other in person in Florida?

Like would Mr. Stone come to Mar-a-lago.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I ever saw Mr. Stone at Mar-a-lago, no.

MR. SWALWELL: When did candidate Trump first learn of hacked Democratic emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you first see him talk about, if you did, hacked Democratic emails? And I bring it up because it was in the press, it was being

reported, it was part of the campaign.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: When the public media accounts were described that Hillary Clinton had whatever, bleached or acid bleached or whatever 33,000 emails, that was the first that either I or Mr. Trump had been made aware of it, and to the best of my recollection, his discussion was, "How could someone have that many emails?"

MR. SWALWELL: From a guy that doesn't email.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Who has never sent an email in his life.

MR. SWALWELL: My question pertained mostly to the Democratic national committee's emails, which it was -- and it's not a trick question. Publicly, it was reported around June 2016, that Democratic emails were hacked, that many of the emails related to opposition research on Donald Trump, and that the attribution of the hack was that Russia had done it; if you recall when candidate Trump first learned or talked openly about this reporting.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Okay. I don't recall having a conversation with him directly about this. It's not to say it didn't happen, but I don't recall it being the topic of conversation. It was -- by June of 2016, I was fairly certain my tenure on the campaign was going to be coming to a close. My relationship with the family at the time -- and I use that term to define the grown children and Jared Kushner -- was strained, and I was literally just trying to keep my job.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever hear candidate Trump express an opinion about public reports that Russia was responsible for the hacked emails?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever hear candidate Trump express an opinion about WikiLeaks?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: And I'm talking -- because you limited the testimony to your time on the campaign, not post.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir. I've never -- to the best of my knowledge, never heard candidate Trump use the term "WikiLeaks."

MR. CASTRO: Congressman, can I ask a question real quick?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah, yeah.

MR. CASTRO: Why did you fire Roger Stone? You said he's a liar.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's true, but also, in addition to that, he was going to appear on Fox News later in the afternoon on a Saturday and say he was quitting the campaign, and so I proactively fired Roger before he could go on television and try and quit.

MR. CASTRO: What did he lie to you about?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: The time of the day, the color of his tie, what color of shoes he was wearing, basically everything and everything.

MR. CASTRO: Well, then, why did you hire him? Why did you all hire him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I didn't. I inherited him.

MR. CASTRO: Why did somebody hire him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: All I could say is that's a preexisting personal relationship that long predates my tenure with the Trump organization. That relationship goes back 30-plus years.

MR. CASTRO: I yield back.

MR. SWALWELL: Was there a specific circumstance, though, that led to his quitting or your about to fire him?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I believe that during this time on the campaign, we



had already fired Mr. Nunberg (ph) for the second time, who was Roger's protege, and we were looking to fire him for the third and final time, and Roger was going to go on a Fox News show by the name of Jennine Perrot (ph) -- Judge Jennine (ph) and do a expose of saying, you know, the candidate is unwinnable and he's going to lose this election and he was going to go on television and make some disparaging comments, and so I contacted our legal counsel and told them to fire Roger immediately, and so they did that.

MR. SWALWELL: How would you describe the relationship between candidate Trump and Jared Kushner?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Complex.

MR. SWALWELL: Would Jared Kushner have the authority to, just as I asked with Don Jr., make appearances or do work on the campaign without running up a chain of command?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: At the end of my tenure in the campaign, Jared Kushner had as much authority as he wanted to exercise on any issue he wanted to, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever observe Mr. Kushner report to or tell candidate Trump work he was doing for the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Was that something that occurred routinely?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Did that occur in person?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It did.

MR. SWALWELL: Did it also occur over the phone?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It did.

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever observe Paul Manafort in person report to his boss, Donald Trump, work that he had been doing on the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Was that something that occurred routinely?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It did.

MR. SWALWELL: And is that something that you also saw occur over the phone between Mr. Manafort and Mr. Trump?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, it is.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware that Donald Trump, Jr. at that Louisville NRA conference met with Alexander Torshin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware that at that NRA conference Donald Trump, Jr. met with Russian Maria Petina (ph)?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know who Rick Clay is?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't believe I do. Henry Clay's grandson?

MR. SWALWELL: Possibly.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware of any -- did anyone on the campaign discuss efforts by a West Virginian named Rick Clay, in May 2016, to establish what he described as a Russian back channel to arrange a meeting between Donald Trump and Vladimir Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: No, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. You weren't aware of correspondence that Mr. Clay had with Mr. Dearborn to try and make this happen?

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I was not, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you tell us earlier which apps you were using, messaging-wise, during the campaign?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. That was covered.

During that March 31st meeting at the Old Post Office building, now the Trump Hotel, did you hear Mr. Papadopoulos offer to connect Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Was there any discussion, after Mr. Papadopoulos' offer, which has later been testified to by Senator Sessions, did you hear any discussion by others in the room about this offer?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Was the first time that you heard about it was when it was reported in the press?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: It was.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you see Attorney General Sessions or then Senator Sessions at that Mayflower event?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I did.

MR. SWALWELL: You referenced that there was an email available, or there was an email at the time that listed the guests who would attend that VIP reception. How would we get that email today?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: I don't have access to that information. All I can tell you is that, to the best of my recollection, I received an email that listed, in an Excel spreadsheet format, the individuals who were going to potentially be there, and I

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

think, to the best of my recollection, there were five or six ambassadors from different countries who were going to be in attendance at the speech that Mr. Trump was going to give that day.

MR. SWALWELL: Who was that disseminated to?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Again, to the best of my recollection, I know I received a copy, but I don't know who else would have been on that distribution list.

MR. SWALWELL: And your testimony today is that that email was a campaign email, on your campaign email address?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: That's accurate, yes.

MR. CHAVKIN: Congressman, in the spirit of cooperation, which we really pledged from the beginning, we'll try to get you access to that.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Chairman, we have concluded our questions.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Lewandowski. Counsel, thank you for being with us.

And with that, we're adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 7:50 p.m., the interview was concluded.]