

Cardwell, Christine (ODAG)

From: Cardwell, Christine (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, July 3, 2018 2:55 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Cc: Atwell, Tonya (ODAG)
Subject: OIG Answer to April 25 2018 memorandum
Attachments: OIG Answer to April 25 2018 memorandum.docx

FYI. Thank you, Chris

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, July 3, 2018 2:12 PM
To: Cardwell, Christine (ODAG)
Subject: Memo for OIG
Attachments: Answers to OIG tg edits.docx; E2018002 ODAG Request for Information 4-25-18 (002).pdf

Chris:

Can you format the attached for a response from me to Dan Beckhard? Thanks.

Scott

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 11:46 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Hannity from last night

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)" <mtpettit@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: June 29, 2018 at 11:44:11 AM EDT
To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: **Hannity from last night**

Intro

sean:

a real thank you to all of those in law enforcement. in 60 seconds, you can't get a better response time. they saved a lot of lives. then we turn to our opening monologue. we'll start with today's huge showdown on capitol hill. the deputy attorney general rod rosenstein, f director christopher wray appearing before the house judiciary committee where they were grilled by members of congress. it was a beat down. we have so many highlights to bring you, including the worst moments from rod rosenstein, who i'm told is unlike me. the deputy ag is continuing to obstruct the u.s. house of representatives and their subpoenas in its effort to check and do their constitutional duty and investigate actions by the fbi and doj. now house republicans are fighting back hard, contempt, impeachment, tonight is very much on the table. also tonight, america's left is ramping up, as i predicted, their disgusting rhetoric, political tactics ahead of the 2018 midterms, and some are actually trying to forcibly shut down immigration and customs enforcement offices across the country. others are calling for the complete abolition of i.c.e. meanwhile many in the media, well, as we predicted, a full mental psychotic breakdown over the news that justiceus anthony kennedy is retiring. it's been a very bad week for democrats. sit tight. we have all of this and so much more and we are following all the details out of annapolis,ing news opening monologue. for over a year, house republicans have desperately been trying to conduct what is their constitutional oversight duties and properly investigate how the fbi and the doj handled, well, really, mishandled the content server investigation. we know she committed felonies, obstructed justice. also the ongoing russia collusion witch hunt and the fisa abuse, lying to fisa court judges is by an opposition party candidates in an election year. sadly their efforts, their document requests, their subpoenas, they have been met with nothing but obstruction and hatred, antipathy, and animus from the deputy ag, who has a bad temper, rod rosenstein. today some of these house members had a rare opportunity to hold rosenstein accountable right to his face. it started with this powerful opening statement from house judiciary committee chairman bob goodlatte. take a look.

the recent inspector general's report revealed bias in the top echelons of the fbi during a hotly

contested presidential election. it revealed that fbi agents, lawyers, and analysts hold profound biases against then candidate donald trump and in favor of his opponent, hillary clinton. it is right out of a novel with salacious, unverified dossiers, reports of informants that appear more like spies for the u.s. government, and application of of the aforementioned go surveillance powers to collect on a u.s. person once associated with president trump's political campaign. it's not a novel. it's real life.

sean: real life. next, they very ill tempered rod rosenstein, who again doesn't like me, i can't imagine why, he was grilled by ohio congressman jim jordan over rosenstein's blatant effort to hide important information from house investigators. again, this is their constitutional job. oversight, separation of the powers, government. look at this tense exchange. it's amazing.

--

why are you keeping information from congress?

congressman, i'm not keeping any information from congress.

in a few minutes, mr. rosenstein, i think that house of representatives will say something different.

i don't agree with you.

i disagree. i think, in a few minutes, the house of representatives is going to go on record saying you haven't complied with requests from a separate and equal branch of government, that you haven't complied with the subpoenas, and you got seven days to get your act together. i think that is what is going to happen by that is not to

jim jordan. i think that the majority of the house of representatives. in just a few minutes, i think that's going to happen. i want to know why you won't give us what you ask for.

sir, i certainly hope that your colleagues aren't under that impression. it's not accurate, sir.

it is accurate! we have got you –

mr. chairman, can we allow the witness to answer?

--

sean: the house did in fact pass a resolution demanding that rosenstein comply with the document request and seven days or they do face the possibility, first of contempt, and even impeachment. by the way, the president can demand at some point everything be handed over, and that will then be a matter of law. in terms of the president having that power, one of the issues at play here, the house investigation into possible coordination between the clinton campaign and the fbi's initiation of that so-called trump-russia, which we now know to be witch hunt. one of the small part of the scandal surrounds bruce antonelli or. look right there, 2016, nally was conducting the oppo research for the clinton campaign. fusion gps, right alongside ex-barns by, foreign national christopher steele. allst while her husband, bruce, a high-ranking doj official, was the federal government's point of contact for the same christopher steele. rod totally unaware of the connection. ti really? i don't believe that. take a look.

--

you said earlier bruce ohr was not working on the russia investigation. let me ask you –
r to my knowledge.

to your knowledge. did you not know that bruce ohr was meeting with christopher steele, getting information about the dossier, and supplying that information to the fbi at the same time his wife, nellie, was working for fusion gps, that was helping hillary clinton? did you not know he was doing that for the fbi?

correct. because you did not know that?

correct.

okay. his office as a couple of doors down but you had no idea he was actually the go-between to get that information.

--

sean: another key question was asked by a florida congressman ron desantis, a question we have not been asking right hereco on the show for months. why hasn't rod rosenstein recused himself from the mueller witch hunt? notice a lot of what you are hearing tonight should be recognizable to you because we have been reporting this for a long time. it was all true. take a look.

you appointed mueller, you're supervising mueller, and supposedly about collusion between trump's campaign and russia and obstruction of justice, but you wrote the memo saying that comey should be fired, and you signed the fisa extension forne carter page. my questionn is do you, it seems like you should be recused from this more so than jeff sessions, you are involved making decisions involving this investigation. why haven't you done that?

if it were appropriate for me to recused, i would be more than happy to do so, and let someone else handle it. it is my responsibility to do it. all i can tell you –

how do you have obstruction of justice possibility for a president exercising his powers to failure and fbi director that you said and oh, by the way, the report makes it clear that jim comey should have been fired. by redoing this with the mueller probe?

i am not commenting on what is going on in the mueller probe.

sean:
here we are, 407 long days into mueller's fishing exhibition. congressman trey gowdy, south carolina, confronting rod rosenstein with what we have all been thinking. watch this from today.

russia attacked this country. they should be the target but russia isn't being hurt by this investigation right now.at we are. this country is being hurt by it. we are being divided. we've seen the bias. using the pies. we need to see the evidence. if you have evidence of wrongdoing by any member of the trump campaign, presented to the damn grand jury. if you have evidence that the president acted inappropriately, presented to the american people people. justice delayed is justice denied. all of us are being denied. whatever you have god, finish it the hill up. this country is being torn apart apart.

sean:

finish it the hell up. that's right. are you watching what you have done to the country, what you are doing to the country? rod rosenstein, really, when is this and? rod, it is your constitutional duty, checks and balances, coequal branches, to provide members of congress with the subpoenaed documents and information they need so they can doey your job -- their job and check your department. in seven days from today, if the doj continues as obstruction, i urge every single member of the house to now take action to, yes, move to contempt, and he has, impeachment. enough is enough. democrats are perfectly fine with doj obstruction. their friends in the deep state have a lot to hide. meanwhile, as robert mueller's witch hunt is producing literally zero evidence that the president did anything wrong, the people on the left are now predictably beginning to unravel. f their favorite new target, the u.s. immigration and customs enforcement agency, it's doing the job that congress passed, their laws. throughout the week, hundreds of left-wingin protesters, they "occupied" fisa offices across multiple cities, forcing some to temporarily close their doors on these demonstrators blocked interventions, obstructed i.c.e. employees, attempted to tamp out in front of the building, "the hill" reported many protesters celebrated the news that their occupation actually prompted delays and some operations at the center. "this may result in some immigrants being attained for weeks longer than expected." great job. this all culminated in washington, d.c., where 575 people were arrested after literally storming the center building. multiple democratic lawmakers were in attendance, including one congresswoman from washington, who was arrested. sadly, this anti-i.c.e. rhetoric on the left, on tv, he's even farmers.

Part 2

sean:

reacting to deputy attorney general rod rosenstein appearance on capitol hill. sara carter. see that brooke? early july. you can preorder it on amazon.com or barnesandnoble.com. it will be the definitive book, the licit scheme to clear hillary clinton and frame donald trump. fox news legal knowledge gregg jarrett. we can start fromme you. i captured a lot of inconsistencies that ifr know you did.

well, one could say they were lysed by rod rosenstein. for example, he denied ever threatening members of the intelligence committee and the staff in a january 10th meeting in which he threatened to get his hands on their emails, text, and phone records.

sean:

that's a little s scary, isn't it?

attracted to people in that meeting, they use the word, "threatened," and that he said that he was threatening to obtain those texts and emails and so forth. so that did not appear to be

terribly truthful by him. he also wasn't truthful when he said i'm not withholding any evidence of subpoenaed records. well, his own letters refusing to turn over the documents or evidence that he is withholding, and yet he said, i'm not withholding. there wasn't a lot of truth in rod rosenstein today.

sean:

let me get your initial reaction, sara carter.

i think that when trey gowdy, representative trey gowdy, questioned him and made his statement, saying, if you have rosenstein, let's just get it out right now. stop driving the american public. this administration, and our country, through the mud. if you have any evidence that anything happened with the trump administration for mike president trump, get it out there. let us know what it is. he never wouldn't have done that that. you look at the ig report, how he evaded and avoided questions, i tell you, gregg is 100% right. i spoke in a similar sources who have been those backroom rod rosenstein –

sean:

i spoke to someone who is personally the victim of a temper tantrum. a direct conversation that was relayed to me.

rod rosenstein flat out lied. he lied to congress, and he lied to the american people. we just got a call a spade a spade. if you look at the ig report, i want to go back to that really quick. we look at strzok, i was looking at a more detailed, talking with sources, and there is one point where strzok tried to explain the insurance policy question. in august, the text message that he sent to lisa page about having an insurance policy andur talking with andrew mccabe, and he explains it away as saying, we were talking about how aggressively were going to be or how overt we were going to be with this investigation. and when i was talking to fbi sources about this, they said, that is so telling. because at that moment in time, when he left that out to horwitz, when he made that statement, he was basically saying, we are going to go after drum, even if it means going after the people around him. even if it means putting this information out there in the media, even if it means arresting people for crimes that were committed ten years ago or maybe 1 they are not even crimes, just getting that around the president. the chaos he really has been the fbi and the people on the seventh floor at the doj, and not even so much the russians anymore. real chaos in our country is coming from them.

sean:

c rosenstein said, i'mnything. i made a short list, wrote it down before the show. we'll stop trump, they had data from everybody from a period of time, he withheld the fact that strzok of rudolph contreras, he begged up to the last minute, paul ryan, not to release but became the nunes memo which told us about fisa abuse. the doj tried to hide the fact that two of the most important investigative investigators on the hillary and russia probe were anti-trump. five months after strzok and page were shut out the door, it was the inspector general that released for strzok-page texts. that's only the short-list, gregg.

what did rosenstein say? he calls it inappropriate. it has to be the most colossal understatement of all time, especially when you consider the ig said that this is a man who had a willingness to abuse his position of power to influence an election. by gerard rosenstein, oh, it's just inappropriate.

sean:

the things that stand out, all three of us have talked to at least one person, i've talked to one, you've talked to two. how many sources do you have that he has a temper?

i have at least four sources

I have at least four sources.

sean:
you are working harder than greg and i. [laughter]

i'm not.

sean:
's actions, highly inappropriate. ac no. that would be bringing an investigation to influence a presidential election, and as your book says, a scheme to clear hillary and frame trump. that is what happened.

rosenstein said today, if it's appropriate, i'll recuse myself. it was appropriate a long time ago. he is a witness investigator, prosecutor, judge, into one.

sean:
say that again.e,

he's a witness, key witness, investigator, supervising their prosecution, which makes him a prosecutor, also the judge and jury because he decides whether any charges would be brought.

sean:
why is the only mad at me by name and not you and sara? frankly, i'm taking all the heat.

we are feeling a little jealous.

sean:
they tried to undermine the election to favor one candidate and screw the other candidate, and why the rest of the media ignores the story, i don't know.

it matters because they weaponized our tools of law enforcement, the nsa, the cia, the fbi, and everything else. this is such an enormous investigation. we haven't even talked about the unmasking's yet. they weaponized the tools -- we need to get back to that. we need to have answers. it if the united states is going to move forward, if we are going to clean up our system, our fbi and intelligence agencies, we need to know what happened. the truth needs to come out, and the people thatpl abused it need to be removed.

one of the most striking moments occurred today when he was asked about mueller's not one but two clearing conflicts of interest that are disqualifying. rosenstein said, i don't know of any conflict of interests with mr. mueller. he apparently doesn't read newspapers because dozens and dozens of law professors and lawyers i have written a myriad of columns explaining the disqualifying conflicts of interest of robert mueller. but rosenstein is either a modern-day machiavelli and or he is the most oblivious person to hold that position.

sean:
you know what someoneio said today, i really believed them. they said, hannity, you are trying to do this because you are undermining mueller. the whole story. the more important thing they said, they don't get at. they really believe that these guys -- i'll throw this to sara -- that they actually think that they were better, smarter, and that they think they are the super patriots and that we come of the people, are stupid. they knew better which is why they had to save hillary and a undermined trump.

they undermined the american people. they undermined the system that our nation is founded on, shawn. just look at at the most disparaging comments that strzok and page it said about

people that shop at walmart, the american people, people in pennsylvania.

sean:

i can smell them. i shop at walmart. can you smell me?

there is nothing more disgusting than people thinking that they know everything. that is the reason why president trump won. people were sick and tired of being told they weren't smart enough, not good enough, they don't know what to do. you know what, the american people said, we are smart enough, we are good enough, and we don't really care what you have to say because we live in this country and we will vote for who we want to vote for. if trump hadn't have won, if you would not have won this election, think about what the alternative would be. we would never know what would have happened.

sean:

please mark that sara monologue. you get the last word.

people like rosenstein and comey and strzok and lisa page and mccabe and the whole gang are a symbol of corruption and how absolute power corrupts absolutely.

sean:

we haven't been wrong on one thing yet, have we?

not yet.

sean:

is scary. the media ignored it. frankly, you guys deserve pulitzer prizes. i can't. wait for your book. good job as always. when we comedo back,

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 3:47 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Subject: Document4
Attachments: Document4.docx

Per your request.

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 2:18 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Bruce Ohr/McCabe TPs for DAG hearing

SS—can you provide 2 tps each for the following topics/questions:

(b)(5) [Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Thanks,
David

David F. Lasseter
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
(202) 514-1260

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 4:06 PM
To: Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)
Subject: Answers to OIG tg edits
Attachments: Answers to OIG tg edits.docx

See attached for how I took your comments into account. Thanks a bunch!

Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)

From: Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 3:35 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Bcc: Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)
Subject: RE: Answers
Attachments: Answers to OIG [tg edits].docx

Hi – Stopped by, but your door was closed. Let me know if you want to talk and will come around. Am free until 4:45 and then again probably around 5:45. Attached are a few edits/thoughts for consideration.

Thanks.

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 1:23 PM
To: Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG) <tagauhar@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Answers

Can you take a look at these draft responses when you have a minute? Thanks.

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2018 4:30 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Letter to Huber
Attachments: 2018-5-24 HuberLetter.pdf

Letter from Graham concerning Huber responsibilities and authorities.

From: Holmes, Lee (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2018 3:34 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <dlasseter@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Stoughton, Katie (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6)
Subject: Letter to Huber

David—

I've attached a letter from Senator Graham to Mr. Huber. Please let me know it's been received.

Thanks.

Lee

LEE HOLMES
Chief Counsel
Senator Lindsey O. Graham
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary
(b)(6)



UNITED STATES SENATE

May 24, 2018

The Honorable John W. Huber
United States Attorney for the District of Utah
U.S. Department of Justice
111 South Main Street
Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2176

Dear Mr. Huber:

I was pleased to see the March 28, 2018, announcement that Inspector General Horowitz will review the Department of Justice's (DOJ) and Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) FISA application to surveil Carter Page, as well as the DOJ's and FBI's relationship with Christopher Steele. As you may have learned from my referral with Senator Grassley of these matters to Mr. Horowitz, I am deeply concerned by DOJ's and FBI's reliance on a dossier paid for by one political party as the basis for government surveillance of another political party.

The day after the announcement of the Inspector General's investigation, on March 29, 2018, the Senate Judiciary Committee received a letter from Attorney General Sessions declining my recommendation that he appoint a second special counsel to investigate the same matters. The Attorney General noted the Inspector General's investigation, and also noted that he directed you to evaluate "certain issues ... in cooperation with the Inspector General." Please answer the following questions:

1. What is the scope of your mandate?
2. What role does Mr. Horowitz play in your investigation?
3. What role do you play in Mr. Horowitz's investigation?
4. Are you expected to authorize and execute legal process on Mr. Horowitz's behalf?
5. What level of control does Mr. Horowitz have over you? May you refuse to take certain actions Mr. Horowitz believes should be taken?

6. Do you have to seek approval from the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or anyone else before expanding the scope of your investigation, executing or seeking any legal process, or choosing to prosecute?
7. What is your budget, and how do you staff your investigation?

Sincerely,



Lindsey O. Graham
United States Senator

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 1:15 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: FW: 2018-05-21 CEG to DOJ (Ohr)
Attachments: 2018-05-21 CEG to DOJ (Ohr).pdf

Attached incoming from Grassley requests the Ohr documents. (b)(5)

They also request a transcribed interview and a promise that we will provide them will all information we provide HPSCI.

(b)(5)

From: Lay, DeLisa (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 12:15 PM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <dlasseter@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6); Davis, Patrick (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6); Parker, Daniel (Judiciary-Rep) (b)(6); CEG (Judiciary-Rep) <CEG@judiciary-rep.senate.gov>; Sawyer, Heather (Judiciary-Dem) (b)(6)
Subject: 2018-05-21 CEG to DOJ (Ohr)

Hi David,

Attached please find a letter from the Chairman to the Deputy Attorney General. Please confirm receipt and send any follow-up correspondence to me and the addresses copied above.

Best,
DeLisa

DeLisa Lay
Senior Investigative Counsel
Oversight and Whistleblower Policy
Chairman Charles E. Grassley
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary
(202) 224-5225

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, IOWA, CHAIRMAN

ORRIN G. HATCH, UTAH
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, SOUTH CAROLINA
JOHN CORNYN, TEXAS
MICHAEL S. LEE, UTAH
TED CRUZ, TEXAS
BEN SASSE, NEBRASKA
JEFF FLAKE, ARIZONA
MIKE CRAPO, IDAHO
THOM TILLIS, NORTH CAROLINA
JOHN KENNEDY, LOUISIANA

DIANNE FEINSTEIN, CALIFORNIA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, RHODE ISLAND
AMY KLOBUCHAR, MINNESOTA
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, DELAWARE
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, CONNECTICUT
MAZIE HIRONO, HAWAII
CORY A. BOOKER, NEW JERSEY
KAMALA D. HARRIS, CALIFORNIA

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6275

KOLAN L. DAVIS, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*
JENNIFER DUCK, *Democratic Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

May 21, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

As you know, you personally assured me that the Senate Judiciary Committee would receive access to the same information provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) in the course of the Department's efforts to accommodate that committee's requests regarding matters related to Fusion GPS, Christopher Steele, the use of the DNC-funded anti-Trump dossier, the application process for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) authority, and the origins and conduct of the Justice Department's related counterintelligence and criminal investigations. Thank you for providing access to FISA applications and related records in the past. On multiple occasions in recent days, your staff has reassured the Committee in writing and in telephone conversations that your commitment remains in effect and that you have not provided information to HPSCI that has not also been provided to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The documents previously reviewed by the Committee raised a number of important questions. One set of those questions concern the role played by Associate Deputy Attorney General Bruce Ohr in communicating with dossier author Christopher Steele and continuing to funnel information from Steele to the FBI after the FBI had terminated Steele as a source for his failure to abide by FBI instructions to avoid contact with the press about his work. Accordingly, please provide all records related to Mr. Ohr's communications about these matters, including: (1) emails from Mr. Ohr's personal and work accounts, (2) phone logs, (3) handwritten notes, and (4) text messages from personal and work accounts. Additionally, within one week after the complete production of all relevant documents, please have your staff contact the Committee to schedule Mr. Ohr for a transcribed interview with Committee staff.

Please also confirm that you will continue to ensure that the Senate Judiciary Committee receives timely access to or possession of all documents on equal terms provided to other Congressional Committees related to the controversies described in this letter and the investigation that has been publicly reported as "Crossfire Hurricane."

Please direct any questions you may have to DeLisa Lay of my committee staff at (202) 224-5225. Thank you for your cooperation in this important matter.

Sincerely,



Charles E. Grassley

Chairman

cc: The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Ranking Member

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 9:08 AM
To: Catizone, Christopher (ODAG)
Subject: E2018002 ODAG Request for Information 4-25-18 (002).pdf
Attachments: E2018002 ODAG Request for Information 4-25-18 (002).pdf

Per our conversation.

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 6:39 PM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Subject: FW: jordan was on fox today--can you send?>

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: jordan was on fox today--can you send?>

Harris:

"outnumbered overtime" welcome to republican congressman jim jordan the house committee oversight committee. i have no doubt that you caught that. blumenthal accusing donald jr. of lying. that would be a felony.

Jim:

look. the democrats want to make a lot about the meeting, which no real information ever came out of. they never want to talk about the fact that simpson was meeting with the russian lawyer who was in the meeting. he met with her before and after the meeting in new york. that has been reported. they never talk about that.

Harris:

fusion g.p.s.

Jim:

right. the group paid for by the clinton campaign and the democratic national committee to put together the dossier who hired christopher steele. i have not read the transcript. i just came out today. i think there is a lot of other important information we need to get. that is why we have sent a letter to the president today, Harris, asking to get some of the key information they repeatedly denied us getting access to.

Harris:

can we take a pause on that for a second? i want to illuminate what you are talking about. if democrats are saying that donald trump jr. and others are lying about the meeting where does it get us? you say there is information in the documents. you will get to read the transcripts. what are you looking for?

