SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONTINUED INTERVIEW OF: CASSIDY HUTCHINSON

Monday, March 7, 2022

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held via Webex, commencing at 12:06 p.m.

Present: Representatives Aguilar, Raskin, Cheney, and Kinzinger.

Appearances:

For the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL:

[redacted], STAFF ASSOCIATE
[redacted], INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
[redacted], STAFF DIRECTOR
[redacted], STAFF ASSOCIATE
[redacted], SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
[redacted], SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
[redacted], CHIEF INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
[redacted], CHIEF CLERK
[redacted], STAFF ASSOCIATE
[redacted], INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
[redacted], PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER
[redacted], SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL

For CASSIDY HUTCHINSON:

STEFAN PASSANTINO
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
The Wharf
1000 Maine Avenue SW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20024

Mr. [redacted]. Why don't we just get right to it and let's go on the record. It is March 7th -- I'll start that again -- it's March 7th, and this is the resumed interview of Ms. Cassidy Hutchinson by the Select Committee to investigate the January 6th attack on the United States Capitol.

I see Mr. Passantino, you've come back, and, Ms. Hutchinson, you are here with us as well.

On our side, again I'll just introduce myself, I'm [redacted], senior investigative counsel for the committee. To my left is [redacted], senior investigative counsel to the committee. To his left is [redacted], chief investigative counsel to the subcommittee.

To my right is [redacted], investigative counsel to the committee, and to her right is [redacted], professional staff member to the committee. And, again, we're same set-up.

We have people who have joined via the Webex link and are listed there on the side. And like last time, I'll try to announce any members that join as they do so. There may be a slight delay.

I'll just remind you that this is all being taken down by a court reporter, so I'd encourage you to use verbal answers instead of shaking your head or other nonverbal type -- or nonword type answers.

The same ground rules apply. The only thing that I would remind you, is that, even though you're not under oath, Ms. Hutchinson, deliberately providing false information to Congress can be a crime and is illegal under title 18, United States Code Section 1001, and others.

If at any point you need a break to speak with Mr. Passantino, please let us know, we're happy to do that. And if you want a break for any other reasons, let us know that

as well, and we're certainly happy to oblige.

I would note that Mr. Kinzinger just joined, he's a select committee member, and I think, with that, unless you have any questions, we're ready to proceed.

Mr. Passantino. Very good.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. And do you understand everything that I just went over with you?

Ms. Hutchinson. Yes.

Mr. [redacted]. Then, at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Tonolli to ask a few questions.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Good afternoon, Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you for indulging me at the start here. It's nice to meet you. You have in front of you, I can see on the screen, some exhibits that we sent you this morning. And three of those are text exchanges between Katrina Pierson and then, respectively, Mark Meadows, Dan Scavino, and Max Miller.

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And just to set it up, and we can be efficient with this, is, the questions I'll ask are focused on the decisions around who was to speak at the rally on the 6th at the Ellipse -- and I'll note for the record that Ms. Cheney has joined us -- and so that's the context.

And so I'll start off by asking you this, Ms. Hutchinson -- and we're going to focus on the timeframe in December of 2020 and January of 2021 -- did you know or know of Ms. Katrina Pierson at that time?

A Yes, sir.

Q Were you aware that she was working on the Ellipse rally with the rally

organizers?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you understand that the rally organizers for the Ellipse event were Women for America First?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, it's a mother and daughter who run the organization named Amy and Kylie Kremer. Do you know who they are?

A Vaguely, but yes, sir.

Q They had done a few rallies in D.C. after the election respectively in November and December. Were you aware that those took place in Freedom Plaza?

A Yes, sir.

Q And President Trump drove by the November rally in a motorcade. If you remember, it was a Saturday morning. Were you aware at the time that he was doing that?

A Yes, sir.

Q And we've seen that Ms. Amy Kremer reached out to Mr. Meadows in advance of that rally to see if the President would appear. Were you aware that that had happened?

A Do you happen to have the date that he went by in the motorcade?

Q Sure. It was Saturday, November 14th.

A No. I wouldn't have fielded any of those incoming inquiries. That's when Mr. Meadows and I were out with coronavirus. We hadn't been at the White House together.

Q Okay. Now focus on December of 2020, it was a Saturday, the 12th, and the President ended up flying over the rally-goers in Marine One. Were you aware that

that happened that day?

A I was. But he was taking Marine One to Joint Base Andrews that day anyway because that was the day of the Army-Navy football game in New York that we traveled to.

Q To be sure, are you aware that the flight path was rerouted to go over the rally-goers from the original flight path?

A Not to my immediate recollection. I don't remember any discussions about rerouting it.

Q Fair enough.

A It's possible I was a part of those discussions or had, in passing, overheard them, just because of Mark's involvement with it, but I don't remember right now.

Q Do you recall when you first became aware that the rally was going to be taking place on January 6th, when it just first came to your attention?

A Likely the end of December. I don't have an exact date.

Q So, on December 27th, President Trump sent out a tweet saying something to the effect of: See you in D.C., details to follow. And, when he sent that tweet, it was the evening of December 27th, and he was at Mar-a-Lago. Do you -- were you in Florida on that day, if you remember?