Jim:

i haven't read them yet. i want to get a chance to go through them. they just came out this morning when donald trump jr. was interviewed at the senate. so i'll take a look at that. but we haven't seen it yet. i know that there is all kind of information we have asked the department of justice to give us. they are repeatedly not given us the information. we want access as a separate and equal branch of government.

Harris:

okay. i have the letter. i will read from it now. dear mr. president -- you are not reaching out through the d.o.j. it's my understanding you just took it up a notch, it just got hotter. we write to where you exercise your authority as president of the united states to instruct attorney general jeff sessions to immediately produce all documents requested by congress relating to our investigation of certain prosecutorial and investigative decisio d.o.j." these are republicans and he is a republican a.g. what is going on?

Jim:

well, we are tired of unelected people at the department of justice repeatedly not giving us information we are entitled to receive as a separate and equal branch of government and keeping information from us. for example, why did james comey not tell us the guy he leaked information through to the "new york times" danial richman was a special government employee at the f.b.i. whit did they redact and not tell us that peter strozk had a relationship with the judge, the same judge that heard michaelflip's -- michaelflip's case? they redacted that information. why have they never told us why jim baker, the general counsel at the f.b.i. why he was demoted and resign -- reassigned? all the information they are keeping from us. it's pulling teeth. every time we try to get something it's frustrating. not just for us but for the american people who want answers to important questions.

Harris:

in heat of the moment to get the information you take this to the president. no doubt, and the other freedom caucus members, i believe mark meadows is on the list with you and sandis of florida, too. you get together and somebody has to say in the room, can the president do this? the answer?

Jim:

he the head of the executive branch. this is all about transparency. remember this, too. when they took the dossier to the court, when they went and got the fisa warrant to spy on carter page, they didn't tell the court two pieces of information. they didn't tell the court who paid for the dossier or that the author had been fired from the f.b.i. they didn't tell them that relationship had been terminated because christopher steele was looking information about his relationship with the f.b.i. you and i go to court, we have to give the truth, the whole truth. the f.b.i. didn't do that.

Harris:

nothing but.

Jim:

and nothing but the truth. the f.b.i is the context we find ourselves in. not to mention, Harris, the fact that james comey has been fired, deputy director andrew mccabe has been fired. jim baker, chief counsel of the f.b.i. was demoted, reassigned and left employment at the f.b.i. lisa page, the counsel demoted and left the f.b.i. peter strozk deputy head of counterintelligence demoted and reassigned. that is the context we find ourselves in. as a separate and equal branch of government, people go on the ballot every two years to get elected by the american people we have a right to get information to get answers to critical questions the american people have.

Harris:

can i ask what this means for jeff sessions? this has gotten a little politically -- now the judge andrew napolitano is next to me. you may hear me. he is chuckling as i ask the question. this is a fireball in some ways for him to handle. he has recused himself from the russia investigation. what do you anticipate will happen with a.g. sessions if the president dinosaur steps his way in and says yeah, i'll declassify, make it public and move it forward.

Jim:

i don't know. this is a short answer. i think the president of the united states as we say in letter should tell attorney general jeff sessions, deputy attorney general rod rosenstein give congress, give the legislative

branch the information they need. this is in everyone's best interest to have transparency so we can once and for all figure out what happened here. for example, we would like to see the august 2 memo. mr. meadows and i wrote a letter a month ago asking the justice department to let us see the august 2 memo, some change to the scope of the special counsel information. two weeks ago the federal judge says he wants to see it as well. this is the kind of thing we need access to. the only way to do it now is for the president of the united states to tell the attorney general to give us the information.

Harris:

i want to go real basic before i let you go. people will watch this around the country and wonder, okay, you get in a dispute with jeff sessions to find out? what did he tell you?

Jim:

we talked to jeff sessions last fall when we talk about the need for a second special counsel to look at this. i don't like special counsel but i don't know how the f.b.i. investigates themselves. we talked to rod rosenstein in person and we asked him specifically about what i brought up, the august 2 memo and a host of other things. i don't know that meeting was all that productive. but we did raise the issues with mr. rosenstein as well.

Harris:

i just ask because people will scratch their heads saying they are all there together, why don't they just talk?

Jim:

we tried. we have tried everything. that is why we finally said we are going to go to the individual, elected by the american people who heads the executive branch. whether he go to him and say give -- we will go to him and say give us the information to get answers.

Harris:

representative, jim jordan, we appreciate you updating on this and the breaking gnaws of the let -- breaking news of the letter you sent the president. thank you.

Jim:

take care.

Harris: let's get legal dissection here from someone who has seen it up close and watch it unfold. fox news senior judicial analyst andrew napolitano. what do you make of that?

Napolitano:

the letter is extraordinary. i can't recall a time in the modern era where leaders of the house of representatives wrote directly to the president about their frustration about the justice department.

Harris:

they are all in the same party.

Napolitano:

correct. they are all in the same party. when they are all in the same party it's usually resolved behind closed doors with a phone call. the president has taken the position, admirably, but this is frustrating that he will not get involved in the management of the d.o.j. because he is a subject of a d.o.j., department of justice, investigation. at some point he is going to say enough is enough. i'm a subject here. over here i'm going manage. i understand jim jordan's frustration. and it is this. when the documents do come out from the department of justice, so much of it is redactions removed, they see things that shouldn't have been redacted but were redacted to save the author of the document from embarrassment. not to save a national secret. not to save the identity of an intelligence source but to save embarrassment.

Harris:

we have been down this memo road and declassification road in the last few months and the president has weighed in on occasion with things. you saw different home -- memo inside house intelligence. he can weigh in. and you say legally he will at some point potentially.

Napolitano:

at some point he says enough is enough.

Harris:

is this a tipping point? is this enough to get the president to say you know what d.o.j., heads? i want this declassified.

Napolitano:

i don't know if it's enough but it is a march in the direction. the next step, this is the second to last step to hold either attorney general jeff sessions or deputy -- i'm not suggesting this be done and jim jordan knows they can do this. they have the votes to do it. or deputy attorney general rod rosenstein in contempt for failure to comply with a bona fide, legitimate congressional subpoena. rod rosenstein's argument is we can't give you certain things because we are in the middle of the investigation. if we give it to you and you reveal it, it would tip off opinioners and defendants.

Harris:

i like how you put that. you didn't use the word "leak."

Napolitano:

when we have an impasse like that, where do we go? judicial branch. let the judge decide what -- let the judge decide what the congress gets and what the d.o.j. keeps.

Harris:

how complicated is it that jeff sessions recused? if he is held in contempt is that a fireable situation?

Napolitano:

the president can fire cabinet member at any point. but it would be unfair to target jeff session recused himself. it would not be unfair to target rod rosenstein because with respect to this area he is effectively the attorney general.

Harris:

wow! the house freedom caucus turned up the heat. talk about the trump tower meeting. donald trump jr. coming out saying hey, at least they see the question i was asked. what do you make of the transcripts?

Napolitano:

they are equivocal. i'm smiling because i read the democratic version of it. you would think it's two different transcripts but it is the same. the democrats, and you just played a clip of senator richard blumenthal --

Harris:

yeah, he called don jr. a liar.

Napolitano:

accused him of committing a felony. i don't believe it's under oath but it is still a crime to lie to congress in a formal interrogation setting whether you are under oath or not.

Harris:

what is this to the g.o.p.?

Napolitano:

Napolitano:

to the g.o.p., we know the so-called russian adoption lawyer was a russian agent and that she met with these people intending to bring them in to her orbit. we don't know if she succeeded. that is what bob mueller –

Harris:

bottom line. legal situation for donald trump jr.?

Napolitano:

the crime is not receive of assistance from the russians. it's the agreement to receive assistance. that is what muler is -- that is what mueller is looking for. i don't know if it came out today but i don't know what else mueller has.

Harris:

this goes to jim jordan's push to get the scope memo. how wide can mueller go? what is he looking at?

Napolitano:

i'm sure it's very wide.

Harris:

thank you for joining me live from new york when i was in israel.

Napolitano:

it was a hoot.

Harris:

thank you for being here. all right. is the summit off? the threat from north korea when it comes to next month's highly anticipated sit-down between our president and their dictator. is north korea posturing or is this a serious hurdle? the president has a message to kim jong un. a short time ago and the white house says it is ready for whatever happens. stay close.

Napolitano:

the president is the toughest negotiator around. he is prepared to go through this process. his team is prepared to go through the process. and this is not something that is out of the ordinary in

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Tucker transcript

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)" <mtpettit@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: May 16, 2018 at 9:59:20 AM EDT
To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Tucker transcript

tucker:

they are definitely not. i know you don't want to risk libel by naming someone because this is not been proved in court, but give us a sense of what you are talking about. are you saying someone who worked on the drum campaign fed information to law enforcement?

DeSantis:

so if you look at glen simpson's testimony from fusion gps, he talked about there being a human source and that was something that was controversial. some people said it was papadopoulos. it's not papadopoulos. the issue is he acknowledges there's a human source. peter strzok, he opens up the counterintelligence investigation in 2016, what does he do the next day? he goes to great britain and he goes to london and he's meeting with people. how the heck would you do that if you just open the investigation that day? i think in that kind of, the london, christopher steele, glenn simpson access is probably the individual we are looking at. we need to know whether this individual was spying or not. i have great concerns about it but i believe we can get those questions and answers when the justice department ponies up the documents.

tucker:

are you suggesting or do you believe that this is someone who was pressured into cooperating with the investigation, or someone who freely send information over about the campaign?

DeSantis:

i think it's the latter, tucker. i think this could be someone, potentially could have been like steele. there was an agreement to pay steele. did they pay anybody? yes or no. did they direct anybody to go to the campaign? yes or no. very easy questions to answer.

tucker:

i'm sorry, congressman. please go ahead.

ron is exactly right. we also need to know the relationship between mueller and comey. comey kicked this whole thing off with a bogus fisa warrant and what is the relationship between mueller and comey? did mueller give comey immunity? does comey think he's about the law?

where are we going with all of this? that's what needs to be investigated.

tucker:

do believe, quickly, congressman, do you believe that jim comey has been offered immunity by the mueller investigation?

i think it stands to reason and i think the american people deserve to know.

tucker:

that would be shocking. thank you both. i hope you get to the bottom of those.

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 9:18 PM
To: Plante, Jeanette (JMD)
Subject: Document request for IG investigation

Jennie:

We have another document request from the IG I need some help on. Could you please (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

202-305-7848. Thanks.

Scott

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 2, 2018 12:51 PM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Schools, Scott (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Shannon Break last night at 11:03 pm --- Matt Gaetz on Rosenstein impeachment articles

I've talked to Shannon about the 1.2 problem he has below. But this is the part worth reading for fun:

Shannon Bream: What do you make of that? He says you're not going to be, or people who are making threats about his position are not going to be extorting the DOJ.

Matt Gaetz: Well, earlier you played a clip where Rosenstein said no house republicans would put their names on these articles of impeachment. I think Mr. Rosenstein ought to be more worried about what he has put his name on. For example, the FISA warrant renewal after the FBI knew Christopher Steele was lying and not trustworthy, Rosenstein himself signed the document to spy on an American citizen with no justification. He also put his name on the pleading to silence the whistleblower in the uranium one case. Rod Rosenstein's definition of extortion seems to depart from the law. The definition of extortion is forcing someone to do something that they have no legal obligation to do under some threat. Rod Rosenstein has an obligation to follow the law, that's all we want him to do. And what's most telling about his viewpoint are his most recent comments to the New York Times where he said he doesn't believe that the Congress has a constitutional authority to conduct oversight. I think that means he's not reading Article I correctly, particularly our power to appropriate funds, and then of course ensure that those funds are used in accordance with the law. Here the FBI and Department of Justice departed from the law. They did so because they were out to get Donald Trump. And now they want to evade oversight and it's something we're not going to let them do.

xxxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Langstein, Joel (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 2, 2018 10:53 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA) <mtpettit@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Shannon Break last night at 11:03 pm --- Matt Gaetz on Rosenstein impeachment articles

Fox News — Shannon Bream (11:03 PM)

<http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=e55ce001-19f3-4589-bef8-4142243eda27>

Ed Henry: Meanwhile Republicans Trey Gowdy and Bob Goodlatte are probing Comey's leaks, sending a letter to Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein seeking documents on a Comey friend who was used to release some of his memos. Rosenstein fired back at House Republicans who are prepping those articles of impeachment you mentioned against him for not producing other documents quickly enough. Rosenstein said the

department of justice is not going to be, his words, extorted. meadows fired back that rosenstein should stick to facts and not rhetoric.

Shannon Bream: All right. we are joined now by a member of the house, freedom caucus, the group considering articles of impeachment against rosenstein. Matt gaetz is a republican congressman from florida. okay. so you probably heard a little bit from the deputy attorney general responding to this. i want to play more of what he had to say today when this topic came up.

Rod Rosenstein: There have been people who have been making threats privately and publicly against me for quite some time. and i think they should understand by now, the department of justice is not going to be extorted. we're going to do what's required by the rule of law.

Shannon Bream: What do you make of that? He says you're not going to be, or people who are making threats about his position are not going to be extorting the doj.

Matt Gaetz: Well, earlier you played a clip where rosenstein said no house republicans would put their names of these articles of impeachment. I think mr Rosenstein ought to be more worried about what he has put his name on. For example, the fisa warrant renewal after the fbi knew Christopher steele was lying and not trustworthy, rosenstein himself signed the document to spy on an american citizen with no justification. he also put his name on the pleading to silence the whistleblower in the uranium one case. Rod rosensteins definition of extortion seems to depart from the law. the definition of extortion is forcing someone to do something that they have no legal obligation to do under some threat. rod rosenstein has an obligation to follow the law, that's all we want him to do. and what's most telling about his viewpoint are his most recent comments to the new york times where he said he doesn't believe that the congress has a constitutional authority to conduct oversight. I think that means hes not reading article I correctly, particularly our power to appropriate funds, and then of course ensure that those funds are used in accordance with the law. here the fbi and department of justice departed from the law. they did so because they were out to get donald trump. And now they want to evade oversight and its something were not going to let them do.

Shannon Bream: Let's talk about chairman goodlatte and gowdy have reached a deal with the doj to get production of documents to get they've been after for a long long time, it sounds like there's progress on some of these fronts as far as cooperation with the doj. why is that not enough?

Matt Gaetz: Because we're not getting the documents fast enough. we've requested 1.3 documents and we've received only a few thousand at a time. that's entirely inappropriate. now rosenstein has shown his cards. he doesn't believe that we have a constitutional ability to conduct oversight. i think the department of justice and the fbi know they did wrong in these fisa warrants that were based on false information where they were not disclosing all the facts to the court. they're hoping if this takes long enough and this survives to the november elections, there's a chance democrats will take control and then there will be no meaningful oversight, there will just be a witch hunt against the president. time is not our friend and that's why we need to act quickly

Shannon Bream: Quickly on this idea of the fall elections, which you mentioned, jennifer ruben says this, these people, meaning you guys, talking about impeachment are nuts and unfit to hold office. enough. vote them out. how does this factor into the fall?

Matt Gaetz: Well, she has one vote just like everybody else. the folks in my district and across the country are fed up with the mistreatment of our president. we've got a president who' out there trying to denuclearize the korean peninsula, to face iran, and he has to deal with this ludicrous investigation that was never on fact, where theres been no evidence of collusion, and which by the way, if there even was a prosecution, rosenstein would be a witness based on the questions that were released about comeys firing. so you can't oversee an investigation when you could potentially be a witness in that investigation. these aren't things that are nuts. we just want the law to be followed.

Shannon Bream: keep us up to date. we know that we'll be watching as well as the deputy attorney general.

Devin Nunes, California, CHAIRMAN

K. Michael Conaway, Texas
Peter T. King, New York
Frank A. LoBiondo, New Jersey
Thomas J. Rooney, Florida
Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Florida
Michael R. Turner, Ohio
Brad R. Wenstrup, Ohio
Chris Stewart, Utah
Rick Crawford, Arkansas
Trey Gowdy, South Carolina
Elise M. Stefanik, New York
Will Hurd, Texas

Adam B. Schiff, California,
RANKING MEMBER

James A. Himes, Connecticut
Terri A. Sewell, Alabama
André Carson, Indiana
Jackie Speier, California
Mike Quigley, Illinois
Eric Swalwell, California
Joaquin Castro, Texas
Denny Heck, Washington

Paul D. Ryan, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE
Nancy Pelosi, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

HVC-304, THE CAPITOL
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4121

DAMON NELSON
STAFF DIRECTOR

TIMOTHY S. BERGREEN
MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

September 1, 2017

The Honorable Jeff Sessions
Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Attorney General Sessions:

On August 24, 2017, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (“Committee”) served subpoenas on the Attorney General, in his capacity as head of the Department of Justice (“DOJ”), and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) for production of documents relevant to the Committee’s ongoing investigation of Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, including allegations of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians.

The subpoenas directed DOJ and FBI to produce any and all documents relating to the agencies’ relationship with former British Secret Intelligence Service officer Christopher Steele and/or the so-called “Trump Dossier,” including those memorializing FBI’s relationship with Mr. Steele, any payments made to Mr. Steele, and efforts to corroborate information provided by Mr. Steele and his sub-sources—whether directly or via Fusion GPS. The subpoenas also directed DOJ and FBI to provide copies of any Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) applications submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC)—whether or not approved by the FISC—incorporating information provided by Mr. Steele, his sub-sources, and/or Fusion GPS.

Resort to compulsory process was necessary because of DOJ’s and FBI’s insufficient responsiveness to the Committee’s numerous Russia-investigation related requests over the past several months. On multiple occasions, through written requests and direct engagements, the Committee has sought but failed to receive responsive testimony or documents from DOJ and FBI. For example, to date the Committee has not received a meaningful response to its May 9, 2017, request to Attorney General Sessions. Additionally, on May 16, 2017, the Committee sent a letter asking then-Acting Director Andrew McCabe to participate in a voluntary interview, and produce relevant documents. The Committee received no reply until May 27—more than two months later—when DOJ declined the interview request and indicated that “the Department is not prepared to respond further to your request at this time.”

Previously, on March 8, the Committee sought from DOJ certain documents, including relevant FISA applications and FISC orders, and on March 17 was allotted two billets to review responsive documents on a read-and-return basis. The Committee was not provided a copy of these documents, and the Committee's request to review them again was denied.

The subpoenas issued on August 24 required production no later than 12:00pm on September 1, 2017. Neither DOJ nor FBI provided any documents by the deadline. On the afternoon of August 31, less than 24 hours before the due date, the Committee received an initial response from the DOJ Office of Legislative Affairs requesting—on behalf of both DOJ and FBI—additional time to comply with the subpoenas.

The Committee requires timely production of the subpoenaed documents in order to execute its oversight responsibilities on behalf of the American public and fully evaluate the actions of both DOJ and the FBI. There is no legitimate basis for DOJ's failure to meaningfully engage the Committee until the eve of the deadline or begin production as a show of good faith.

Moreover, there is no legitimate basis for DOJ's request for additional time to comply, because DOJ and the FBI are well aware of the identity of the requested documents. Indeed, as noted above, at least some of them have already been compiled and made temporarily available for the Committee's review, and the remaining requested documents are readily identifiable.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the Committee hereby grants an additional thirteen (13) days for full compliance and production, to occur no later than 9:00 a.m. on September 14, 2017, at the local specified in the original subpoena. This revised deadline will not be extended.

In the alternative, if all responsive documents are not produced by the revised deadline, the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI shall appear before the Committee at 9:00 am on September 14, 2017, in Room HVC-210 of the U.S. Capitol during an open hearing, to explain under oath DOJ's and FBI's unwillingness or inability to comply in full with the subpoenas issued on August 24.

Please be advised that, in the event that DOJ or FBI fails to provide the documents in full or testimony described above, the Committee expressly reserves its right to proceed with any and all available legal options—including reporting to the full House of Representatives a resolution to hold the Attorney General and Director of the FBI in contempt of Congress, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192, 194.

Sincerely,



Devin Nunes
Chairman

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 7:05 PM
To: AMZ
Subject: Ohr docs
Attachments: Ohr comms.pdf

Per our conversation. The relevant comms are on page 6.

SS

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: RE: Mark Meadows just called

Can you confirm this below from Meadows? (b)(5)

Similarly, on 8/14/2016 Lisa Page writes "but see, this article so rings true that then I think the "chs is wrong." Given the timing and context, the information creates an inference that the CHS or confidential human source, is Christopher Steele.

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 5:45 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Mark Meadows just called

Can you call me when you have a moment?

David F. Lasseter
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
(202) 514-1260

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
CHAIRMAN

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin
LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
STEVE KING, Iowa
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas
JIM JORDAN, Ohio
TED POE, Texas
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
TREY GOWDY, South Carolina
RAUL R. LABRADOR, Idaho
BLAKE FARENTHOLD, Texas
DOUG COLLINS, Georgia
RON DeSANTIS, Florida
KEN BUCK, Colorado
JOHN RATCLIFFE, Texas
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MATT GAETZ, Florida
MIKE JOHNSON, Louisiana
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
JOHN RUTHERFORD, Florida
KAREN HANDEL, Georgia

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-3951

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary>

JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
RANKING MEMBER

JERROLD NADLER, New York
ZOE LOFGREN, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
TED DEUTCH, Florida
LUIS V. GUTIERREZ, Illinois
KAREN BASS, California
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES, New York
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
ERIC SWALWELL, California
TED LIEU, California
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland
PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington
BRAD SCHNEIDER, Illinois

July 27, 2017

The Honorable Jeff Sessions
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Dear Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

We are writing to you to request assistance in restoring public confidence in our nation's justice system and its investigators, specifically the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). We need to enable these agencies to perform their necessary and important law enforcement and intelligence functions fully unhindered by politics. While we presume that the FBI's investigation into Russian influence has been subsumed into Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation, we are not confident that other matters related to the 2016 election and aftermath are similarly under investigation by Special Counsel Mueller. The unbalanced, uncertain, and seemingly unlimited focus of the special counsel's investigation has led many of our constituents to see a dual standard of justice that benefits only the powerful and politically well-connected. For this reason, we call on you to appoint a second special counsel¹ to investigate a plethora of matters connected to the 2016 election and its aftermath, including actions taken by previously public figures like Attorney General Loretta Lynch, FBI Director James Comey, and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Many Democrats and members of the Washington media previously called for a "special prosecutor" to investigate Russian influence on the election and connections with the Trump campaign. Not surprisingly, once you actually made the decision to appoint a special counsel, the calls for further investigations by congressional committees continued, focused on allegations that have heretofore produced no evidence of criminality, despite the fact that over a year has passed since the opening of the original FBI investigation. Political gamesmanship continues to

¹ See 28 CFR Part 600 – General Powers of Special Counsel.

saturate anything and everything associated with reactions to President Trump's executive decisions, and reveals the hypocrisy of those who refuse to allow the Special Counsel's investigation to proceed without undue political influence. It is an unfortunate state of affairs.

Your stated rationale for recommending Director Comey's termination as FBI Director was his mishandling of former Secretary Clinton's email investigation and associated public disclosures concerning the investigation's findings. We believe this was the correct decision. It is clear that Director Comey contributed to the politicization of the FBI's investigations by issuing his public statement, nominating himself as judge and jury, rather than permitting career DOJ prosecutors to make the final decision. But many other questions remain unanswered, due to Mr. Comey's premature and inappropriate decision, as well as the Obama Justice Department's refusal to respond to legitimate Congressional oversight. Last week, the Republican Members of this Committee sent a letter to the Justice Department, asking for responses to those unanswered inquiries.² These questions cannot, for history's sake and for the preservation of an impartial system of justice, be allowed to die on the vine.

It is therefore incumbent on this Committee, in our oversight capacity, to ensure that the agencies we oversee are above reproach and that the Justice Department, in particular, remains immune to accusations of politicization. Many Congressional entities have been engaged in oversight of Russian influence on the election, but a comprehensive investigation into the 2016 Presidential campaign and its aftermath must, similarly, be free of even the suggestion of political interference. The very core of our justice system demands as much. A second, newly-appointed special counsel will not be encumbered by these considerations, and will provide real value to the American people in offering an independent perspective on these extremely sensitive matters.

Our call for a special counsel is not made lightly. We have no interest in engendering more bad feelings and less confidence in the process or governmental institutions by the American people. Rather, our call is made on their behalf. It is meant to determine whether the criminal prosecution of any individual is warranted based on the solemn obligation to follow the facts wherever they lead and applying the law to those facts.

As we referenced above, Democrats and the mainstream media called for a special counsel to be appointed to investigate any Russian influence on President Trump's campaign. Their pleas were answered, but there are many questions that may be outside the scope of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. This was clear following Mr. Comey's recent testimony to the Senate Intelligence Committee on June 8, 2017, which ignited renewed scrutiny of former

² See House Judiciary Committee letter of July 21, 2017 to Attorney General Sessions, requesting answers to multiple questions which remain unanswered or inadequately answered from the Obama Administration, available at https://judiciary.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/072117_Letter-to-AG-Sessions.pdf?utm_source=House+Judiciary+Committee+Press+Releases&utm_campaign=fcab593157-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2017_07_21&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_df41eba8fd-fcab593157-101865997.

Attorney General Loretta Lynch, and the actions she took to mislead the public concerning the investigation into the Clinton email investigation. Last year, this Committee inquired repeatedly about the circumstances surrounding that and other matters, but our inquiries were largely ignored.³

During his testimony, Mr. Corney referenced a meeting on the Phoenix airport tarmac between Ms. Lynch and former President Bill Clinton. Mr. Corney raised concerns about Ms. Lynch's conduct, and questioned her independence, stating:

At one point, the attorney general had directed me not to call it an investigation, but instead to call it a matter, which confused me and concerned me. That was one of the bricks in the load that led me to conclude, 'I have to step away from the department if we're to close this case credibly.'⁴

In addition, in preparing to testify in front of Congress for a September 2015 hearing, Mr. Corney asked Ms. Lynch at the time whether she was prepared to refer to the Clinton investigation as just that, an "investigation." Mr. Corney testified that Ms. Lynch said, "Yes, but don't call it that, call it a matter." Mr. Corney retorted, "Why would I do that?" Ms. Lynch answered, "Just call it a matter."⁵ Mr. Corney stated that he acquiesced, but it gave him "a queasy feeling," since it gave him the "impression that the attorney general was trying to align how we describe our work" with how the Clinton campaign was talking about it.⁶

Notwithstanding the fact that the FBI is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and not the Federal Bureau of Matters, one is hard-pressed to understand why Ms. Lynch directed then-Director Corney to call the Clinton investigation a "matter" unless she intended to use such deceptive language to help wrongly persuade the American people that former Secretary Clinton was not, in fact, the subject of a full-scale FBI investigation, or to otherwise undermine the integrity of the investigation.

Following Director Corney's Senate Intelligence Committee testimony, Senator Dianne Feinstein was asked about the testimony while appearing on CNN's "State of the Union." Senator Feinstein stated, "I would have a queasy feeling too, though, to be candid with you, I think we need to know more about that, and there's only one way to know about it, and that's to have the Judiciary Committee take a look at that."⁷

³ *Id.*

⁴ Peter Baker, *The New York Times*, June 8, 2017, available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/08/us/politics/comey-testimony-loretta-lynch.html>.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Ed O'Keefe, *The Washington Post*, June 8, 2017, available at https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2017/live-updates/trump-white-house/james-comey-testimony-what-we-learn/comey-repeats-that-lynch-asked-him-to-describe-clinton-investigations-as-a-matter/?utm_term=.ccb1c193f596.

⁷ Eli Watkins, "Feinstein: Judiciary Committee must 'step up and carry its weight'," *CNN.com*, June 11, 2017, available at <http://www.cnn.com/2017/06/11/politics/dianne-feinstein-james-comey/index.html>.

We share Senator Feinstein's and Mr. Comey's concerns – specifically, that during the midst of a contentious Presidential election, which was already rife with scandal arising from Secretary Clinton's mishandling of classified information, that our nation's chief law enforcement officer would instruct the FBI Director, her subordinate, to mislead the American public about the nature of the investigation. Following Ms. Lynch's directive to downplay the Clinton investigation as a "matter," Director Comey infamously terminated the Clinton investigation, stating, "[a]lthough there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information, our judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case."⁸

Mr. Comey's testimony has provided new evidence that Ms. Lynch may have used her position of authority to undermine the Clinton investigation. At any other point in history this accusation would entail a shock to the conscience of law abiding Americans who expect a DOJ free of political influence. We only have, however, an investigation into Russian influence on the 2016 election, including any ties to the Trump campaign. To limit our nation's insight into just this single component of the 2016 election will only cause the special counsel's work to be derided as one-sided and incomplete. The special counsel's work must begin and end unimpeded by political motivations on either side of the aisle. For these reasons, the following points must also be fully investigated – ideally, via a second special counsel. This is imperative to regain the cherished trust and confidence in our undoubtedly distressed law enforcement and political institutions.

We call on a newly appointed special counsel to investigate, consistent with appropriate regulations, the following questions, many of which were previously posed by this Committee and remain unanswered:

- 1) Then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch directing Mr. Comey to mislead the American people on the nature of the Clinton investigation;
- 2) The shadow cast over our system of justice concerning Secretary Clinton and her involvement in mishandling classified information;
- 3) FBI and DOJ's investigative decisions related to former Secretary Clinton's email investigation, including the propriety and consequence of immunity deals given to potential Clinton co-conspirators Cheryl Mills, Heather Samuelson, John Bentel and possibly others;
- 4) The apparent failure of DOJ to empanel a grand jury to investigate allegations of mishandling of classified information by Hillary Clinton and her associates;
- 5) The Department of State and its employees' involvement in determining which communications of Secretary Clinton's and her associates to turn over for public scrutiny;

⁸ Statement by FBI Director James B. Comey on the Investigation of Secretary Hillary Clinton's Use of a Personal E-Mail System, July 5, 2016, *available at* <https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/statement-by-fbi-director-james-b-comey-on-the-investigation-of-secretary-hillary-clinton2019s-use-of-a-personal-e-mail-system>.

- 6) WikiLeaks disclosures concerning the Clinton Foundation and its potentially unlawful international dealings;
- 7) Connections between the Clinton campaign, or the Clinton Foundation, and foreign entities, including those from Russia and Ukraine;
- 8) Mr. Comey's knowledge of the purchase of Uranium One by the company Rosatom, whether the approval of the sale was connected to any donations made to the Clinton Foundation, and what role Secretary Clinton played in the approval of that sale that had national security ramifications;
- 9) Disclosures arising from unlawful access to the Democratic National Committee's (DNC) computer systems, including inappropriate collusion between the DNC and the Clinton campaign to undermine Senator Bernie Sanders' presidential campaign;
- 10) Post-election accusations by the President that he was wiretapped by the previous Administration, and whether Mr. Comey and Ms. Lynch had any knowledge of efforts made by any federal agency to unlawfully monitor communications of then-candidate Trump or his associates;
- 11) Selected leaks of classified information related to the unmasking of U.S. person identities incidentally collected upon by the intelligence community, including an assessment of whether anyone in the Obama Administration, including Mr. Comey, Ms. Lynch, Ms. Susan Rice, Ms. Samantha Power, or others, had any knowledge about the "unmasking" of individuals on then candidate-Trump's campaign team, transition team, or both;
- 12) Admitted leaks by Mr. Comey to Columbia University law professor, Daniel Richman, regarding conversations between Mr. Comey and President Trump, how the leaked information was purposefully released to lead to the appointment of a special counsel, and whether any classified information was included in the now infamous "Comey memos";
- 13) Mr. Comey's and the FBI's apparent reliance on "Fusion GPS" in its investigation of the Trump campaign, including the company's creation of a "dossier" of information about Mr. Trump, that dossier's commission and dissemination in the months before and after the 2016 election, whether the FBI paid anyone connected to the dossier, and the intelligence sources of Fusion GPS or any person or company working for Fusion GPS and its affiliates; and
- 14) Any and all potential leaks originated by Mr. Comey and provide to author Michael Schmidt dating back to 1993.

You have the ability now to right the ship for the American people so these investigations may proceed independently and impartially. The American public has a right to know the facts – all of them – surrounding the election and its aftermath. We urge you to appoint a second special counsel to ensure these troubling, unanswered questions are not relegated to the dustbin of history.

Sincerely,

Bob Goodlatte

Jo Jordan

Lamar Smith

Matt [Signature]

Tom Marino

Steve Chalot

Blake Farentsoid

Steve King

Louis Lohmert

[Signature]

[Signature] Raúl R. Labrador

[Signature] Andy Biggs

MIKE JOHNSON

John Sutherland

Martha Roby

John Ratcliffe

Kent Starks

Karen C. Handel

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, March 8, 2018 7:12 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Subject: RE: Christopher Steele, the Man Behind the Trump Dossier _ The New Yorker.pdf

Article is accurate on that point.

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Sent: Thursday, March 8, 2018 10:51 AM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Christopher Steele, the Man Behind the Trump Dossier _ The New Yorker.pdf

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2018 10:21 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: redactions story

FBI removes some redactions in Christopher Steele criminal referral regarding second Trump-Russia dossier

Washington Examiner

Daniel Chaitin

February 6, 2018 – 8:03 PM

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/fbi-removes-some-redactions-in-christopher-steele-criminal-referral-regarding-second-trump-russia-dossier/article/2648321>

The FBI has removed multiple redactions from a Jan. 4 criminal referral related to "Trump dossier" author Christopher Steele that was released this week, the Senate Judiciary Committee announced Tuesday evening.

The referral, which says the ex-British spy wrote a second memo about President Trump and Russia with details that were not among those included in the dossier published early last year by BuzzFeed, was made by Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, and Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee Chairman Lindsey Graham, R-S.C.

In a press release, Grassley explained that he sought the cooperation of the FBI to make as much of the referral available to the public as possible, via a second review, after the first left much of the document redacted.

"I appreciate the FBI's quick turnaround on a tight deadline to my request for a classification review of the Steele referral," Grassley said in a statement. "The more clarity we can provide to the American people about decisions at the FBI and Justice Department, the better. I will keep pushing for additional transparency and thank the men and women of the FBI and Justice Department for their continued service."

Grassley's push for transparency comes in the aftermath of last week's public release of the House Intelligence Committee memo, which outlines alleged abuses of surveillance authority by the U.S. government.

The referral, which was first released in heavily redacted form on Monday, appears to confirm some level of coordination between the extended Clinton circle and the Obama administration in the effort to seek damaging information about then-candidate Trump.

Read the newly released referral below:

[DOCUMENT EMBEDDED]

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Nadler on Memo

Nadler calls GOP memo criticizing FBI 'profoundly misleading'

Politico

Kyle Cheney

January 23, 2018 – 12:16 PM

<https://www.politico.com/story/2018/01/23/republican-memo-fbi-jerry-nadler-358918>

Rep. Jerrold Nadler, the top Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, says he considers a GOP memo critical of top FBI officials "profoundly misleading" after seeing the highly classified source material Republicans used to craft it.

Few lawmakers have gotten access to the materials House intelligence committee chairman Devin Nunes relied on to compile his four-page memo, which the committee circulated among all House members last week but has not made public. But Nadler said in a letter released Tuesday that he and Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte recently had a chance view the classified materials.

"Those materials tell a very different story than the conspiracy theory concocted by Chairman Nunes and being repeated in the press," Nadler wrote in the letter to Goodlatte.

A parade of GOP lawmakers this week have said the memo confirms misconduct and political bias against President Donald Trump by senior officials at the FBI. Democrats say the memo, which Republicans haven't shown to the FBI or Justice Department, is an attempt to undermine the special counsel investigation into Russian election meddling and any involvement by Trump's associates.

Nunes and other top Republicans have been discussing whether to make an unprecedented request to release the classified memo publicly, using an obscure process that would give Trump a chance to weigh in — possibly as soon as next week — and could require a vote of the full House. Many conservatives in Congress and in media have called on them to release the document.

Nadler's criticism of the memo adds to the partisan furor it's created on Capitol Hill. Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the intelligence committee, has called the memo a set of "distortions" and Republican talking points meant to tar investigators and protect the president from ongoing Russia probes. Schiff also said most lawmakers would never see the underlying source material behind the memo, preventing them from assessing its accuracy.

Nadler urged Goodlatte to work with him to "make these source materials available to every member of our Committee."

"Too many of our colleagues appear to be constructing their own version of history — completely unrelated to the facts as you and I understand them — based, at least in part, on this memorandum," he wrote. "Our members should have the benefit of access to the actual record without delay."

Nadler also urged Goodlatte to demand that Nunes release his memo to the Justice Department and FBI, both of which

Nadler also urged Goodlatte to demand that Nunes release his memo to the Justice Department and FBI, both of which have said they've sought the document but have yet to receive it. A Senate intelligence committee source said Nunes also hasn't responded to requests from members of the panel to share the document with senators.

"Some of our colleagues have compounded the problem by attacking the Department in public — where, because of the classified and sensitive nature of the case, Department officials cannot defend themselves," Nadler said.

Goodlatte met over the weekend with Nunes and Oversight Committee Chairman Trey Gowdy to discuss how to handle calls to release the memo publicly. They're considering whether to take a committee vote to do so next week. If they do, it would launch a process that would give Trump five days to approve or reject the request. If he approves, as GOP lawmakers expect, the memo could become public as soon as next Wednesday.

Sources familiar with the memo, which was compiled by aides to House Intelligence Committee chairman Devin Nunes, say it claims that senior FBI officials abused a secret surveillance program, commonly known as FISA, to target the Trump campaign last fall. According to three people who have viewed it, the memo suggests that FBI agents seeking a fall 2016 warrant to conduct surveillance of Trump campaign adviser Carter Page concealed the role a disputed dossier alleging Kremlin influence over Trump played in their decision.

The dossier that the memo alleges helped drive the decision to seek a FISA warrant on Page was compiled in 2016 by former British spy Christopher Steele, a trusted FBI partner in previous investigations, who had been commissioned by the private research firm Fusion GPS to investigate Trump's business ties to Russia. Fusion's work was funded at that time by a lawyer who represented Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign and the Democratic National Committee. It's unclear if Steele's relationship to the campaign was disclosed in the FISA application.

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)

From: Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:00 AM
To: Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Markup January 11

Rob,

(b)(5)

Thanks!
Prim

From: Hildabrand, Dorothy W. (OLA)
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:28 AM
To: Escalona, Prim F. (OLA) <pfescalona@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Tyson, Jill C. (OLA) <jctyson@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Pickell, Lindsay A. (OLA) <lapickell@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA) <mhankey@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <dlasseter@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Mangum, Anela M. (OLA) <amangum@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Markup January 11

I. Senators Attending:

Grassley, Cornyn, Kennedy, Crapo, Sasse, Lee, Hatch, Cruz, Tillis
Feinstein, Durbin, Whitehouse, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Hirono, Harris, Leahy

Sen. Grassley mentioned the large number of nominees, and said they usually would have been a UC agreement. He said the commuter has already voted on most. He's allowing new members to submit QFRs by the end of the day tomorrow.

He mentioned marshal nominee, Ted Kamatchus from Iowa.

He said the minority requested that they hold over nominees for a week.

Sen. Feinstein welcomed Sen. Harris and Booker and noted the number of women on the committee. She then congratulated Sen. Hatch on the child pornography bill and noted the importance of the restitution provision.

Sen. Hatch spoke about the child pornography bill, including the restitution from the crime victims' fund, access to the images, and a guardian ad litem provision.

Sen. Grassley said they'll add an amendment with minor clarifications to S.2152. Sens. Whitehouse, Blumenthal and Klobuchar thanked Sens. Hatch and Feinstein for their collegial work on the bill. Sens. Kennedy and Cruz were added as co-sponsors.

The amendment and then bill were added by voice vote.

Sen. Kennedy requested that the chairman call a meeting of the Judiciary (Committee?) for a status update on

the investigations, which Sen. Grassley is considering. Sen. Cornyn said they've been hearing about Fusion GPS in the news and do want a status update. Sen. Grassley and Sen. Feinstein agreed to have their staffs sit down and discuss what to do about the request.

II.

III. **Nominations**

Voted Out (by voice vote):

Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas

En banc by voice vote:

Joseph D. Brown, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas

Matthew D. Krueger, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin

En banc by voice vote:

Norman Euell Arflack, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky

Ted G. Kamatchus, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa

Held Over:

DOJ Nominees:

Brian Allen Benczkowski, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division

Jeffrey Bossert Clark, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division

Eric S. Dreiband, to be Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division

Elizabeth L. Branch, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit

Judges:

Stuart Kyle Duncan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit

David Ryan Stras, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit

Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama

R. Stan Baker, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia

Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama

Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama

Thomas Alvin Farr, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina

Charles Barnes Goodwin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma

Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana

Matthew J. Kacsmayk, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas

Emily Coody Marks, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama

Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama

Mark Saalfield Norris, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee

William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia

Eli Jeremy Richardson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee

Holly Lou Teeter, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas

II. Bills

[S. 2152, Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2017](#) (Hatch, Feinstein, Grassley, Whitehouse, Cornyn, Klobuchar, Tillis, Blumenthal, Hirono)- amended and reported (voice vote)

Dorothy Hildabrand
Research Assistant
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
Phone: 202 205 7851


PHONE: 202-303-7031

Email: Dorothy.W.Hildabrand@usdoj.gov

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Letter to DAG re: Ohr
Attachments: Letter from MRM to Rosenstein 1.4.2018.pdf

SS-(b)(5)



Thanks,
David

David F. Lasseter
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
(202) 514-1260

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2018 9:30 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Fox News: 'Somebody's already been killed' because of Trump dossier, Fusion GPS rep revealed

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Isgur Flores (b)(6)
Date: January 9, 2018 at 9:21:32 PM EST
To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Fox News: 'Somebody's already been killed' because of Trump dossier, Fusion GPS rep revealed

From: Comms Alert <CommsAlert@gop.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2018 2:34:06 PM
Subject: Fox News: 'Somebody's already been killed' because of Trump dossier, Fusion GPS rep revealed

'Somebody's already been killed' because of Trump dossier, Fusion GPS rep revealed

Fox News

Alex Pappas

January 9, 2018

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/01/09/somebodys-already-been-killed-because-trump-dossier-fusion-gps-rep-revealed.html>

An attorney for the co-founder of opposition research firm Fusion GPS revealed during a closed-door interview this summer with congressional investigators that "somebody's already been killed" as a result of the publication of the anti-Trump dossier.

"He wants to be very careful to protect his sources," Josh Levy, an attorney for Fusion GPS co-founder Glenn Simpson, said during an Aug. 22 Senate Judiciary Committee interview of his client. "Somebody's already been killed as a result of the publication of this dossier and no harm should come to anybody related to this honest work."

Levy doesn't elaborate on who was killed. The website BuzzFeed first published the dossier online last January, airing its unverified allegations about President Trump's connections with Russia.

The Levy statement was contained as part of the lengthy transcript of Simpson's interview with committee investigators, released Tuesday by Senate Judiciary Committee Ranking Member Dianne Feinstein.

"The innuendo and misinformation circulating about the transcript are part of a deeply troubling effort to undermine the investigation into potential collusion and obstruction of justice," Feinstein said in a statement. "The only way to set the record straight is to make the transcript public."

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley had opposed releasing the transcript, saying certain "investigative factors" must be considered to protect information during an ongoing inquiry.

Simpson's firm commissioned the dossier, which was written by former British MI6 agent Christopher Steele.

Trump has derided the dossier as politically motivated, and several GOP-led committees are investigating whether it formed the basis for the FBI's initial investigation into Russian election interference.

Fox News' Adam Shaw and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2018 2:15 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG); Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Subject: For Review
Attachments: FBI's McCabe 'has an Ohr problem,' will not testify on Tuesday, source says _
Fox News.pdf; FederalInvestigationofSchedulingError.pdf; LinderLetter.pdf; Re:
Draft letter.msg; DAG Letter - Draft - Boyd Preferences V2.docx; DOJ
PRODUCTION LINE BY LINE V2.docx



POLITICS · December 12th, 2017

FBI's McCabe 'has an Ohr problem,' will not testify on Tuesday, source says



By Chad Pergram, Edmund DeMarche | Fox News



00:02 / 05:02

Does Mueller have proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

Former federal prosecutor Andy McCarthy sounds off on 'The Ingraham Angle.'

Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe, who was reportedly scheduled to testify behind closed doors in front of the House Intelligence Committee on Tuesday, will instead meet next week due to a "scheduling error," Department of Justice officials told Fox News.

McCabe's testimony was likely to, at least in part, focus on Peter Strzok's role in the Hillary Clinton email investigation.

Strzok is a former deputy to the assistant director at the FBI who was removed from Special Counsel Robert Mueller's staff after Mueller learned Strzok had exchanged anti-Trump texts with a colleague.

House investigators previously told Fox News they have long regarded Strzok as a key figure in the chain of events when the bureau, in 2016, received the infamous anti-Trump "dossier," which launched a counterintelligence investigation into possible Russian meddling in the election.

"This was a routine scheduling error after the dates were switched on an internal email that we are happy to provide the committee," a Justice Department official told Fox News. "The FBI regrets the error, and we look forward to making both witnesses (the alleged FBI handler for Christopher Steele and McCabe) available prior to the Christmas recess."



Bruce Ohr Ohr was recently demoted from one of his two senior posts, Fox News has learned. (AP)

Steele is a former British spy who reportedly compiled a dossier of allegations about President Trump's ties to Russia. Fox News also was shown an internal email from a senior FBI official instructing a subordinate to confirm with the committee that the Steele handler would visit the committee on Dec. 12, with McCabe on Dec. 19.

But Fox News was told by those familiar with the matter that the intelligence committee is suspicious of the purported scheduling error. One source said they believe the schedule issue arose [after Fox News' report Monday night on Department of Justice official Bruce Ohr.](#)

Ohr was recently demoted from one of his two senior posts. Fox News reported that Ohr's wife, Nellie Ohr, worked through last fall for Fusion GPS, which was behind the anti-Trump dossier.

The precise nature of Mrs. Ohr's duties – including whether she worked on the dossier – remains unclear but a review of her published works available online reveals Mrs. Ohr has written extensively on Russia-related subjects.



Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe will meet with the House Intelligence Committee next week. (Reuters)

“McCabe has an Ohr problem,” one congressional source said.

The supposition is that Justice Department officials realized McCabe would face questions about Ohr and he is not prepared to respond.

The committee is prepared to subpoena all Justice Department documents and records related to the scheduling debacle, the source said. The committee is also prepared to subpoena McCabe to compel his testimony later this week.

Some Capitol Hill sources have expressed reservations that McCabe could retire before various congressional investigators get to him.

Fox News' Jake Gibson and James Rosen contributed to this report.

Edmund DeMarche is a news editor for FoxNews.com. Follow him on Twitter [@EDeMarche](https://twitter.com/EDeMarche).

U.S.

Crime
Military
Education
Terror
Immigration
Economy
Personal Freedoms

Politics

Executive
Senate
House
Judiciary
Foreign policy
Polls
Elections

Business

Markets
Politics
Technology
Features
Business Leaders

Science

Archaeology
Air & Space
Planet Earth
Wild Nature
Natural Science
Dinosaurs

World

U.N.
Conflicts
Terrorism
Disasters
Global Economy
Environment
Religion
Scandals

Entertainment

Celebrity News
Movies
TV News
Music News
Style News
Entertainment Video

Lifestyle

Food + Drink
Cars + Trucks
Travel + Outdoors
House + Home
Fitness + Well being
Style + Beauty

Tech

Security
Innovation
Drones
Computers
Video Games
Military Tech

Health

- Healthy Living
- Medical Research
- Mental Health
- Cancer
- Heart Health
- Children's Health

About

- On Air Personalities
- Careers
- College Students
- Fox Around the World
- Advertise With Us
- Ad Choices
- Email Newsroom
- Media Relations

Video

- Watch Live
- Show Clips
- News Clips
- Editor's Picks
- Fox News Go

Other

- Fox News Insider
- Fox News Radio
- Fox Nation
- Live Video
- Newsletters
- Alerts
- Podcasts
- Apps & Products

[Terms of Use](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Closed Captioning Policy](#) [Help](#)

This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed. ©2017 FOX News Network, LLC. All rights reserved. All market data delayed 20 minutes.

Murphy, Marcia (ODAG)

From: Murphy, Marcia (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2017 6:17 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG); Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Cc: Gamble, Nathaniel (ODAG)
Subject: 2017.12.18.GaetzLtr_12_28_2017_18_12_29.pdf
Attachments: 2017.12.18.GaetzLtr_12_28_2017_18_12_29.pdf

FYI...this letter came in today. Sending the original to Exec Sec to be assigned to OLA for response.

MATT GAETZ
1ST DISTRICT, FLORIDA

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0901

WASHINGTON OFFICE
507 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
(202) 225-4136

DISTRICT OFFICE
226 SOUTH PALAFOX PLACE
6TH FLOOR
PENSACOLA, FL 32502
(850) 479-1183
<http://gaetz.house.gov>

December 18, 2017

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

In your December 13 testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, you said that were unable to answer several of my questions, as well as the questions of my colleagues, because you needed to check your information before providing an answer. I appreciate your commitment to accuracy. Now that you are able to check and confirm the information you provide, I would like to ask again:

- 1) Was Peter Strzok either the recipient or the sender of any documents or correspondence related to the "tarmac meeting" of former Attorney General Loretta Lynch and former President William Clinton? If so, please provide copies of any and all such documents.

- 2) When did the Department of Justice become aware that Nellie Ohr was employed by Fusion GPS? Since her husband, Bruce Ohr, served as the Associate Deputy Attorney General, did her employment with Fusion GPS raise any concerns about potential conflicts-of-interest among anyone within the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Investigation? Were these concerns addressed in any way?

- 3) When did the Department of Justice learn about Bruce Ohr's meeting with Christopher Steele, and his meeting with Glenn Simpson? When I asked you these questions during your testimony, you said that you were not in a position to provide that information, but that the Department of Justice has agreed to turn over relevant information to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I should not need to point out that the House Committee on the Judiciary, not the Intelligence Committee, has oversight over the Department of Justice. Your answer to this question is relevant to our oversight capacity.

The American people have seen your testimony, and have been left with more questions than answers. So too have my fellow members of the House Committee on the Judiciary. With this letter, I hope to receive answers.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Matt Gaetz". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Matt Gaetz

Member of Congress

Lasseter, David F. (OLA)

From: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2017 2:26 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Incoming letters to DAG
Attachments: 2017-12-06 RHJ to DOJ Rosenstein.pdf; Instructions for Responding to Committee Request 115th.pdf; 2017-11-15 Letter to Sessions on Special Counsel.pdf

Scott—attached are the letters I have most readily available. I will continue to look for any others.

Thanks,
David

David F. Lasseter
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
(202) 514-1260



UNITED STATES SENATE

November 15, 2017

The Honorable Jeff Sessions
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

I am writing to urge you to appoint a special counsel to look into the Uranium One controversy surrounding former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton as well as the relationship between Fusion GPS, the Democratic National Committee (DNC), the Clinton campaign, and Russian actors.

I believe a special counsel is warranted to ensure that there is no conflict of interest between your office and these investigations, and that both matters deserve to be looked at in terms of violations of the law and potential Russian influence on the 2016 campaign as well as the operation of our government. In light of the contentious environment in which we live, I believe a credible in-house investigation will be hard to achieve. It is necessary to avoid even the appearance of conflicts of interest with all things Russia.

I have supported Mr. Mueller's investigation into the Trump campaign and all things Russia, and I expect that investigation to proceed unencumbered. However, given all of the activity between Fusion GPS and the DNC, the hiring of a former foreign intelligence officer to gather information against then-candidate Trump cries out for a special counsel. I believe it is inappropriate for an American political party to fund an operation where a former foreign intelligence officer is used to gather information against a political rival from Russian sources, as everything in Russia is monitored and controlled by Russian intelligence services.

Additionally, I believe a special counsel is needed to investigate the Uranium One controversy in light of the specter of a quid pro quo among Secretary Clinton, the State Department, Rosatom, Uranium One, and the Clinton Foundation. Recent news reports indicate that prior to the approval of the Uranium One-Rosatom deal, the FBI had gathered evidence that Russian officials were engaged in a racketeering scheme designed to grow Vladimir Putin's atomic energy business inside the United States.¹ Further, a female Russian spy posing as an American

¹ "FBI uncovered Russian bribery plot before Obama administration approved controversial nuclear deal with Moscow," THE HILL, Oct. 17, 2017, available at <http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/355749-fbi-uncovered-russian-bribery-plot-before-obama-administration>.

reportedly attempted to grow close to a major Democratic donor in hopes of gaining intelligence on Secretary Clinton's State Department.² The FBI had also reportedly obtained evidence that Russian officials had donated millions of dollars to the Clinton Foundation, and news sources indicate that former President Bill Clinton received \$500,000 for a single Moscow speech from a Kremlin-tied Russian bank that was promoting Uranium One stock³—all while the State Department under Secretary Clinton's leadership was deciding to approve Rosatom's purchase of Uranium One.

I hope you will take this request seriously and appoint a special counsel as soon as practicable.

Sincerely,



Lindsey O. Graham
United States Senator

² "FBI watched, then acted as Russian spy moved closer to Hillary Clinton," THE HILL, Oct. 22, 2017, *available at* <http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/356630-fbi-watched-then-acted-as-russian-spy-moved-closer-to-hillary>.

³ "Cash Flowed to Clinton Foundation Amid Russian Uranium Deal," NEW YORK TIMES, April 23, 2015, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/24/us/cash-flowed-to-clinton-foundation-as-russians-pressed-for-control-of-uranium-company.html>.

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 8:13 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

(b)(5) [REDACTED] Thanks all.

On Dec 20, 2017, at 8:09 PM, Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Quietly?

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 7:30 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b)(6) [REDACTED]; Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Isgur Flores (b)(6) [REDACTED]
Date: December 20, 2017 at 7:28:32 PM EST
To: "sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov" <sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

From: Comms Alert <CommsAlert@gop.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 6:50:15 PM
Subject: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI
Politico
Kyle Cheney & John Bresnahan
December 20, 2017 – 6:34 PM
<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/12/20/house-republicans-quietly-investigate-doj-fbi-310121>

The group was born out of frustration over the Justice Department's refusal to explain how it used a disputed dossier.

A group of House Republicans has gathered secretly for weeks in the Capitol in an effort to build a case that senior leaders of the Justice Department and FBI improperly — and perhaps criminally — mishandled the contents of a dossier that describes alleged ties between President Donald Trump and Russia, according to four people familiar with their plans.

A subset of the Republican members of the House intelligence committee, led by Chairman Devin Nunes of California, has been quietly working parallel to the committee's high-profile inquiry into Russian meddling in the 2016 presidential election. They haven't informed Democrats about their plans, but they have consulted with the House's general counsel.

The people familiar with Nunes' plans said the goal is to highlight what some committee Republicans see as corruption and conspiracy in the upper ranks of federal law enforcement. The group hopes to release a report early next year detailing their concerns about the DOJ and FBI, and they might seek congressional votes to declassify elements of their evidence.

That final product could ultimately be used by Republicans to discredit special counsel Robert Mueller's investigation into whether any Trump aides colluded with Russia during the 2016 campaign — or possibly even to justify his dismissal, as some rank-and-file Republicans and Trump allies have demanded. (The president has said he is not currently considering firing Mueller.)

Republicans in the Nunes-led group suspect the FBI and DOJ have worked either to hurt Trump or aid his former campaign rival Hillary Clinton, a sense that has pervaded parts of the president's inner circle. Trump has long called the investigations into whether Russia meddled in the 2016 election a "witch hunt," and on Tuesday, his son Donald Trump Jr. told a crowd in Florida the probes were part of a "rigged system" by "people at the highest levels of government" who were working to hurt the president.

The sources familiar with the separate inquiry said it was born out of steadily building frustration with the Justice Department's refusal to share details of the way the Trump dossier was used to launch the FBI's investigation of his campaign team last year — or whether it was the basis for any court-ordered surveillance of Trump associates.

The group is relying on the same documents and testimony provided by top Obama administration officials — such as former acting attorney general Sally Yates, former attorney general Loretta Lynch and former UN ambassador Samantha Power — who were grilled as part of the intelligence committee's broader Russia probe.

It's unclear how many members of the intelligence committee are participating in the side effort. Lawmakers on the full committee interviewed by POLITICO refused to discuss it.

"I don't talk about what we do behind closed doors," said Rep. Mike Conaway (R-

Texas), who's leading the intelligence committee's bipartisan Russia probe. "I'm not going to talk about that," said Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), another member of the panel.

A congressional aide with knowledge of the meetings said Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.) was not among the participants. "While he does believe the FBI and DOJ have recently made decisions worth looking into, he is and will always be a defender of the FBI, DOJ and the special counsel," the aide said.

Nunes' office declined to comment about the effort, but he has aired his suspicions about the law enforcement agencies before.

"I hate to use the word corrupt, but they've become at least so dirty that who's watching the watchmen? Who's investigating these people?" he said in a Fox News interview earlier this month. "There is no one."

DOJ and FBI officials also declined to comment. Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein defended the FBI and Mueller's team at a recent hearing on Capitol Hill. "The special counsel investigation is not a witch hunt," he said.

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House intelligence committee, said he wasn't aware of the Nunes effort but said it fit with what he sees as an increasingly destructive bent in Republicans' rhetoric and actions.

"I think what we are seeing in our committee ... is an effort to attack the Department of Justice, an effort to attack the FBI, to attack Bob Mueller, is an effort to undermine the investigations and these institutions out of fear of what they'll find and try to discredit them in advance," he said. "It's a pernicious thing to do that will ultimately inflict long-term damage on these institutions."

The Nunes-led group is the latest evidence of an increasingly toxic and bruising confrontation between Republicans on Capitol Hill and the highest ranks of the justice system. Some Hill Republicans are irate about the Justice Department's refusal to provide more details about its investigation of Trump associates' ties to Russia. They're also frothing over the FBI's handling of the Trump-Russia dossier, which GOP lawmakers have openly mocked as "discredited" and "disproven."

In recent weeks, GOP lawmakers have berated top Justice Department officials and threatened to hold them in contempt of Congress, and a couple of rank-and-file members described ongoing investigations of Trump associates in startling terms — including as a potential "coup" attempt. On Wednesday, Fox News reported that Nunes intends to subpoena senior FBI agents connected to the dossier.

Earlier this week, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) called for the FBI's deputy director, Andrew McCabe, to be replaced amid claims by Republicans of anti-Trump bias infecting the bureau. And Gowdy, the chairman of the House oversight committee, joined House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte on Tuesday to request interviews with senior FBI officials as early as Thursday — which some lawmakers say is the precursor to subpoenas.

To Democrats, the GOP offensive is an attempt to distract from the investigation of Trump associates by Mueller, who has already indicted Trump's former campaign chairman Paul Manafort and secured a guilty plea from his first national security adviser, Michael Flynn. There are indications he's investigating whether Trump obstructed justice by firing former FBI Director James Comey, whose exit led to Mueller taking over the Russia probe.

The more dangerous Mueller's probe has seemed to become to the White House, the louder the attacks have gotten from Trump allies on Capitol Hill, Democrats say.

"Republicans are terrified that Special Counsel Mueller is getting closer to the truth, and they are desperate to grind his investigation to a halt — even if they undermine the foundations of our democracy," Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.) said in a statement after Republicans requested the FBI interviews.

GOP lawmakers have become increasingly fixated on the FBI's use of the dossier describing sometimes salacious allegations of Trump's ties to the Kremlin. The document was compiled by former British spy Christopher Steele, who was commissioned by opposition research firm Fusion GPS. Under pressure from Nunes, Fusion revealed that funding for the dossier project was provided by Clinton's campaign and the Democratic National Committee. The House general counsel helped argue on behalf of Nunes in court to compel the release of Fusion's funding information.

In January, then-FBI Director Comey briefed Trump about the dossier prior to his inauguration, and the contents subsequently leaked in the media after circulating in Washington for months. Trump has rejected the allegations as fiction, and Republicans on Capitol Hill have largely dismissed it as a "discredited" or "false" document, though investigators have spent months attempting to verify its contents.

Still, Republicans on the intelligence and judiciary committees have increasingly wondered aloud whether the FBI — which had a longstanding relationship with Steele — used the allegations in his dossier to obtain surveillance warrants to spy on Trump campaign associates. They also want to know if the agency paid Steele for his work at the same time he was being paid by the Clinton campaign.

In recent weeks, Republicans have grown more vocal in their accusations that the FBI, DOJ and Mueller's team are biased. They've railed against political donations that some of Mueller's attorneys have made to Democrats. And more recently, they've pointed to a series of text messages — revealed by the DOJ inspector general — in which two senior FBI officials, who were previously assigned to the special counsel's office, bashed Trump.

Schiff said committee rules require consultation between Republicans and Democrats, but House Speaker Paul Ryan must enforce bipartisan cooperation if he wants it to occur.

"And at this point, you have to conclude that he doesn't," Schiff said. Ryan's office declined to comment.

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 8:12 PM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

Who knew politico (or nunes) had such a wonderful sense of irony?

On Dec 20, 2017, at 8:09 PM, Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Quietly?

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 7:30 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b)(6); Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Isgur Flores (b)(6)
Date: December 20, 2017 at 7:28:32 PM EST
To: "sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov" <sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

From: Comms Alert <CommsAlert@gop.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 6:50:15 PM
Subject: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

Politico

Kyle Cheney & John Bresnahan

December 20, 2017 – 6:34 PM

<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/12/20/house-republicans-quietly-investigate-doj-fbi-310121>

The group was born out of frustration over the Justice Department's refusal to explain how it used a disputed dossier.

A group of House Republicans has gathered secretly for weeks in the Capitol in an effort to build a case that senior leaders of the Justice Department and FBI improperly — and perhaps criminally — mishandled the contents of a dossier that describes alleged ties between President Donald Trump and Russia, according to four people familiar with their plans.

A subset of the Republican members of the House intelligence committee, led by Chairman Devin Nunes of California, has been quietly working parallel to the committee's high-profile inquiry into Russian meddling in the 2016 presidential election. They haven't informed Democrats about their plans, but they have consulted with the House's general counsel.

The people familiar with Nunes' plans said the goal is to highlight what some committee Republicans see as corruption and conspiracy in the upper ranks of federal law enforcement. The group hopes to release a report early next year detailing their concerns about the DOJ and FBI, and they might seek congressional votes to declassify elements of their evidence.

That final product could ultimately be used by Republicans to discredit special counsel Robert Mueller's investigation into whether any Trump aides colluded with Russia during the 2016 campaign — or possibly even to justify his dismissal, as some rank-and-file Republicans and Trump allies have demanded. (The president has said he is not currently considering firing Mueller.)

Republicans in the Nunes-led group suspect the FBI and DOJ have worked either to hurt Trump or aid his former campaign rival Hillary Clinton, a sense that has pervaded parts of the president's inner circle. Trump has long called the investigations into whether Russia meddled in the 2016 election a "witch hunt," and on Tuesday, his son Donald Trump Jr. told a crowd in Florida the probes were part of a "rigged system" by "people at the highest levels of government" who were working to hurt the president.

The sources familiar with the separate inquiry said it was born out of steadily building frustration with the Justice Department's refusal to share details of the way the Trump dossier was used to launch the FBI's investigation of his campaign team last year — or whether it was the basis for any court-ordered surveillance of Trump associates.

The group is relying on the same documents and testimony provided by top Obama administration officials — such as former acting attorney general Sally Yates, former attorney general Loretta Lynch and former UN ambassador Samantha Power — who were grilled as part of the intelligence committee's broader Russia probe.

It's unclear how many members of the intelligence committee are participating in the side effort. Lawmakers on the full committee interviewed by POLITICO refused to discuss it.

"I don't talk about what we do behind closed doors," said Rep. Mike Conaway (R-

Texas), who's leading the intelligence committee's bipartisan Russia probe. "I'm not going to talk about that," said Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), another member of the panel.

A congressional aide with knowledge of the meetings said Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.) was not among the participants. "While he does believe the FBI and DOJ have recently made decisions worth looking into, he is and will always be a defender of the FBI, DOJ and the special counsel," the aide said.

Nunes' office declined to comment about the effort, but he has aired his suspicions about the law enforcement agencies before.

"I hate to use the word corrupt, but they've become at least so dirty that who's watching the watchmen? Who's investigating these people?" he said in a Fox News interview earlier this month. "There is no one."

DOJ and FBI officials also declined to comment. Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein defended the FBI and Mueller's team at a recent hearing on Capitol Hill. "The special counsel investigation is not a witch hunt," he said.

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House intelligence committee, said he wasn't aware of the Nunes effort but said it fit with what he sees as an increasingly destructive bent in Republicans' rhetoric and actions.

"I think what we are seeing in our committee ... is an effort to attack the Department of Justice, an effort to attack the FBI, to attack Bob Mueller, is an effort to undermine the investigations and these institutions out of fear of what they'll find and try to discredit them in advance," he said. "It's a pernicious thing to do that will ultimately inflict long-term damage on these institutions."

The Nunes-led group is the latest evidence of an increasingly toxic and bruising confrontation between Republicans on Capitol Hill and the highest ranks of the justice system. Some Hill Republicans are irate about the Justice Department's refusal to provide more details about its investigation of Trump associates' ties to Russia. They're also frothing over the FBI's handling of the Trump-Russia dossier, which GOP lawmakers have openly mocked as "discredited" and "disproven."

In recent weeks, GOP lawmakers have berated top Justice Department officials and threatened to hold them in contempt of Congress, and a couple of rank-and-file members described ongoing investigations of Trump associates in startling terms — including as a potential "coup" attempt. On Wednesday, Fox News reported that Nunes intends to subpoena senior FBI agents connected to the dossier.

Earlier this week, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) called for the FBI's deputy director, Andrew McCabe, to be replaced amid claims by Republicans of anti-Trump bias infecting the bureau. And Gowdy, the chairman of the House oversight committee, joined House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte on Tuesday to request interviews with senior FBI officials as early as Thursday — which some lawmakers say is the precursor to subpoenas.

To Democrats, the GOP offensive is an attempt to distract from the investigation of Trump associates by Mueller, who has already indicted Trump's former campaign chairman Paul Manafort and secured a guilty plea from his first national security adviser, Michael Flynn. There are indications he's investigating whether Trump obstructed justice by firing former FBI Director James Comey, whose exit led to Mueller taking over the Russia probe.

The more dangerous Mueller's probe has seemed to become to the White House, the louder the attacks have gotten from Trump allies on Capitol Hill, Democrats say.

"Republicans are terrified that Special Counsel Mueller is getting closer to the truth, and they are desperate to grind his investigation to a halt — even if they undermine the foundations of our democracy," Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.) said in a statement after Republicans requested the FBI interviews.

GOP lawmakers have become increasingly fixated on the FBI's use of the dossier describing sometimes salacious allegations of Trump's ties to the Kremlin. The document was compiled by former British spy Christopher Steele, who was commissioned by opposition research firm Fusion GPS. Under pressure from Nunes, Fusion revealed that funding for the dossier project was provided by Clinton's campaign and the Democratic National Committee. The House general counsel helped argue on behalf of Nunes in court to compel the release of Fusion's funding information.

In January, then-FBI Director Comey briefed Trump about the dossier prior to his inauguration, and the contents subsequently leaked in the media after circulating in Washington for months. Trump has rejected the allegations as fiction, and Republicans on Capitol Hill have largely dismissed it as a "discredited" or "false" document, though investigators have spent months attempting to verify its contents.

Still, Republicans on the intelligence and judiciary committees have increasingly wondered aloud whether the FBI — which had a longstanding relationship with Steele — used the allegations in his dossier to obtain surveillance warrants to spy on Trump campaign associates. They also want to know if the agency paid Steele for his work at the same time he was being paid by the Clinton campaign.

In recent weeks, Republicans have grown more vocal in their accusations that the FBI, DOJ and Mueller's team are biased. They've railed against political donations that some of Mueller's attorneys have made to Democrats. And more recently, they've pointed to a series of text messages — revealed by the DOJ inspector general — in which two senior FBI officials, who were previously assigned to the special counsel's office, bashed Trump.

Schiff said committee rules require consultation between Republicans and Democrats, but House Speaker Paul Ryan must enforce bipartisan cooperation if he wants it to occur.

...

"And at this point, you have to conclude that he doesn't," Schiff said. Ryan's office declined to comment.

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 8:09 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Subject: RE: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

(b)(5)

From: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 7:55 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Re: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

(b)(5)

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 20, 2017, at 7:33 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Statement I suggest--(b)(5)

[Redacted]

On Dec 20, 2017, at 7:29 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Isgur Flores (b)(6)
Date: December 20, 2017 at 7:28:32 PM EST
To: "sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov" <sarah.isgur.flores@usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

From: Comms Alert <CommsAlert@gop.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 6:50:15 PM

Subject: Politico: House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

House Republicans quietly investigate perceived corruption at DOJ, FBI

Politico

Kyle Cheney & John Bresnahan

December 20, 2017 – 6:34 PM

<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/12/20/house-republicans-quietly-investigate-doj-fbi-310121>

The group was born out of frustration over the Justice Department's refusal to explain how it used a disputed dossier.

A group of House Republicans has gathered secretly for weeks in the Capitol in an effort to build a case that senior leaders of the Justice Department and FBI improperly — and perhaps criminally — mishandled the contents of a dossier that describes alleged ties between President Donald Trump and Russia, according to four people familiar with their plans.

A subset of the Republican members of the House intelligence committee, led by Chairman Devin Nunes of California, has been quietly working parallel to the committee's high-profile inquiry into Russian meddling in the 2016 presidential election. They haven't informed Democrats about their plans, but they have consulted with the House's general counsel.

The people familiar with Nunes' plans said the goal is to highlight what some committee Republicans see as corruption and conspiracy in the upper ranks of federal law enforcement. The group hopes to release a report early next year detailing their concerns about the DOJ and FBI, and they might seek congressional votes to declassify elements of their evidence.

That final product could ultimately be used by Republicans to discredit special counsel Robert Mueller's investigation into whether any Trump aides colluded with Russia during the 2016 campaign — or possibly even to justify his dismissal, as some rank-and-file Republicans and Trump allies have demanded. (The president has said he is not currently considering firing Mueller.)

Republicans in the Nunes-led group suspect the FBI and DOJ have worked either to hurt Trump or aid his former campaign rival Hillary Clinton, a sense that has pervaded parts of the president's inner circle. Trump has long called the investigations into whether Russia meddled in the 2016 election a "witch hunt," and on Tuesday, his son Donald Trump Jr. told a crowd in Florida the probes were part of a "rigged

system" by "people at the highest levels of government" who were working to hurt the president.

The sources familiar with the separate inquiry said it was born out of steadily building frustration with the Justice Department's refusal to share details of the way the Trump dossier was used to launch the FBI's investigation of his campaign team last year — or whether it was the basis for any court-ordered surveillance of Trump associates.

The group is relying on the same documents and testimony provided by top Obama administration officials — such as former acting attorney general Sally Yates, former attorney general Loretta Lynch and former UN ambassador Samantha Power — who were grilled as part of the intelligence committee's broader Russia probe.

It's unclear how many members of the intelligence committee are participating in the side effort. Lawmakers on the full committee interviewed by POLITICO refused to discuss it.

"I don't talk about what we do behind closed doors," said Rep. Mike Conaway (R-Texas), who's leading the intelligence committee's bipartisan Russia probe. "I'm not going to talk about that," said Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), another member of the panel.

A congressional aide with knowledge of the meetings said Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.) was not among the participants. "While he does believe the FBI and DOJ have recently made decisions worth looking into, he is and will always be a defender of the FBI, DOJ and the special counsel," the aide said.

Nunes' office declined to comment about the effort, but he has aired his suspicions about the law enforcement agencies before.

"I hate to use the word corrupt, but they've become at least so dirty that who's watching the watchmen? Who's investigating these people?" he said in a Fox News interview earlier this month. "There is no one."

DOJ and FBI officials also declined to comment. Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein defended the FBI and Mueller's team at a recent hearing on Capitol Hill. "The special counsel investigation is not a witch hunt," he said.

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House intelligence committee, said he wasn't aware of the Nunes effort but said it fit with what he sees as an increasingly destructive bent in Republicans' rhetoric and actions.

"I think what we are seeing in our committee ... is an effort to attack the

Department of Justice, an effort to attack the FBI, to attack Bob Mueller, is an effort to undermine the investigations and these institutions out of fear of what they'll find and try to discredit them in advance," he said. "It's a pernicious thing to do that will ultimately inflict long-term damage on these institutions."

The Nunes-led group is the latest evidence of an increasingly toxic and bruising confrontation between Republicans on Capitol Hill and the highest ranks of the justice system. Some Hill Republicans are irate about the Justice Department's refusal to provide more details about its investigation of Trump associates' ties to Russia. They're also frothing over the FBI's handling of the Trump-Russia dossier, which GOP lawmakers have openly mocked as "discredited" and "disproven."

In recent weeks, GOP lawmakers have berated top Justice Department officials and threatened to hold them in contempt of Congress, and a couple of rank-and-file members described ongoing investigations of Trump associates in startling terms — including as a potential "coup" attempt. On Wednesday, Fox News reported that Nunes intends to subpoena senior FBI agents connected to the dossier.

Earlier this week, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) called for the FBI's deputy director, Andrew McCabe, to be replaced amid claims by Republicans of anti-Trump bias infecting the bureau. And Gowdy, the chairman of the House oversight committee, joined House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte on Tuesday to request interviews with senior FBI officials as early as Thursday — which some lawmakers say is the precursor to subpoenas.

To Democrats, the GOP offensive is an attempt to distract from the investigation of Trump associates by Mueller, who has already indicted Trump's former campaign chairman Paul Manafort and secured a guilty plea from his first national security adviser, Michael Flynn. There are indications he's investigating whether Trump obstructed justice by firing former FBI Director James Comey, whose exit led to Mueller taking over the Russia probe.

The more dangerous Mueller's probe has seemed to become to the White House, the louder the attacks have gotten from Trump allies on Capitol Hill, Democrats say.

"Republicans are terrified that Special Counsel Mueller is getting closer to the truth, and they are desperate to grind his investigation to a halt — even if they undermine the foundations of our democracy," Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.) said in a statement after Republicans requested the FBI interviews.

GOP lawmakers have become increasingly fixated on the FBI's use of

the dossier describing sometimes salacious allegations of Trump's ties to the Kremlin. The document was compiled by former British spy Christopher Steele, who was commissioned by opposition research firm Fusion GPS. Under pressure from Nunes, Fusion revealed that funding for the dossier project was provided by Clinton's campaign and the Democratic National Committee. The House general counsel helped argue on behalf of Nunes in court to compel the release of Fusion's funding information.

In January, then-FBI Director Comey briefed Trump about the dossier prior to his inauguration, and the contents subsequently leaked in the media after circulating in Washington for months. Trump has rejected the allegations as fiction, and Republicans on Capitol Hill have largely dismissed it as a "discredited" or "false" document, though investigators have spent months attempting to verify its contents.

Still, Republicans on the intelligence and judiciary committees have increasingly wondered aloud whether the FBI — which had a longstanding relationship with Steele — used the allegations in his dossier to obtain surveillance warrants to spy on Trump campaign associates. They also want to know if the agency paid Steele for his work at the same time he was being paid by the Clinton campaign.

In recent weeks, Republicans have grown more vocal in their accusations that the FBI, DOJ and Mueller's team are biased. They've railed against political donations that some of Mueller's attorneys have made to Democrats. And more recently, they've pointed to a series of text messages — revealed by the DOJ inspector general — in which two senior FBI officials, who were previously assigned to the special counsel's office, bashed Trump.

Schiff said committee rules require consultation between Republicans and Democrats, but House Speaker Paul Ryan must enforce bipartisan cooperation if he wants it to occur.

"And at this point, you have to conclude that he doesn't," Schiff said. Ryan's office declined to comment.

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 12:44 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: FW: EXCLUSIVE: HPSCI plans new subpoenas as McCabe draws blank on Democrats' funding of dossier

Incoming...

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Gibson, Jake [mailto:Jake.Gibson@FOXNEWS.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: EXCLUSIVE: HPSCI plans new subpoenas as McCabe draws blank on Democrats' funding of dossier

EXCLUSIVE: HPSCI plans new subpoenas as McCabe draws blank on Democrats' funding of dossier

By James Rosen

Congressional investigators tell Fox News that Tuesday's seven-hour interrogation of Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe contained numerous conflicts with the testimony of previous witnesses, prompting the Republican majority staff of the House Intelligence Committee to decide to issue fresh subpoenas next week on Justice Department and FBI personnel.

While HPSCI staff would not confirm who will be summoned for testimony, all indications point to demoted DOJ official Bruce G. Ohr and DOJ General Counsel James A. Baker, who accompanied McCabe, along with other lawyers, to Tuesday's HPSCI session.

The issuance of a subpoena against the Justice Department's top lawyer could provoke a new constitutional clash between the two branches, even worse than the months-long tug of war over documents and witnesses that has already led House Speaker Paul Ryan to accuse DOJ and FBI of "stonewalling" and HPSCI Chairman Devin Nunes (R-CA) to threaten contempt-of-Congress citations against Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and FBI Director Christopher Wray.

"It's hard to know who's telling us the truth," said one House investigator after McCabe's questioning.

Fox News is told that several lawmakers participated in the questioning of McCabe, led chiefly by Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-SC).

Sources close to the investigation say that McCabe was a “friendly witness” to the Democrats in the room, who are said to have pressed the deputy director, without success, to help them build a case against President Trump for obstruction of justice in the Russia-collusion probe. “If he could have, he would have,” said one participant in the questioning.

Investigators say McCabe recounted to the panel how hard the FBI had worked to verify the contents of the anti-Trump “dossier” and stood by its credibility. But when pressed to identify what in the salacious document the bureau had actually corroborated, the sources said, McCabe cited only the fact that Trump campaign advisor Carter Page had traveled to Moscow. Beyond that, investigators said, McCabe could not even say that the bureau had verified the dossier’s allegations about the specific meetings Page supposedly held in Moscow.

The sources said that when asked when he learned that the dossier had been funded by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee, McCabe claimed he could not recall – despite the reported existence of documents with McCabe’s own signature on them establishing his knowledge of the dossier’s financing and provenance.

The decision by HPSCI staff to subpoena Ohr comes as he is set to appear before the Senate Intelligence committee, which is conducting its own probe of Russian interference in the 2016 election.

Until earlier this month, when Fox News began investigating him, Ohr held two titles at DOJ: associate deputy attorney general, a post that placed him four doors down from his boss, Rosenstein; and director of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces (OCDEF), a program described by the department as “the centerpiece of the attorney general’s drug strategy.”

Subsequently, Fox News disclosed that Ohr’s wife Nellie, an academic expert on Russia, had worked for Fusion GPS through the summer and fall of 2016.

Former FBI Director James Comey, testifying before the House in March, described the dossier as a compendium of “salacious and unverified” allegations against then-candidate Donald Trump and his associates. The Nunes panel has spent much of this year investigating whether DOJ, under then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch, used the dossier to justify a foreign surveillance warrant against Page, a foreign policy advisor to the Trump campaign.

DOJ and FBI say they have cooperated extensively with Nunes and his team, including the provision of several hundred pages of classified documents relating to the dossier.

James Rosen
Chief Washington Correspondent
Twitter: @JamesRosenTV

james.rosen@foxnews.com

202-824-6541 (office) / (b)(6) (mobile)

(b)(6) (WH) / (b)(6) (State)

Editor, *A Torch Kept Lit: Great Lives of the Twentieth Century*

by William F. Buckley, Jr. / *New York Times* bestseller

Available in all formats @ atorchkeptlit.com

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:59 PM
To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Subject: RE: edits

(b)(5)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the main body of the email.

From: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:57 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

(b)(5)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the main body of the email.

(b)(5)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:51 PM
To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Re: edits

(b)(5)

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:45 PM, Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

(b)(5)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:42 PM
To: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Current

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:35 PM
To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>

CC: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Re: edits

Adding Zac

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:32 PM, Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

(b)(5)

[REDACTED]

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:29 PM
To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

(b)(5)

[REDACTED]

xxxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:07 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits
Importance: High

(b)(5)

From: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 12:24 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Matthew Whitaker (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Both attached.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 12:08 PM

Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017, 12:00 PM

To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Ah—got it. No problem. (b)(5)

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 12:07 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Yes. (b)(5)

Will send in a minute.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 12:01 PM
To: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG) <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: edits

D—

If you have edits to remarks, (b)(5)

Thanks!
S

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

<Remarks of Attorney General Sessions SIF DC.docx>


<Addendum 2.docx>

Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:51 PM
To: Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Subject: FW: edits
Attachments: Addendum 2.docx

From: Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:45 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Barnett, Gary E. (OAG) <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Whitaker, Matthew (OAG) <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Duplicative Material



Hur, Robert (ODAG)

From: Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:50 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Subject: RE: current
Importance: High

Suggested tweaks in red below.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Hur, Robert (ODAG) <rhur@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: current

**Remarks of Attorney General Sessions
at a Press Conference
“Addiction to Crime”
December 15, 2017**

(b)(5)



(b)(5)



xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Subject: current

**Remarks of Attorney General Sessions
at a Press Conference
“Addiction to Crime”
December 15, 2017**

(b)(5)



(b)(5)



xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)


From: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:18 PM
To: Hur, Robert (ODAG)
Subject: FW: edits
Attachments: Remarks of Attorney General Sessions dc2.docx; ATT00001.htm

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:12 PM
To: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG) <zbolitho@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: edits

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Cutrona, Danielle (OAG)" <dcutrona@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: December 15, 2017 at 1:06:50 PM EST
To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: "Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)" <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>, "Barnett, Gary E. (OAG)" <gebarnett@jmd.usdoj.gov>, "Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)" <mwhitaker@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: edits

Duplicative Material



(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 10:53 PM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG)
Subject: Today's Heraings.

Congratulations. You have the patience of a Saint. The one thing that sticks in my craw based on my 40 years of practice, 25 years of teaching, 34 years of my panel at the ITC and extensive ethics lecturing is the following:

The FBI Agent at issue changed the wording from "gross negligence" to "wreckless". Before the texts and emails there was no intent context. But now, with them, the intent and context are clear. He did not want Trump to win come hell or high water and was also very pro Secretary Clinton. No reasonable and objective person could draw any other conclusion from this that the changing of the wording was intentionally done to help Secretary Clinton. And, if this was/is true, would not that have been a crime - obstruction? The other issue regarding Fusion GPS may be even worse. If Mr. O coordinated with his wife and Steele to produce the infamous report and that report was then used to provide probable cause for other follow up activities, based on the desire to hurt Trump and help Secretary Clinton, it was an incredible abuse of power.

I know the IG is looking into this. But unless his report is very, very thorough, I fear that it will just create more suspicion. You have had a long and highly regarded career. Your reputation up to now has been above reproach. It is hard to see this from 30,000 feet up when you are in the thick of it but in my 40 years of practice, I cannot recall something at the Federal level that ethically stunk more than the facts here. If it were me, I would bend over backwards to bring in whoever and whatever was/is needed to drill down on both of the issues above. Maybe the IG will be enough. I hope so for all of our sakes.

Best regards,

Bob Panoff

Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 1:14 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)
Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)
Subject: Ratcliffe Transcript

Ratcliffe

thank you, chairman. good to see you.

DAG
like wise.

R

i had a line of questions that i wanted to go into, but like many of the folks on this committee, last night i had a chance to see a number of these text messages between agent peter struck and ms. page. you have been asked about those. have you had a chance to read them?

DAG
not all of them, congressman.

R
how many have you read?

DAG
a few dozen, i believe.

R

i will tell you i can't read some of these publicly. they are that obscene. they are that offensive. as someone who served with you at the department of justice and reveres the independence of the department of justice, i will tell you that i changed my questioning to ask you about them because as i read them, i found them so sickening and heartbreaking that i felt. compelled to do so. in addition to being sickening and heartbreaking, these texts are also evidence. they are not evidence of an appearance of impropriety, they are evidence of an actual visit y'all's bias of prejudice, of actual hatred for the subject of the special counsel's investigation by folks serving as the independent investigators and lawyers on the special counsel itself. mr. deputy attorney general, i guess please tell me when you read these texts your heart fell and that you were appalled by what you read there.

DAG
i dent mean to kwifl with you, congressman. the special counsel investigation does not have any identified subjects as individuals other than the persons who have been charged. but i can tell you with regard to those text messages, we concluded when we learned about them that it was appropriate to complete the inspector general's investigation and if the inspector general reaches a conclusion it's misconduct, i have an opinion as anybody may about what it looks like, but it's important for me since i supervise that investigation so to await a formal conclusion. then any recommendation before i reach a official decision and take any action.

R

when you line up about struck and ms. page along with bruce orr and all the other conflicts of interest, i would tell you that, first of all, these aren't run of the mill conflicts of interest. employees of the department sometimes have spouses that are involved with corporations, but we're not talking about companies like walmart or microsoft. we're talking about fusion gps that had ten employees and his wife onewas one of them.

DAG
i want to clarify. mr. orr was part of my office when i arrived, i never involved mr. orr in the russia investigation, so he had no role assigned by me.

R

i understand that, but i guess i'm getting at the conflict of interest here and the appearance of impropriety are colossally bad. let's talk about judgment. you said in response to the e questioning we should have great confidence in mueller and director ray and in yourself. and oioint out that is as soon as director mueller found out about mr. struck that he took action. isn't he the one that chose them in the first place?

DAG
i don't know to what extent mr. mueller. my goal was to get him in and work inging as quickly as possible. i don't

I don't know to what extent Mr. Mueller. My goal was to get him in and work things as quickly as possible. I don't know any screening he did.

R

do you know what anyone did with respect to vetting this team? if you set out to create an appearance of bias or prejudice or impropriety or conflict of interest, the only way you could do a better job of doing it would be to pick this team and have them wear their i'm with her t-shirts to work every day.

DAG

I regret that you feel that way congressman and I talked to director muller and he understands the importance of avoiding bias in the investigation

R

deputy attorney general, i have talked often about the fact that i think people can lose faith and trust in elected officials, but if they lose faith in investigations like the fbi and department of justice to fairly investigate violations of the law, we may lose the republic. the daily transgressions that become public one after another are not serving either the department of justice or the fbi well. and i just encourage you to do everything you can to restore integrity to those organizations that i know we have both revered.

DAG

i agree with you entirely, congressman. i want to assure you that when attorney general sessions talked with me about taking on this job, he conveyed to me that his desire to make certain we do everything we can to enhance public confidence in the rule of law and ensure the department of justice runs appropriately. he, like you and me, served as a u.s. attorney for 12 years and he was so proud to return because of the deep respect he has for the department. i think that's reflected in the appointments that have been made to the department, setting myself aside. we have a superb team of experienced official who is are in position to run it. we have 115,000 employees. things go wrong. but i can assure you we will respond appropriately when they do.

R

thank you. i yield back.

Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 1:00 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)
Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)
Subject: DeSantis Transcript

DeSantis

mr. deputy attorney general, when sally yates defied the travel restriction in 2017 was that appropriate what she did?

DAG

i disagreed with her decision.

D

so if you're in a position where you get an order, your job is to follow the order if you think it's unconstitutional your response would be to your office, correct?

DAG

my response would be first to talk with the person who gave the order, but ultimately if i concluded it were unconstitutional, i would not implement it.

D

obviously, you can't have a department operating where each one is sworn to follow the orders? themselves where they don't

DAG

that's exactly right.

D

it bothered me one of the recent revelations. a big democrat owner, which doesn't disqualify you from being fair. doesn't mean that disqualifies you. he sends her an e-mail saying how he's in awe and so proud of her basically standing up to trump. it was seen as a very direct rebuke to the president. so your test was are the political opinions affecting how one conducts himself in office. i think that's a fair test. isn't that example of that e-mail an example of his strong strongly held anti-trump opinions affecting how he's conducting himself on his official e-mail?

DAG

as i mentioned, i've discussed this general issue with director mueller on several occasions. he understands the importance of ensuring that there's no bias reflected in the conduct of the investigation.

D

it looks bad to the public. part of it is there an actual bias. is there an appearance to have that and clearly what she did was not something that experienced prosecutors would think is good. the supreme court has slapped it down. the russia investigation, who started it? who was it? who opened the case?

DAG

congressman, that matter is under review by the intelligence committee. there's nothing that i can talk about publicly regarding the initiation of the investigation. i can assure you we're going to provide appropriate access to the intelligence committee to what they need.

D

did the fbi pay for the dossier

DAG

I'm not in position to answer

D

you know the answer to the question?

DAG

i believe i know the answer, but the intelligence committee is the appropriate committee to make that.

D
that's not true. we have oversight over your department and the fbi. whether public funds were spent on a dossier, that's not something that's classified. we have every right of that information. if you're not, they will probably be things. was that information used to get surveillance over anybody associated with trump?

DAG
i appreciate that question. i know there's been a concern for several members of the committee. i have set aside a half hour every day to review applications. it's not legal for me to talk about those applications. so i'm not able to answer one way or the other.

D
i'd like that authority. i think you can -- you may not be able to talk about the sources, but if this was used, we need to know that. do you agree that given -- who was the role of bruce other? he met with christopher steele before the election.

DAG
i do not know all the details. this information is still developing. i don't know the full story. we have agreed to make him available for congressional interviews interviews.

D
you need to pursue it. it's your department. you demoted him. he's work inging with christopher steele. you have an anti-trump dasossier. this doesn't look good. we need answers to those questions.

DAG
just that -

D
i get it. e let e me ask you this. the role of mr. struck. how much of this russia investigation was due to him? yes, mueller saw the texts. there was nothing he could do. how much of this whole investigation has been infected with his bias? have you made a determination on that?

DAG
i have not, but i do want you to know, again, without talking specifically about this investigation. the fbi does have procedures for all investigations to ensure they are appropriately vetted. there's no case for one individual to make decisions.

D
i hope that, but if you look at that text on august this is bad. he says, i want to believe the path you threw out for consideration in andy's office. i'm going to go out on a limb and say andrew mccabe. there's no way, meaning donald trump, gets elected. but i'm afraid we can't take that risk. we in the fbi can't take that risk. it's like an insurance policy in the unlikely event you die before you're 40. let me ask you this. if you have those walmart. shopping trump voters that peter struck so derided in his text messages, how do they react to that? do they have confidence in their fbi and their department of justice when you see that that you can't let the american people vote somebody in who they want to?

DAG
congressman, i think -- what i hope you can tell your constituents and to provide reassurance to the american people is we have appropriate internal affairs officers who will get to the bottom of that. our inspector general is the one who exposed that. he's going to deliver a report and we're going to -

D
when is that report due?

Chair
jegentleman is out of time.

DAG
it's going to be relatively soon. he's testifying next door. he knows i want it completed as quickly as possible. but to make sure he gets it right.

D
i thank the gentleman. i yield back.

Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 12:42 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)
Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)
Subject: Labrador Transcript

Labrador

thank you, mr. chairman. thank you, mr. rosenstein, for being here today. i shudder at some of the questions from the other side. and i just want to ask you a quick question. have you ever said that you are the president's wingman?

DAG
no, sir.

L
has the current attorney general of the united states ever said that he is the president's wingman?

DAG
not to my knowledge.

L
but yet, the attorney general under president obama said that he was the president's wingman, and i never heard a single democrat object to that. so it's kind of ridiculous to sit here and try to question your integrity or try to question whether somebody is going to be loyal to their president or not, as you clearly indicated, you can be both loyal to the constitution and to the president of the united states, as long as there's not a conflict of interest, as long as you're not doing anything that is inappropriate, it's okay to be the president's wingman. it's also okay to say that you're going to be loyal to the president, as long as they're not asking you to do anything that is illegal. isn't that correct?

DAG
yes.

L
so what was the goal of the russians when they tried to interfere with the elections in the united states?

DAG
the assessment of the intelligence community as reflected in their public report is that the goal of the russians was to undermine american confidence in democracy.

K
so to undermine the american -

DAG
paraphrasing, congressman. i don't have it in front of me.

L
they tried to undermine the u.s. faith in the democratic process, is that correct?

DAG
i believe that's correct.

L
i believe no one in the united states has done more to undermine the belief in the united states democratic process than the democrats, and the press in some cases, when they continue to report on false allegation after allegation after allegation. in fact, what you see from the democrats is they move from one allegation, that allegation is proven to be false, and they move to the next one, and they move to the next one, and they move to the next one. because they're unhappy with the result of the election. can you tell me why the independent counsel was actually appointed?

DAG
the special counsel, congressman, i have explained publicly, that i appointed the special counsel based upon unique circumstances in order to promote public confidence, and i have nothing to add to that.

L
why, when mr. mueller was charged with investigating, he was charged with investigating, quote, any links and/or coordination between the russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of donald trump. and any matters that arose or may arise directly from the investigation, end quote. that charge is overly broad. but there's been two prosecutions or at least two charges so far brought by the independent counsel, is that correct?

DAG
four individuals charged, two pleaded guilty and two will stand trial.

L
have any of them been charged with any links and or coordination between the russian government and individuals associated with the campaign for president trump?

DAG
congressman, the charges speak for themselves. i'm not going to comment beyond what's in the charging documents.

L
is there anything in the charging documents that there was a coordination between the trump administration and the russians

DAG
congressman, i'm not going to comment beyond what's in the charging documents. i think you can draw your own conclusion.

L
something i do agree with my friends on the other side is we should get to the bottom of this. we should know the truth. we should know whether there was collusion between russia and the president of the united states. we should also know if there was collusion between any department who tried to interfere with our elections. so can you tell me, was there collusion between the doj and fusion gps to use a democratic funded document for political and legal purposes?

DAG
i don't know the answer to that, congressman. i would simply point out the language used in the appointing order was coordination. and i believe that was the language used by director comey when he publicly testified about an ongoing investigation. i did not use the word collusion.

L
okay. so that coordination, was there any coordination between the doj and fusion gps to try to undermine an election of the united states?

DAG
if there were, congressman, i would be very concerned about it. as you know, there are ongoing reviews, and i'm not in a position to comment about that.

L
ongoing reviews, so there could potentially be an investigation whether the doj and members of the doj actually colluded with an enemy of a political party and a political candidate to undermine the elections of the united states.

DAG
if there's any evidence that warrants it, we'll do what is appropriate.

L
all right, so i think if you want to restore the trust of the american people, i think the department of justice has a duty to give us all the information we have been asking for. we need to find out who started this investigation, we need to find out what the purpose was. if you have an individual who actually had a desire to have an outcome in a political race, and they decided to use the department of justice to investigate their political opponent, i think that's one of the worst crimes that has occurred in the history when it comes to politics, do you agree with that?

DAG
if that were what happened, it would be of grave concern.

L
i hope you're truly investigating this and that we get to the bottom of this. thank you very much. i yield back.

Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 12:32 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)
Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)
Subject: Gowdy Transcript

Gowdy

thank you. there are a lot of issues i would like to ask you about, mr. deputy attorney general. we had a terrorist incident in new york this week. we have 702 reauthorization pending in congress, gun violence, the opioid epidemic, criminal justice reform. but when i go home to south carolina this weekend, trust me when i tell you, no one is going to ask me about any of those issues. they're going to ask me, what in the hell is going on with the department of justice and the fbi? the reason we have special counsel, and this is a very important point, and you know it, the reason we have special counsel is because of a conflict of interest. the regulation itself specifically makes reference to a conflict of interest, and we don't like conflicts of interest because it undercuts people's confidence in both the process and the result. so let's be really clear why we have special counsel. it was either a real or perceived conflict of interest that we were fearful would either impact the result or people's confidence in the process. that's why we have something called special counsel. and that's why we have special counsel in this fact pattern. and lo and behold, those who are supposed to make sure there are no conflicts of interest seem to have a few of their own. there's a senior prosecutor who sent obsequious e-mails to a fact witness. she could be described as nothing other than a fact witness. she's a really important fact witness if you pursue the line of inquiry that my democrat friends want to per sue. they got off collusion and now they're on obstruction of justice. she may be the most important fact witness in an obstruction of justice case. and the senior prosecutor for this conflict of interest free special counsel sent a fawning obsequious e-mail to a fact witness. then we have prosecutors assigned to conduct this investigation who donated almost exclusively to one candidate over another. and then we have a prosecutor assigned to this conflict of interest free team that attended what was supposed to be, what he had hoped to be a victory party for secretary clinton. and we have a senior doj official, mr. deputy attorney general, with an office that used to be two doors down from yours. meeting with fusion gps, and fusion gps, of course, was paying for russian dirt on the very person that they're supposed to be objectively investigating. and then that same senior doj official's wife, the one that met with fusion gps, his wife was on the payroll of fusion gps. and then we have a senior agent assigned to investigate secretary clinton's e-mail, help draft the exoneration letter, what would change the language from grossly negligent to extremely careless. interviewed secretary clinton in an nartinterview i have never seen and i doubt you have either in your career as a prosecutor, interviewed michael flynn. was actively involved in the investigation into the trump campaign before the inspector general found his texts. so this agent in the middle of almost everything related to secretary clinton and president trump sent pro-clinton texts, anti-trump texts to his paramour, in response to being told maybe he is where he is to protect the country from that menace, donald trump, he said, i can protect our country at many levels. and then he said, hillary clinton should win 100 million to nothing. think about that, mr. deputy attorney general. that's a pretty overwhelming victory. 100 million to zero. and when i read that last night, what i thought was, this conflict of interest free senior agent of the fbi can't think of a senior solitary american who would vote for donald trump. that's where the zero comes in. not a single solitary american he can imagine would vote for donald trump. this is the conflict of interest free special agent assigned. and then he went on, if that weren't enough, to belittle trump supporters by saying he could smell them at a walmart in virginia. this is the person we needed to avoid a conflict of interest. and then he said this. they fully deserve to go and demonstrate the absolute bigoted nonsense of trump. but he wasn't content to just disparage donald trump. he had to disparage donald trump's fami this is what he said, mr. deputy attorney general. he said the douche bags are about to come out. he's talking about our first lady and children. this conflict of interest free special agent of the fbi. this is who we were told we needed to have an objective, impartial, fair, conflict of interest free investigation. so he's openly pulling for the candidate he had a role in clearing, and he's openly investigating a candidate that he has bias against, and then if that's not enough, he says trump is an f'ing idiot. what the f just happened to our country. this is the same man who said he would save our country. what happens when people who are supposed to cure the conflict of interest have even greater conflicts of interests than those they replace? that's not a rhetorical question. you nor i nor anyone else would ever sit peter strzok on a jury. we wouldn't have him objectively dispassionately investigate anything knowing what we know now. why didn't we know it ahead of time, and the last question, my final question to you, and i appreciate the chairman's patience, how would you help me answer that question when i go back to south carolina this weekend?

DAG

congressman, first of all, with regard to the special counsel, mr. strzok was already working on the investigation when the special counsel was appointed. the appointment i made was of robert mueller. what i recommend you tell your constituents is robert mueller and rod rosenstein and chris wray are accountable and we'll make sure no bias is reflected in any of the actions taken by the special counsel or in any matter within the jurisdiction of the department of justice. when we have evidence of any inappropriate conduct, we're going to take

action on it. and that's what mr. mueller did here as soon as he learned about this issue. he took action. and that's what i anticipate that the ref ourur prosecutors and new group of u.s. attorneys, our justice department appointees, they understand the rules, and they understand the responsibility to defend the integrity of the department. if they find evidence of improper conduct, they're going to take action. congressman, that's the best assurance i can give you. but actually, there's one other point, which is you should tell your constituents that we exposed this issue because we're insuring that the inspector general conducts a thorough and effective investigation and if there is any evidence of inpropriety, he's going to surface it and report about it publicly.

G
i'll try.

Chair
the gentleman's time has expired.

Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)

From: Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 11:49 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Whitaker, Matthew (OAG)
Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)
Subject: Gohmert Transcript

Gohmert

thank you, mr. chairman. thanks for being here. did you ever tell special counsel robert mueller that in essence everything you do must not only be just and fair but must also appear beyond reproach, anything like that?

DAG

> in essence, yes.

G

since attorney general sessions recused himself, you are effectively the boss on the special counsel and staff, correct?

DAG

that is correct that i am effectively the boss.

G

well, we all know that fbi director james comey was fired. we know of your letter, we know of your public statements. but here's a question. to your knowledge, who first proposed the idea of firing james comey as fbi director?

DAG

i'm not going to comment on that. the president has explained that he made the decision and i'm not going to comment beyond that.

G

at the time you wrote the letter suggesting the firing, did you believe what you put in that letter?

DAG

yes, i did.

G

if an fbi employee goes into a meeting as part of his job in furtherance of his job, someone in the government, and he comes out and he makes a memo memorializing the meeting, perhaps in the future past memory refreshed. is that memo doj property?

DAG

Generally, congressman, i would think that it would be. might depend what the subject matter is, but generally the answer would be yes.

G

well, an fbi employment agreement statement says -- and this is the person agreeing to work for the fbi -- all information acquired by me in connection with my official duties with the fbi and all official material remain the property of the united states. i will not reveal any material from or related to fbi files or any other information acquired by virtue of my official employment. if you make a memo of things that were discussed as part of your job, then it would be a violation of that agreement to send that to someone to leak to the press, isn't that right?

DAG

it well may be.

G

the question i'm about to ask, i'm not asking what you may have told attorney general jeff sessions. i don't want to know any words used or ideas conveyed, nor sources referenced. in fact, i'm asking a question that could not possibly have any other answer other than yes or no. you are completely free to wholly answer this question with one of those two words and neither word is privileged, confidential or classified. as attorney general jeff sessions' deputy, did you give jeff sessions any advice regarding whether or not he should recuse himself in the matter of the russian investigation, yes or no?

DAG

no. can i give a little bit of an explanation? i wasn't there. i was confirmed i believe on april 25th and took office on april 26th. i was not there at the time of the recusal.

G

all right. did you ever talk to bruce orr?

DAG

yes.

G

wasn't he four doors down from yours?

DAG

i haven't counted but he was down the hall.

G

of course he's been demoted over the relationship with fusion gps and then of course we found out that his wife nellie was a russian expert and was made by fusion gps through summer and fall of 2016 helping the clinton campaign get a dossier from the russians. how well dune the people that work on your hall?

DAG

well, it varies, congressman. i think that it varies. some of them i know well. some of them i don't know as well.

G

everybody has some political opinions or otherwise. the key is not having those affect or bias you in the department of justice.

DAG

correct.

G

here is mr. struck, some of his texts talking about trump. he's an idiot talking about trump. and martin owe mal'malley is a d-word. he goes on. at some point the republican party needs to pull their head out of their blank. shows no sign of occurring any time soon. of course he's -- the f we were told by christopher wray stands for fidelity, but these were all made in the course of infidelity. then he makes slurs against kasich. it's unbelievable, i hate these people, talking about the republicans. no support for the women who has to spend the rest of her life rearing this child and then we care about life. a-holes. how the f can he be a republican? on and on it goes. america will get what the voting public deserves and that's what i'm afraid of. hillary should win 100 million to zero. did you hear him make a comment -- anyway. this is not just political opinions. this is disgusting, unaccountable bias and there's no way that could not affect a person's work. were you aware of just how biassed mr. struck was?

DAG

no, i was not

G

thank you. one final thing. i'm asking a question, the answer's not classified or privileged. based on information and belief to the best of your knowledge has the fbi ever used work product or report any part of which was paid by political campaign, party, candidate or prepared on a candidate's behalf?

DAG

congressman, the issue that you're --

Chair

the time of the gentleman has expired. the witness may answer the

DAG

i know we're working with at least one committee, house intelligence that has access to that information. i believe they'll get whatever information --

G

i'm asking a general question.

Chair

the time of the gentleman has expired.

DAG

not to my personal knowledge, but i don't know everything about the fbi.

G

mr. chairman, point of personal privilege, since my character was slandered by mr. cohen who said that i never -- we never challenged mueller until he came after the administration when he knows how tough i went after fbi director mueller. he's been here when i went after mueller while bush was president. he knows i have been after him because of the damage he did and what he stated about me is a lie. and i need the record to properly reflect that.

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 9:17 AM
To: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG); Hur, Robert (ODAG); Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: for today

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: December 13, 2017 at 9:12:18 AM EST
To: "Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)" <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>, "Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)"
(b)(6)
Subject: for today

Text Messages in Hand, Republicans Plan to Accuse Justice Department of Bias

New York Times

Nicholas Fandos

December 13, 2017

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/13/us/politics/trump-mueller-russia-republican-campaign.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fpolitics>

WASHINGTON — The release Tuesday night of F.B.I. officials' text messages describing the possibility of a victory by Donald J. Trump as "terrifying" and saying that Hillary Clinton "just has to win" is certain to fuel a Republican campaign to attack the impartiality of the Justice Department and its special counsel, Robert S. Mueller III — and possibly hamper him with an investigation of the special counsel's office.

Accusations of bias, primed by the newly released texts from an F.B.I. agent, Peter Strzok, and an F.B.I. lawyer, Lisa Page, are likely to take center stage on Wednesday when Rod J. Rosenstein, the deputy attorney general who appointed Mr. Mueller as special counsel, testifies before the House Judiciary Committee. Republicans say they will press Mr. Rosenstein to appoint a second special counsel to investigate political partisanship in the department and to scrutinize Mr. Trump's former presidential rival, Mrs. Clinton.

The campaign against the Justice Department, at the very least, provides a rallying cry for the president's supporters to counter the drumbeat of news about Russian interference in the election and the possible collusion of the Trump campaign.

"Each and every day we are finding more and more instances of intractable bias that is infecting this investigation," said Representative Matt Gaetz, a first-term Florida Republican who has emerged as one of Mr. Trump's most vocal defenders on Capitol Hill.

Democrats on the committee will try to extract assurances from Mr. Rosenstein that Mr. Mueller's investigation into the Trump campaign's ties to Russia is safe.

Mr. Mueller, a registered Republican appointed by President George W. Bush to direct the F.B.I., has long had critics in the most pro-Trump corners of the House and the conservative news media. But in recent weeks, as his investigation has delivered a series of indictments to high-profile associates of the president and evidence that at least two of them are cooperating with the inquiry, those critics have grown louder and in numbers.

Moreover, the voices of doubt are no longer confined to the party's far-right wing. They include Republican mainstays like Senators Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Charles E. Grassley of Iowa.

"I was the lone voice in the wilderness, and now I have a robust chorus behind me," Mr. Gaetz said on Tuesday. He told Politico that he had warned Mr. Trump just days before, while in flight on Air Force One, that Mr. Mueller's investigation was "infected with bias."

The developments came in rapid succession on Tuesday, beginning with the president's own legal team. Jay Sekulow, one of Mr. Trump's outside lawyers for matters related to the Russia investigation, told Axios that mounting evidence warranted the appointment of a second special counsel to look at conflicts of interest in the Justice Department.

In an interview, Mr. Sekulow said his complaints had "nothing to do" with Mr. Mueller, with whom the president's lawyers have continued to cooperate. Rather, he cited a Fox News report from Monday that Bruce Ohr, a senior Justice Department official, had been demoted for not disclosing meetings with officials from Fusion GPS, the investigative firm behind a controversial dossier of opposition research on the Trump campaign.

"The situation with regard to the D.O.J. and F.B.I., with regard to the Fusion GPS issue, is serious, has serious repercussions for our country and should be looked into," Mr. Sekulow said.

Democrats say the pattern is becoming clear: As Mr. Mueller moves closer to Mr. Trump's inner circle, Republicans try to discredit federal law enforcement and undercut the eventual findings of the special counsel. The Republican effort may also be intended to blunt the political repercussions should Mr. Mueller be fired, Democrats say.

Senator Richard Blumenthal, Democrat of Connecticut, who sits on the Judiciary Committee, called the demands for a second special counsel "absurd."

"It would be unprecedented to have a special counsel look at an entire agency," he said. "And there is no credible reason to diminish the outstanding and distinguished work done by the F.B.I. over many years simply because the president wants to deflect or distract from the ongoing special investigation of himself."

In addition to Mr. Ohr, Republicans point to the case of Mr. Strzok, an F.B.I. agent who was removed from Mr. Mueller's staff because of anti-Trump text messages that he traded with another person on the team. Texts exchanged between Mr. Strzok and Ms. Page came to light Tuesday night. Mr. Strzok was a key member of the F.B.I. team that investigated whether Mrs. Clinton and her aides mishandled classified information.

And they see further evidence of bias in an email sent by Andrew Weissmann, one of Mr. Mueller's top deputies, in January telling the acting attorney general, Sally Q. Yates, that he was "so proud and in awe" of

her decision not to defend Mr. Trump's travel ban in court.

Mr. Gaetz and a half dozen or so colleagues detailed those cases on the House floor for an hour on Tuesday evening.

Representative Andy Biggs, Republican of Arizona, said the pattern about Mr. Mueller's hiring decisions was clear: "It just happens over and over again. To get on that team you have to have a conflict or bias."

Perhaps more portentous is the restive Senate, a less partisan body where Mr. Mueller's appointment in May was met as a welcome relief. Skepticism about the special counsel's investigation is starting to take root there, too.

"I think he's got a tough job to do, but it seems he's running far afield," said Senator Richard C. Shelby, a long-serving Republican from Alabama. "Maybe it's part of what he can do, but I thought he was going to investigate the Russian influence in the election, and it seems like he is going after a lot of other places, too."

Mr. Graham, who a year ago was a leading Republican voice for a thorough investigation of Russian campaign interference, seems to have shifted his focus as well.

"I will be challenging Rs and Ds on Senate Judiciary Committee to support a Special Counsel to investigate ALL THINGS 2016 — not just Trump and Russia," he wrote on Twitter.

Mr. Rosenstein's hearing on Wednesday is likely to resemble that of one of his colleagues, the F.B.I. director, Christopher A. Wray, whose appearance before the Judiciary Committee last week gave Republicans ample opportunity to question the political independence of his agents.

Mr. Wray rebuffed any suggestion that his employees had a political agenda. He said that the F.B.I. made its decisions "based on nothing other than the facts and the law."

In one exchange, Representative Louie Gohmert, Republican of Texas, rattled off a list of high-ranking F.B.I. officials and questioned whether they were politically motivated. Mr. Wray responded, "I'm not aware of any senior F.B.I. executives who are allowing improper political considerations to affect their work with me right now."

Representative Eric Swalwell, Democrat of California, said it was "sickening" to listen to Republicans smear the F.B.I.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 10:57 PM
To: Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)
Subject: Re: Fusion GPS Confirms Hiring DOJ Official's Wife To Investigate Trump - The Daily Caller

Thanks for keeping us in the loop.

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:38 PM, Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA) <mhankey@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Adding Zach and Zac.

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:32 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Lovely.

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:29 PM, Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
(b)(6) wrote:

Oh good grief.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:25 PM, Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)
<pfescalona@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

<http://amp.dailycaller.com/2017/12/12/fusion-gps-confirms-hiring-doj-officials-wife-to-investigate-trump/>

Prim Escalona
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
202.305.4573

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 10:55 PM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG); Hur, Robert (ODAG); Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Fusion GPS Confirms Hiring DOJ Official's Wife To Investigate Trump - The Daily Caller

FYSA

<http://amp.dailycaller.com/2017/12/12/fusion-gps-confirms-hiring-doj-officials-wife-to-investigate-trump/>

Prim Escalona
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
202.305.4573

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 10:55 PM
To: Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)
Cc: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA); Escalona, Prim F. (OLA); Tyson, Jill C. (OLA); Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Fusion GPS Confirms Hiring DOJ Official's Wife To Investigate Trump - The Daily Caller

Thanks for heads up

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:38 PM, Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA) <mhankey@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Adding Zach and Zac.

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:32 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Lovely.

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:29 PM, Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)

(b)(6) wrote:

Oh good grief.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 12, 2017, at 10:25 PM, Escalona, Prim F. (OLA)

<pfescalona@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

<http://amp.dailycaller.com/2017/12/12/fusion-gps-confirms-hiring-doj-officials-wife-to-investigate-trump/>

Prim Escalona
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
202.305.4573

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG)
Cc: Hur, Robert (ODAG); Bolitho, Zachary (ODAG)
Subject: FW: F&F

FYSA (from fox and friends this am)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 7:32 AM
To: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
(b)(6)
Subject: F&F

(b)(5)

EARHARDT: sarah, there's a guy we have been talking about in the news, his name is bruce ohr. doj official. worked at your agency. and he was demoted last week for having connections to that dirty dossier. obviously you can't have connections. can't meet with people writing the dirty dossier if you work at doj. nellie and she worked for fusion gps during the election. just more plirks. what's your reaction?

ISGUR FLORES: well, as you said, he was removed from the office of the deputy attorney general last week. and various congressional committees have asked to speak with him. we're going to make him available for that so i expect he will talk to congress in the next week or two here.

KILMEADE: has the justice department been a disappointment to the president?

ISGUR FLORES: you would have to ask the president that. but i think that attorney general jeff sessions has followed through on more conservative policy than any other department. we have ended third party settlements, cracking down on violent crime. the opioid epidemic. supporting our law enforcement again and increasing morale out there.

KILMEADE: he might have recused himself from this investigation for no reason. it turns out there is a email showing the fbi told him flat out you don't have to reveal these conversations with this russian ambassador. and it turns out he recused himself because of that.

ISGUR FLORES: no, no, no. i think this is actually really important. the fbi email you are referring to is what he need to put on fs 86. security form that cnn then wrote that he needed to have all of those meetings on. that was incorrect. because he was following the advice from the fbi. his recusal, however, was based on the fact that he was a senior advisor to the trump campaign and that is specific in the department of justifiable regulations that if you are a senior advisor in the campaign, you have to recuse yourself from any investigation into that campaign. so it had nothing to do with any meetings with russians.

KILMEADE: you are saying he could never preside over a russian investigation?

ISGUR FLORES: not into the campaign in which he was a senior advisor.

KILMEADE: i wonder why he took the job then.

DOOCY: sarah, let me ask you a question regarding andrew mccabe, is he a top guys at the department of justifiable. he was supposed to appear on capitol hill today. he canceled at the last minute. there are a number of people who say he was worried about being asked about bruce ohr and bruce ohr's tweeted that out and added something more sinister. why did he cancel?

ISGUR FLORES: i have seen the emails myself. this turns out to be, you know, why email is the best/worst form of communication. what happened was the fbi had planned to have two witnesses testify. one on the 12th and one on the 19th. when they sent the email to the committee, they flipped the two witnesses. and so mccabe was supposed to testify on the 19th. they told the committee the 12th the alleged handler was supposed to testify on the 12th but they told the committee the 19th. we are trying to sort that out right now. the fbi sincerely regrets the error, obviously.

DOOCY: so a scheduling problem.

ISGUR FLORES: huge scheduling problem in this case.

DOOCY: unbelievable. all right. well, people are talking about it sara, thank you very much for joining us today from the department of justifiable.

EARHARDT: thanks, sarah.

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?StationID=130&DateTime=12/12/2017%207:04:51%20AM&playclip=true>

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Subject: RE: F&F

Thank you, Sarah. Hope you got at least a bit of sleep last night.

Zach

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 7:32 AM
To: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
(b)(6)
Subject: F&F

(b)(5)

EARHARDT: sarah, there's a guy we have been talking about in the news, his name is bruce ohr. doj official. worked at your agency. and he was demoted last week for having connections to that dirty dossier. obviously you can't have connections. can't meet with people writing the dirty dossier if you work at doj. nellie and she worked for fusion gps during the election. just more plirks. what's your reaction?

ISGUR FLORES: well, as you said, he was removed from the office of the deputy attorney general last week. and various congressional committees have asked to speak with him. we're going to make him available for that so i expect he will talk to congress in the next week or two here.

KILMEADE: has the justice department been a disappointment to the president?

ISGUR FLORES: you would have to ask the president that. but i think that attorney general jeff sessions has followed through on more conservative policy than any other department. we have ended third party settlements, cracking down on violent crime. the opioid epidemic. supporting our law enforcement again and increasing morale out there.

KILMEADE: he might have recused himself from this investigation for no reason. it turns out there is a email showing the fbi told him flat out you don't have to reveal these conversations with this russian ambassador. and it turns out he recused himself because of that.

ISGUR FLORES: no, no, no. i think this is actually really important. the fbi email you are referring to is what he need to put on fs 86. security form that cnn then wrote that he needed to have all of those meetings on. that was incorrect. because he was following the advice from the fbi. his recusal, however, was based on the fact that he was a senior advisor to the trump campaign and that is specific in the department of justifiable regulations that if you are a senior advisor in the campaign, you have to recuse yourself from any investigation into that campaign. so it had nothing to do with any meetings with russians.

KILMEADE: you are saying he could never preside over a russian investigation?

ISGUR FLORES: not into the campaign in which he was a senior advisor.

KILMEADE: i wonder why he took the job then.

DOOCY: sarah, let me ask you a question regarding andrew mccabe, is he a top guys at the department of justifiable. he was supposed to appear on capitol hill today. he canceled at the last minute. there are a number of people who say he was worried about being asked about bruce ohr and bruce ohr's tweeted that out and added something more sinister. why did he cancel?

ISGUR FLORES: i have seen the emails myself. this turns out to be, you know, why email is the best/worst form of communication. what happened was the fbi had planned to have two witnesses testify. one on the 12th and one on the 19th. when they sent the email to the committee, they flipped the two witnesses. and so mccabe was supposed to testify on the 19th. they told the committee the 12th the alleged handler was supposed to testify on the 12th but they told the committee the 19th. we are trying to sort that out right now. the fbi sincerely regrets the error, obviously.

DOOCY: so a scheduling problem.

ISGUR FLORES: huge scheduling problem in this case.

DOOCY: unbelievable. all right. well, people are talking about it sara, thank you very much for joining us today from the department of justifiable.

EARHARDT: thanks, sarah.

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?StationID=130&DateTime=12/12/2017%207:04:51%20AM&playclip=true>

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2017 9:23 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Subject: RE: WSJ editorial

Thanks for flagging.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2017 1:45 PM
To: Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA) (b)(6); Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
<zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: WSJ editorial

(b)(5)

By

The Editorial Board

Dec. 10, 2017 5:02 p.m. ET

[753 COMMENTS](#)

Christopher Wray was supposed to bring a new candor and credibility to the FBI after the James Comey debacle, but the country is still waiting. The director's testimony Thursday to the House Judiciary Committee suggests he has joined the Justice Department effort to stop the public from learning about the bureau's role in the 2016 election.

Judiciary Chairman Bob Goodlatte invited Mr. Wray to answer the multiplying questions about the bureau's 2016 political interference. This includes the role that the Steele dossier—opposition research financed by the Clinton campaign—played in the FBI's decision to investigate the Trump presidential campaign. The committee also wants answers about reports that special counsel Robert Mueller demoted Peter Strzok, a lead FBI investigator in both the Trump and Hillary Clinton email investigations, after Mr. Strzok exchanged anti-Trump texts with his mistress, who also works at the FBI.

Mr. Wray spent five hours stonewalling. The director ducked every question about the FBI's behavior by noting that the Justice Department Inspector General is investigating last year's events.

Is Mr. Wray concerned that Mr. Strzok edited the FBI's judgment of Mrs. Clinton's handling of her emails to "extremely careless" from "grossly negligent" in a previous draft? The grossly negligent phrase might have put Mrs. Clinton in legal jeopardy, but Mr. Wray said he couldn't answer because that is subject to the "outside, independent investigation."

Is Mr. Wray taking steps to ensure his top ranks are free of political “taint”? He couldn’t say because of the “outside, independent” investigation.

Ohio Republican Jim Jordan noted that the only way for Congress to know if the FBI used the Steele dossier to obtain a warrant to spy on the Trump campaign is for the FBI to provide its application to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. “Is there anything prohibiting you from showing this committee [that application]?” Mr. Jordan asked.

Mr. Wray’s answer was dismissive. “I do not believe that I can legally and appropriately share a FISA court submission with this committee,” said Mr. Wray. “When I sign FISA applications, which I have to do almost every day of the week, they are all covered with a ‘classified information’ cover.”

This is an excuse, not a serious reason. The IG is a watchdog created by Congress to investigate executive misbehavior. It was never intended to supplant congressional oversight, much less be an excuse for executive officials to protect their decisions from scrutiny.

As for hiding behind “classified information,” the House Intelligence Committee that is investigating Russian campaign meddling has appropriate clearances. Mr. Goodlatte reminded Mr. Wray that the Judiciary Committee also has primary jurisdiction over the FISA court.

The FISA application is central to the issue of Russian meddling and whether the FBI used disinformation to trigger a counterintelligence investigation of a U.S. presidential candidate. Congress and the U.S. need to know not only if Trump officials were colluding with Russians but also if Russia and the Clinton campaign used false information to dupe the FBI into intervening in a U.S. election. Yet the FBI and Justice have been stonewalling House Intelligence for months.

The lack of cooperation has become more troubling amid reports that senior career Justice officials have a partisan motivation. Judicial Watch last week released emails showing that Mr. Mueller’s top lieutenant, Andrew Weissmann, praised Obama holdover and acting Attorney General Sally Yates in January for defying Mr. Trump on his travel ban.

Justice also confirmed a Fox News report last week that one of its top lawyers, Bruce Ohr, was in contact with Christopher Steele (the dossier author) before the election, and after the election with Glenn Simpson, the founder of Fusion GPS, the opposition-research firm that hired Mr. Steele. Mr. Ohr was demoted, which suggests his contacts were unauthorized.

By the way, the chief law enforcement officer of the United States is the President. This means he

has the legal authority through his deputies at the White House and Justice to see the FISA application. AG Jeff Sessions is recused from the Russia probe, which complicates his access because we don't know the extent of his recusal. But Deputy AG Rod Rosenstein supervises the FBI when Mr. Sessions does not.

Mr. Rosenstein can and should order the FBI to meet Congress's document requests including the FISA application. If he refuses, then Mr. Trump through White House counsel Donald McGahn can order him to do so. Mr. Rosenstein could choose to resign rather than comply, but he will not have the law on his side.

The easy way to solve this standoff is for executive officials, including the FBI, to do their duty and cooperate with the duly elected Members of Congress. If they don't, sterner measures like a finding of contempt of Congress will be needed.

xxx

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)
Sent: Friday, December 8, 2017 11:11 AM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Subject: ohr narrative

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/byron-york-dossier-author-was-in-contact-with-obama-justice-department/article/2642930?platform=hootsuite>

Byron York: Dossier author was in contact with Obama Justice Department

by [Byron York](#) | [Dec 7, 2017, 11:04 PM](#)

It's been 10 months since Washington learned that former British spy Christopher Steele, author of the so-called "Trump dossier," took the Hillary Clinton-funded opposition research document to the FBI, which considered sponsoring the anti-Trump work at the height of the 2016 presidential campaign. Now, congressional investigators have made what is perhaps an even more consequential discovery: Knowledge of the dossier project, during the campaign, extended into the highest levels of the Obama Justice Department.

The department's Bruce Ohr, a career official, served as associate deputy attorney general at the time of the campaign. That placed him just below the deputy attorney general, Sally Yates, who ran the day-to-day operations of the department. In 2016, Ohr's office was just steps away from Yates, who was later fired for defying President Trump's initial travel ban executive order and still later became a prominent anti-Trump voice upon leaving the Justice Department.

Unbeknownst to investigators until recently, Ohr knew Steele and had repeated contacts with Steele when Steele was working on the dossier. Ohr also met after the election with Glenn Simpson, head of Fusion GPS, the opposition research company that was paid by the Clinton campaign to compile the dossier.

Word that Ohr met with Steele and Simpson, first reported by Fox News' James Rosen and Jake Gibson, was news to some current officials in the Justice Department. Shortly after learning it, they demoted Ohr, taking away his associate deputy attorney general title and moving him full time to another position running the department's organized crime drug enforcement task forces.

The news also stunned some of those who had been investigating the matter. Yes, they knew that knowledge of the dossier extended to some officials in the FBI. That was bad enough; how could the FBI endorse and consider underwriting one campaign's dirt-digging operation in the middle of a hotly contested election? But now investigators know that nearly the highest levels of the Obama Justice Department were also aware of the dossier.

Investigators believe the dossier's sensational allegations of collusion between Russia and the Trump campaign played a role in the beginning of the FBI's counterintelligence investigation into the Trump-Russia affair — an investigation that later morphed into special counsel Robert Mueller's work.

investigation that later morphed into special counsel Robert Mueller's probe.

House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes, R-Calif., whose investigation has led to a number of revelations about the dossier, was unhappy to learn about such a key piece of information months after the investigation began. Ohr's contacts with Steele and Simpson were covered by a subpoena Nunes issued to the FBI and the Justice Department on Aug. 24. Yet as recently as Tuesday, when Nunes, along with House Oversight Committee Chairman Trey Gowdy, R-S.C., met with deputy attorney general Rod Rosenstein, the department said nothing about Ohr's role.

"Pursuant to the House Intelligence Committee's prior subpoenas and information requests, the Department of Justice should have provided the committee with information on contacts that DOJ official Bruce Ohr had with Fusion GPS representatives and Christopher Steele," Nunes said in a statement Thursday. "The committee will issue a subpoena to Bruce Ohr for information on this matter."

The Ohr revelation comes not long after word that top FBI agent Peter Strzok was removed from the Mueller investigation for anti-Trump text messages he exchanged with a top FBI lawyer who had also worked for the Mueller probe. Now, with news of Ohr's contacts with Steele and Simpson, Republicans on Capitol Hill — and perhaps some Democrats, too — will wonder just how far the Obama Justice Department officials went in the effort to stop Trump.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)

From: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG)
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2017 10:22 PM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG)
Cc: Hur, Robert (ODAG); Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Subject: FW: HJC Clips

Sir,

With thanks to OLA and OPA, (b)(5)

Thank you,

Zach

From: Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2017 8:42 PM
To: Terwilliger, Zachary (ODAG) <zterwilliger@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fwd: HJC Clips

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: December 5, 2017 at 9:59:07 AM EST
To: "Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)" <mhankey@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: HJC Clips

Links and transcripts

Attorney General Sessions House Judiciary Committee Hearing (CNN) – Rep.

Darrell Issa Questioning

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?PlayClip=FALSE&DTSearch=TRUE&DateTime=11%2F14%2F2017+11%3A024%3A44&market=m1&StationID=100>

REP. DARRELL ISSA: thank you, mr. chairman. general sessions it's good to see you again. i don't speak russian and i don't meet with russians and i don't really want to ask about those questions today but i have very important questions.

ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF SESSIONS: congressman isa, you said that, but i bet you have met with some russians and if you -- in your lifetime and taking those words at face value, somebody might accuse you of not being honest.

REP. ISSA: you're absolutely --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that's what the law does to me

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that's what they've done to me.

REP. ISSA: you're right, attorney general sessions, that is the challenge, as a member of the foreign affairs committee, my job with lots of ambassadors and i don't want to try to remember everyone and everything that was discussed in what i thought was a meeting. there are a couple areas that are leftover from the previous administration that i would like to talk to you about. one of them is we sent loretta lynch a letter related to sober homes and a predicament and the predicament is fairly straightforward. if -- and her answer to be honest to chairman goodlatte and the rest of us was not satisfactory and we've given your staff a copy of it. sober living homes are nothing but boarding houses, they're required to provide no care whatsoever to the alcoholic or recovering drug abuser because that has to be done somewhere else or they don't qualify as sober homes. and yet, currently, there is in the ninth circuit decisions that cause cities to be unable to regulate them in a way that would prevent people from simply buying houses in a row in a very prestigious neighborhood and turning them into these, if you will, sober living homes, again boarding houses with 15 or more people. will you agree to work with us to try to find an appropriate way to align your enforcement of the americans with disability act and your enforcement of the fair housing act, with the necessity for cities to be able to essentially regulate how many people live in a home?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes. i would be pleased to do that. this is an important act.

REP. ISSA: yes.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: issues because a lot of money is being spent and some of it not wisely in these areas.

REP. ISSA: a lot of federal dollars being squandered to the benefit of people speculating. the second one is, a trial court ruling in the durante nursery in the army corps of engineers case. are you familiar with the case?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not.

REP. ISSA: i would like you to become familiar because during your administration, an assistant u.s. attorney on your behalf argued that the waters of the u.s. which is not a valid regulation delivered to congress and eligible under cra to be considered or rejected, continued to argue that that was law. would you agree that your attorneys on your behalf should not argue regulations which have not been delivered to congress and as a result, are not eligible for cra review?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: mr. isa, i have now recalled the case. i didn't recall it by name. that matter was intensely reviewed by a new assistant attorney general for the acting at least for the environmental of natural resources division. after great consideration, we felt -- it was advised to me and i proved going forward with that position in court. so i will take responsibility for it. but i got to tell you, we did look at it very hard.

REP. ISSA: in general if a regulation is created or some other words of the executive branch they don't have the weight of law unless they're delivered to congress so we have an opportunity to review them under the congressional review act.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that would sound correct.

REP. ISSA: thank you. my last question, is less of a softball and neither one of these are softballs they're very important to california. but in a previous congress, the way and means committee of the united

important to California. but in a previous congress, the ways and means committee of the united states house voted for referred criminal charges against lois learner. i was involved in investigating her wrongful activity. they referred criminal charges and they did so under a statute that says and i'll paraphrase it as well as i can that the u.s. attorney for the district of columbia shall present to the grand jury the following. and then they laid out the criminal charges. the previous attorney general ordered the u.s. attorney or u.s. attorney in the district made a decision not to enforce that. now, the statute as we understand it is not a statute that says you will look at this and decide independently. it actually says it shall be presented to the grand jury. will you commit to review that and if you agree with us what the statute says and we think it's plain english initial order a attorney to present to a grand jury and if they no bill it fine present it consistent with congressional and statutory law?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i will review that more personally, but the department of justice view has been it takes a full vote of the house to accomplish that act and i'm not sure where that leaves us. i will give it a personal review which i have not done.

REP. ISSA: if you can stop the clock for one second. if the entire house voted to the --

Attorney General Sessions House Judiciary Committee Hearing (CNN) – Rep. Louie Gohmert Questioning

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?PlayClip=FALSE&DTSearch=TRUE&DateTime=11%2F14%2F2017+15%3A05%3A54&market=m1&StationID=100>

REP. LOUIE GOHMERT: thank you. attorney general sessions, always good to see you.

ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF SESSIONS: thank you.

REP. GOHMERT: and end of the short hearing it looks like unless someone else comes in. first of all, you know, it seemed like to me you got mistreated a little bit. there were questions about your answer to senator franklin's question. and i have a copy of what he said. now, he is explaining his question. he said if there is evidence that anyone affiliated with the trump campaign communicated with russian government in the course of this campaign, what will you do? and then you even had somebody offer into the record that mother jones, basically said you lied. and i would submit this committee doesn't need mother jones to inaccurately describe or depict or tell us what happened when we can look at the conversations and see for me ask you, was your meeting with the russian diplomates, was that in the course and scope of your obligations with the campaign? or in the course and scope of your duties as united states senator?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: well, really, they were mostly official business.

REP. GOHMERT: as u.s. senator?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i did speak at the republican convention. but the conversation on the floor after i finished my remarks were brief. and i was -- and then with regard to the meeting in my office, it was substantially essentially about foreign relations between the united states.

REP. GOHMERT: so what you talked about with them there at the convention, it was not about a presidential campaign of donald trump, it was as, in your capacity as the united states senator, correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: well, i think so. you could say, i guess, that i was invited for other reasons but

reasons, but --

REP. GOHMERT: when you had talked before about that you had consulted with the career people about whether or not to recuse yourself, can you tell us whether or not one of those people with whom you consulted was rod rosenstein?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes, i could say how that occurred.

REP. GOHMERT: but did you -- no i'm just asking if you did.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: so i'm just thinking out loud whether that's kind of consultant relationships.

REP. GOHMERT: i'm not asking you to reveal.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i talked to another senior official in the department of justice who holds the position, and he also consults others within the department before he makes opinions.

REP. GOHMERT: well, were you aware, when you used yourself of the investigation by the justice department into yank dan email account/2009 at index, are you google email account gman at [gmail.com](mailto:gman@gmail.com), wrul aware of those in the criminal complaint?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: flo.

REP. GOHMERT: were you aware that, and i have a motion to seal here.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i don't think so, i'll say it that way.

REP. GOHMERT: tok. this it was an investigation into russia, trying to corner the market with u.s. uranium. and there is actually a motion to seal, i'm sure you've filed many them times tasas u.s. attorney, and this is respected rod rosenstein, u.s. attorney, and add am aka is the assistant u.s. attorney, asking judge william conley to have this russian investigation, the investigation into the russian effort to corner our market to seal those records. so you were not la wear that rosenstein had had this prior dealing with russian uranium before you recused yourself, were you? you weren't aware of that, right?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: well, my recusal that we made public was for the mueller investigation, the campaign, russian interference.

REP. GOHMERT: right. but mueller was appointed.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: right.

REP. GOHMERT: but you weren't aware that mueller had been central in the investigation before jim comey took over at the fbi september of 2013? so you were not aware of the mueller/comey investigation into russian uranium, were you, before you recused yourself?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i don't think so. no, i was not, of course, i wasn't in the department of justice and wasn't aware of that when it was going on.

REP. GOHMERT: my time has run out. but we have a chart here that shows just how integral the relationship is with mr. rose enstein, mr. mueller, into this whole uranium one thing. it sure stinks to high heaven and doesn't appear to me they ought to be involved in investigating. but my time has run out. and i sure appreciate your service.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: thank you. i appreciate your service. mr. chairman, i would just note on that, the matter that was prosecuted concerning your rain um russian investigations was two years after this, and that's when mr. rose enstein handled, it was brought to his office, didn't hit his office until two years afterwards. and really unrelated to the allegations about your rain um one, as i understand it.

Attorney General Sessions House Judiciary Committee Hearing (CNN) – Rep.

Jim Jordan Questioning

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?PlayClip=FALSE&DTSearch=TRUE&DateTime=11%2F14%2F2017+11%3A35%3A50&market=m1&StationID=100>

REP. JIM JORDAN: mr. attorney general, did the fbi pay christopher steele?

ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF SESSIONS: where am i --

REP. JORDAN: yeah. the fbi pay christopher steele the author of the dossier?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: those are matters you will have to direct to the -- i think maybe the special counsel.

REP. JORDAN: why is that? i'm just asking --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not able to -- reveal internal investigator to manners.

REP. JORDAN: you know --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that's under the investigation of anybody, but particularly i think the --

REP. JORDAN: this happened in the summer of 2016. the clinton campaign, the democrat campaign paid through a law firm to produce the dossier, the author christopher steele, reported he was on the payroll of the fbi. i want to know if that is the case?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not able to provide an answer to you.

REP. JORDAN: did the fbi present the dossier to the fisa court?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not able to answer that

REP. JORDAN: do you know if the fbi did the established process protocol in evaluating claims made in the dossier?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not able to answer that.

REP. JORDAN: on january 6th, then fbi directors james comey, briefed president-elect trump up in new york

REP. JORDAN: on january 27th, when the director james comey, entered president's office camp up in new york about the dossier. shortly thereafter, that -- the fact that meeting took place and the subject of the meeting was the dossier was leaked to cnn. do you know who leaked that information?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i do not.

REP. JORDAN: are you investigating who leaked that information?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that would be a matter within the invest gaer to powers.

REP. JORDAN: you a number of investigations going on regarding leaks. is that one of them you're investigating?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i'm not able to reveal the existence of investigations or not.

REP. JORDAN: i appreciate your service in the senate, i appreciate your service at the justice department. consider you a friend. and frankly i appreciate yesterday's letter saying you were considering appointing a special counsel. that you sent us. but my concern is we sent you a letter three and a half months ago asking for a second special counsel and if you're now just considering it, i -- what's it going to take to get a special counsel? we know that -- we know that former fbi director james comey misled the american people in the summer of 2016 when he called the clinton investigation a matter. obviously an investigation. we know fbi director comey was drafting an exoneration letter before the investigation was complete and loreta lynch one day before the benghazi report came out, five days before secretary clinton was scheduled to be interviewed by the fbi met with bill clinton on a tarmac in fee mix. we know after that meeting when she was corresponding with public using the name elizabeth carlisle. as i've said before, seems to me if you're just talking golf and grandkids you can probably use your real name. we know that mr. comey publicized the investigation and we know he made the final decision whether to prosecute or not. and then when he gets fired he leaks a government document through a friend to "the new york times" and what was his goal? to create momentum for a special counsel and it can't just be any special counsel it's got to be bob mueller his best friend predecessor and meantntor the same bob mueller who was involved with the informant regarding russian businesses wanting to do business with the uranium business in the united states regarding the uranium one deal. so i guess my main question is what's it going to take if all of that, not to mention the dossier information, what's it going to take to actually get a special counsel?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: it would take a factual basis that meets the standards of the appointment of a special counsel.

REP. JORDAN: is that -- is that analysis going on right now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: it's in the manual of the department of justice about what's required. we've only had two. the first one was the waco janet reno senator danforth who took over that investigation as special counsel and mr. mueller. each of those are pretty special factual situations.

REP. JORDAN: let me ask it this way --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: we will use the proper standards and that's the only thing i can tell you, mr. jordan.

REP. JORDAN: i appreciate --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: you can have your idea but sometimes we have to study what the facts are and to evaluate whether it needs -- meets the standard required a special counsel.

REP. JORDAN: well, we know one fact we know the clinton campaign, the democrat national committee, paid for through the law firm paid for the dossier. we know that happened. it sure looks like the fbi was paying the author of that document and it sure looks like a major political party was working with the federal government to then turn antion research document the equivalent of some national enchoir ir story into an intelligence document take that to the fisa court they could then get a warrant to spy on americans associated with president trump's campaign. that's what it looks like. doesn't that warrant in addition to the things we know about james comey in 2016 doesn't that warrant naming a second special counsel as 20 members of the committee wrote you asking you to do?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: well, mr. comey is no longer the director of the fbi.

REP. JORDAN: thank goodness.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: we have an excellent man of integrity and ability in chris wray and he will do an outstanding job and i'm happy --

REP. JORDAN: he's not here today, attorney general sessions you are i'm asking --

REP. BOB GOODLATTE: the time of the gentleman expired.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: looks like not enough basis to appoint a special counsel.

Attorney General Sessions House Judiciary Committee Hearing (CNN) -- Rep. Matt Gaetz Questioning

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?PlayClip=FALSE&DTSearch=TRUE&DateTime=11%2F14%2F2017+14%3A09%3A50&market=m1&StationID=100>

REP. MATT GAETZ: you are aware of the july 27th letter that the judiciary chairman sent demanding a special counsel.

ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF SESSIONS: yes.

REP. GAETZ: and you are aware of the november 13th response we received late last evening?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes.

REP. GAETZ: did you direct mr. boyd to direct that response?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: we discussed that, and he drafted it, yes.

REP. GAETZ: did anyone else direct mr. boyd to draft this response or was it just you?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i think it would have been a direction from me.

REP. GAETZ: did you review the letter before it was sent?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes.

REP. GAETZ: and you agree with what's laid out in the letter?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i think so.

REP. GAETZ: so i'm going to now quote, i think it's in the third paragraph, it says the attorney general has directed to evaluate certain things in your letters. these senior prosecutors will report directly to the attorney general and the deputy attorney general. when you say the deputy attorney general you are referring

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: tompressed with mr. rosen stein, yes, he's a friend.

REP. GAETZ: so in this circumstance you contemplate where senior prosecutors are doing the analysis, and then reporting back, do you contemplate by using the conjunction "and" that you would be briefed simultaneously?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i would think so.

REP. GAETZ: who is the final decision maker, you or mr. rosen stein on these matters?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i would make the final decision. i would assume. unless it impla
kate'sicates that i'm recused in or improper for me to involved with.

REP. GAETZ: and that goes to the basis of moo i questions. i'm trying to find out in the very issues referenced in this response, it is stated in this response that it is the attorney general and the deputy attorney general that make a decision. so are you saying that it is the attorney general, it is your decision that is dispositive on those matters?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes. unless it's a conflict that i would make the decision, yes. he would report to both of us.

REP. GAETZ: do you see such a conflict as we sit here now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: well, some of the matters could implacate matters that mr. mueller has that i've recused myself from.

REP. GAETZ: other than the matters mr. mueller is dealing with, are there any other matters that you would see the circumstance where issue has been raised in chairman letter where you anticipate a recusal on your part?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i won't prejudge that. but it's possible.

REP. GAETZ: do you have the authority today, subject tour recusal, to a point special counsel to investigate the uranium one matter?

ATTORNEY GENFRAI SESSIONS: i believe i do

REP. GAETZ: do you have the authority to appoint a special counsel to investigate the fusion gps

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: believe that i should be talking about and evaluating cases here today.

REP. GAETZ: i'm not asking you.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes, you are.

REP. GAETZ: i'm ask about your authority to appoint the special counsel. i don't want to know if the investigations are happening.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: so if i'm not recused i have the authority and duty yes to make that decision.

REP. GAETZ: as it relates to loretta lynch using the pseudonym lace carl lyle, are you recused on that matter?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i don't think so.

REP. GAETZ: are you recused of the fusion gps matter?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: there go, i'm not able to comment about that. but i would say in defense of attorney general lynch, i use the same, i have a pseudonym also, understand all officials do, and maybe some cabinet officials do, but she probably would have been following the advice of the department of justice. i'm just saying.

REP. GAETZ: that's fine.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: we have to be careful.

REP. GAETZ: i no longer interested in that. so i just want to be clear that as it relates to the uranium one matter, you do believe you have the authority to appoint a special counsel and you do not believe that that authority that you have is subject to any recusal at this time?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i cannot say that.

Attorney General Sessions House Judiciary Committee Hearing (CNN) – Rep. Hakeem Jeffries Questioning

<http://mms.tveyes.com/transcript.asp?PlayClip=FALSE&DTSearch=TRUE&DateTime=11%2F14%2F2017+12%3A054%3A50&market=m1&StationID=100>

REP. HAKEEM JEFFRIES: i have a copy of the transcript you stated under oath, i don't recall in some form or fashion 29 times. is that correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF SESSIONS: i have no idea.

REP. JEFFRIES: i have a copy of the transcript of your testimony before the senate intelligence committee. you stated i don't recall in some form or fashion approximately 36 times. is that correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i don't know.

REP. JEFFRIES: in your familiar today, you stated i don't recall at least 20 times, is that fair to say?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i have no idea.

REP. JEFFRIES: on october 4th, during an interview with lou dobbs, you criticized hillary clinton for saying i can't remember approximately 35 times. you also stated during that lou dobbs interview that the intentional failure to remember can constitute perjury. mr. attorney general, do you still believe that the intentional failure to remember can constitute a criminal act?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: if it's an act to deceive, yes.

REP. JEFFRIES: now you testified in january that you had no contact with russian operatives in the trump campaign. earlier today you testified that your story has, quote, has never changed. that was your story, correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i believe that's fair to say. we have added things they did not recall at the time. my statement at the time was my best recollection of the circumstances and as things are brought up –

REP. JEFFRIES: i understand.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: you now acknowledge a meeting with the ambassador on the republican national convention, correct? and he came up to me afterwards and i was standing in front of the speaker and did chat with him. it was just an encounter at that time.

REP. JEFFRIES: you met with the ambassador in september of 2016 as you acknowledged?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes, for an appointment. i had two senior staffers, both full colonels in the united states army retired.

REP. JEFFRIES: you testified in june before the senate intelligence committee that you had not heard even a whisper about possible russian involvement in the trump campaign. we understand you attended this march 31st meeting with george papadopoulos and potential communications with russian operatives and according to your filing, you hosted a campaign dinner meeting on june 30th, 2016 at the capitol hill club and your committee paid for the meeting?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i think that may be so.

REP. JEFFRIES: carter page and george papadopoulos attended that meeting, correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: that has been reported.

REP. JEFFRIES: carter page told you that he was going to moscow in a few days. is that right?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: yes.

REP. JEFFRIES: okay. thank you.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: he said it was a brief meeting as he was walking out the door. i don't recall that conversation, but i'm not able to dispute it.

REP. JEFFRIES: understood. with the time i have limited --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: does that establish some sort of improper contact?

REP. JEFFRIES: i think you understand that.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: he is not russian.

REP. JEFFRIES: i get to ask the question and you provide the answers. you are no longer in the u.s. senate. you voted to remove bill clinton on offices of perjury, correct?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: i voted for impeachment, yes.

REP. JEFFRIES: i understand. to remove him. impeachment is in the house. to remove him from office, you gave this speech on february 29th, 1999. in it you acknowledged that while serving as u.s. attorney, you once prosecuted a young police officer who lied in a deposition. in that speech you decided to prosecute that young police officer even though he corrected his testimony. you testified under oath in january. you subsequently corrected that testimony in a march 6th written submission and have been forced repeatedly to come back to the senate and now the house to clarify. when explaining your vote on the senate floor to remove bill clinton from office, you stated that you refused to hold a president accountable to a different standard than the young police officer who you prosecuted. let me be clear. the attorney general of the united states of america should not be held to a different standard than the young police officer whose life you ruined by prosecuting him for perjury. i yield back.

REP. BOB GOODLATTE: the gentlemen may respond.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SESSIONS: mr. jeffries, nobody, nobody. not you or anyone else should be prosecuted. not me accused of perjury for answering the question the way i did in this hearing. i have always tried to answer the questions fairly and accurately. to ask did you ever do something or meet with russians and deal with the campaign, you are saying mr. carter page who left that reports and i guess his deposition or meeting said i'm going to russia. i made no response and didn't acknowledge it. you are accusing me of lying about that? i say that's not fair, mr. jeffries. i would say that's not fair, colleagues. that's not on any indication that i in any way participated in anything wrong. the same with mr. papadopoulos. he talked about, it is reported in the paper, that he said something about going to russia and dealing with the russians. i pushed back and said you shouldn't do it. i don't think it's right to accuse me of doing something wrong. no no.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
202.305.5808

From: Hankey, Mary Blanche (OLA)
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2017 9:12 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <siflores@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: HJC Clips

(b)(5)



Thanks and let me know if you need anything else.

Mary Blanche Hankey
Chief of Staff and Counsel
Office of Legislative Affairs
Office: 202-305-0149
Cell: (b)(6)

Schools, Scott (ODAG)

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2017 10:42 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA); Boyd, Stephen E. (OLA)
Subject: FW: IMG_1709.JPG
Attachments: IMG_1709.JPG; ATT00001.txt

Sarah:

(b)(5)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Scott

-----Original Message-----

From: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2017 10:28 AM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG) <sschools@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: IMG_1709.JPG

John Dowd

From: John Dowd
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2017 9:20 PM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Lifting the Steele Curtain

Opinion
| Potomac Watch

Lifting the Steele Curtain

The Fusion GPS dossier was one of the dirtiest political tricks in U.S. history.

By
Kimberley A. Strassel

Nov. 9, 2017 7:34 p.m. ET

74 COMMENTS

The Steele dossier has already become a thing of John le Carré-like intrigue—British spies, Kremlin agents, legal cutouts, hidden bank accounts. What all this obscures is the more immediate point: The dossier amounts to one of the dirtiest tricks in U.S. political history. It was perpetrated by Team Clinton and yielded a vast payoff for Hillary's campaign.

The Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign hired the opposition-research firm Fusion GPS in April 2016 to dig up dirt on Donald Trump. Fusion in turn hired former U.K. spook Christopher Steele to assemble the (now largely discredited) dossier. That full dossier of allegations wasn't made public until after the election, in January 2017. And the media and Democrats continue to peddle the line that it played no role during the election itself.

"Details from the dossier were not reported before Election Day," ran a recent CNN story. Hillary Clinton herself stressed the point in a recent "Daily Show" appearance. The dossier, she said, is "part of what happens in a campaign where you get information that may or may not be useful and you try to make sure anything you put out in the public arena is accurate. So this thing didn't come out until after the election, and it's still being evaluated."

This is utterly untrue. In British court documents Mr. Steele has acknowledged he briefed U.S. reporters about the dossier in September 2016. Those briefed included journalists from the New York Times, the Washington Post, Yahoo News and others. Mr. Steele, by his own admission (in an interview with Mother Jones), also gave his dossier in July 2016 to the FBI.

Among the dossier's contents were allegations that in early July 2016 Carter Page, sometimes described as a foreign-policy adviser to Candidate Trump, held a "secret" meeting with two high-ranking Russians connected to President Vladimir Putin. It even claimed these Russians offered to give Mr. Page a 19% share in Russia's state oil company in return for a future President Trump lifting U.S. sanctions. This dossier allegation is ludicrous on its face. Mr. Page was at most a minor figure in the campaign and has testified under oath that he never met the two men in question or had such a conversation.

Yet the press ran with it. On Sept. 23, 2016, Yahoo News's Michael Isikoff published a bombshell story under the headline: "U.S. intel officials probe ties between Trump adviser and Kremlin." Mr. Isikoff said "U.S. officials" had "received intelligence" about Mr. Page and Russians, and then went on to recite verbatim all the unfounded dossier allegations. He attributed all this to a "well-placed Western intelligence source," making it sound as if this info had come from someone in government rather than from an ex-spy-for-hire.

The Clinton campaign jumped all over it, spinning its own oppo research as a government investigation into Mr. Trump. Jennifer Palmieri, the campaign's communications director, the next day took to television to tout the Isikoff story and cite "U.S. intelligence officials" in the same breath as Mr. Page. Other Clinton surrogates fanned out on TV and Twitter to spread the allegations.

The Isikoff piece publicly launched the Trump-Russia collusion narrative—only 1½ months from the election—and the whole dossier operation counts as one of the greatest political stitch-ups of all time. Most campaigns content themselves with planting oppo research with media sources. The Clinton campaign commissioned a foreign ex-spy to gin up rumors, which made it to U.S. intelligence agencies, and then got reporters to cite it as government-sourced. Mrs. Clinton now dismisses the dossier as routine oppo research, ignoring that her operation specifically engineered the contents to be referred to throughout the campaign as "intelligence" or a "government investigation."

Making matters worse, there may be a grain of truth to that last claim. If the Washington Post's reporting is correct, it was in the summer of 2016 that Jim Comey's FBI obtained a wiretap warrant on Mr. Page from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. If it was the dossier that provoked that warrant, then the wrongs here are grave. Mr. Page is suing Yahoo News over that Isikoff story, but he may have a better case against the Clinton campaign and the federal government if they jointly spun a smear document into an abusive investigation.

To that point, it is fair to ask if the entire Trump-Russia narrative—which has played a central role in our political discourse for a year, and is now resulting in a special counsel issuing unrelated indictments—is based on nothing more than a political smear document. Is there any reason to believe the FBI was probing a Trump-Russia angle before the dossier? Is there any collusion allegation that doesn't come in some form from the dossier?

The idea that the federal government and a special counsel were mobilized—that American citizens were monitored and continue to be investigated—based on a campaign-funded hit document is extraordinary. Especially given that to this day no one has publicly produced a single piece of evidence to support any of the dossier's substantive allegations about Trump team

piece of evidence to support any of the dossier's substantive allegations about Trump team members.

So yes, Mrs. Clinton, the dossier—which you paid for—was used in the election. And we are only beginning to understand in how many ways.

Write to kim@wsj.com.

John M. Dowd,
Attorney at Law
Suite 700
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015
john@johnmdowd.com
202-362-5900-w

(b)(6) -c

Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)

From: Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2017 7:42 AM
To: Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: Fwd: Journalist pay questioned in Russian dossier court cases

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG)" <rrosenstein@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Date: November 9, 2017 at 6:24:48 AM EST
To: "Hur, Robert (ODAG)" <rhur@jmd.usdoj.gov>, "Crowell, James (ODAG)" <jcrowell@jmd.usdoj.gov>, "Gauhar, Tashina (ODAG)" <tagauhar@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: **Fwd: Journalist pay questioned in Russian dossier court cases**

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Dowd <john@johnmdowd.com>
Date: November 6, 2017 at 10:10:32 AM EST
To: "Rod Rosenstein (Rod.Rosenstein5@usdoj.gov)" <Rod.Rosenstein5@usdoj.gov>, "Schools, Scott (ODAG)" <Scott.Schools@usdoj.gov>
Subject: **FW: Journalist pay questioned in Russian dossier court cases**

Link: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/nov/5/journalist-pay-questioned-in-russian-dossier-court/?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=email_this&utm_source=email

Dear Rod and Scott:

Please read the attached.

We all now know that the entire Russian drama was and is a complete concoction by the Clinton DNC buying a phony dossier with laundered money by law firms and cut outs with Fusion GPS and former WSJ reporter Glenn Simpson to nullify the results of the Presidential election. It is clear we were all duped including the DOJ and both houses of Congress.

Why are Fusion GPS and Simpson in Court trying to cover up their payments to reporters to push all the Dossier lies and precipitate investigative action by our executive and legislative branches. Who were those reporters? How much did they get paid?

Corruption of our free press undermines and debases the 1st Amendment right of all Americans to know the forces trying to undermine their right to know, their right to freely associate, and to an honest voting process. The present Court action is an audacious attempt to conceal the identities of the participants in this incredible. corrupt scheme Why isn't our DOJ intervening as a friend of the Court to protect the public interest and the integrity of the various investigations into this stunning subversion of our primary and final electoral processes. Thank you for your consideration and prompt action.
V/r

John M. Dowd,
Attorney at Law
Suite 700
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015
john@johnmdowd.com
202-362-5900-w
(b)(6) -c

John Dowd

From: John Dowd
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Rosenstein, Rod (ODAG); Schools, Scott (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Journalist pay questioned in Russian dossier court cases
Importance: High

Link: http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/nov/5/journalist-pay-questioned-in-russian-dossier-court/?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=email_this&utm_source=email

Dear Rod and Scott:

Please read the attached.

We all now know that the entire Russian drama was and is a complete concoction by the Clinton DNC buying a phony dossier with laundered money by law firms and cut outs with Fusion GPS and former WSJ reporter Glenn Simpson to nullify the results of the Presidential election. It is clear we were all duped including the DOJ and both houses of Congress.

Why are Fusion GPS and Simpson in Court trying to cover up their payments to reporters to push all the Dossier lies and precipitate investigative action by our executive and legislative branches.

Who were those reporters? How much did they get paid?

Corruption of our free press undermines and debases the 1st Amendment right of all Americans to know the forces trying to undermine their right to know, their right to freely associate, and to an honest voting process.

The present Court action is an audacious attempt to conceal the identities of the participants in this incredible, corrupt scheme

Why isn't our DOJ intervening as a friend of the Court to protect the public interest and the integrity of the various investigations into this stunning subversion of our primary and final electoral processes.

Thank you for your consideration and prompt action.

V/r

John M. Dowd,
Attorney at Law
Suite 700
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015
john@johnmdowd.com
202-362-5900-w

(b)(6) -c