A No. I had just gotten back to D.C. Mr. Meadows was in Georgia, and I had spent Christmas up in New Jersey with my family, and we had -- we were going back to the White House on December 28th.

Q If you look at what we've marked as exhibit 37, it's Ms. Pierson's text with Mr. Meadows, and just the very first one, you'll see it's on page 3, I should say, there's a lot that's redacted that predated the events.

And do you see right there, on the third page, on December 27th, at 7:16 p.m.,

there's a list of date --

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. So this is Ms. Pierson sending Mr. Meadows a list of appearances for the March for Trump Tour put on by the Kremers and Women for America First that would end in D.C. on January 6th at the end. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now I'll just ask generally, did you become aware, at some point before January 6th, that Ms. Pierson was communicating with Mr. Meadows about the event?

A I'm sorry. You said prior to January 6th?

Q Correct. Did you know that, before that date, that she was talking to Mr. Meadows about the event?

A Yes, sir.

Q And how did you become aware of that?

A Mark likely mentioned it to me at the office or gave me a call, I don't recall exactly. It was likely something along the lines of, if you hear anything from Katrina Pierson, let me know, we're working on rally logistics, or something along those lines.

Q And what did you understand her role to be?

A [Inaudible.]

Q Ms. Pierson's?

A Thank you. As a former campaign official, I just understood her role to be involved in the coordinating of either speakers or just logistics for the rally. I knew that she likely wasn't involved in planning the permit angle of everything, but just likely around, like, the -- like, our immediate surrogates and how we actually wanted the rally to undergo that day.

Q And, to that point, and to my introduction, did you become aware that

Ms. Pierson was talking with Mr. Meadows about who would speak and who would not speak at the Ellipse on January 6th?

A I knew that they were having discussions about it. I don't recall if I knew or was aware whether or not she was the primary point of contact for speaker organization.

Q When you say "the primary point of contact," is that who Mr. -- someone else who Mr. Meadows was speaking about on that issue?

A No. I -- sorry if I wasn't clear. I meant more along the lines of if she was the sole person in charge of organizing the speakers or if there was other individuals. I knew that they were speaking, and I knew that they were speaking about rally logistics, and I knew that they were speaking about potential individuals that would speak at the rally. But I wasn't sure if there was anybody else that he was coordinating with, with her, or if there was multiple channels of communication.

Q Did you understand Mr. Meadows to be talking with any other rally organizer, so not within the White House or the government but actually someone outside in the private sector who was helping to organize the rally, other than Ms. Pierson?

A I knew that he had discussions with Amy -- and forgive me if I'm pronouncing her last name wrong, but Amy Kremer -- Kremer -- but to be honest with you, I -- I just didn't closely track individuals involved with that aspect.

If you were more specific with any individuals that might be in question, but I just didn't frequently communicate with those people, so I didn't really have much involvement or can distinguish people off the top of my head right now.

Q So we're going to get into it by looking at some of the text messages, but I'll just ask you, did you become aware that Ms. Pierson raised concerns with Mr. Meadows about some of the people who were being proposed to speak at the Ellipse?

A I was aware that there were individuals that raised concerns about the speakers to Mr. Meadows. I don't recall whether or not I knew Ms. Pierson was one specifically.

Q Who were the people you remember who did?

A Lot of internal staff. There's -- there was a lot of back and forth during that time of who they actually wanted to be at the rally that day, meaning Mr. Giuliani had opinions about it; there were Members of Congress that had opinions about who should speak; Amy Kremer, Caroline Wren. I remember there being a lot of conversations about who should be permitted guidance and permission to speak, but I don't -- I don't recall an exact list of 10, 15, 20 names that people -- of people that had raised concerns to him.

Q Who are the people that concerns were raised about, that you remember, Ms. Hutchinson?

A Mike Lindell, Steve Bannon, Mo Brooks, off the top of my head, but, again, it was 14 months ago, so I -- it's a little hard to recall some of the names off the top of my head at this time. There was -- I mean, there was a bunch of people. And, honestly, I don't recall the list being even finalized until the night before the rally, so. And I -- I didn't know even the morning of. To be frank, I didn't really care who was speaking. I had [inaudible].

Q Are you aware that Ms. Pierson came to the White House to meet with President Trump personally to discuss the list of speakers?

A Yes, sir.

Q And so, to that point, it might be helpful to go through some of her messages with Mr. Meadows leading up to that meeting, which I'll tell you was January 4th. So, if you look on that same page I directed you to, where you see that first

message, at the bottom on January 2nd at, 5:16 p.m., she asks Mr. Meadows to call her because: Things have gotten crazy, and I desperately need some direction. And were you -- did you consult with Mr. Meadows about his discussions with Ms. Pierson, if you can remember, and what he discussed with her about the rally?

A Not on January 2nd, no.

Q Okay. If we continue then on, if we look to the next page, still on exhibit 37, she says -- and I will direct your attention to the message at 5:49 p.m. on the second: I'm cutting everything before the POTUS block and will look for another location for the rest. Does that sound familiar to you, that there was discussion about taking certain controversial speakers and putting them at a different location to speak, other than the Ellipse?

A Yes, sir.

Q And do you know whether or not that was Mr. Meadows' idea or where that idea came from?

A I don't recall where the idea came from. I knew that he was aware of it, but I don't recall the origination of that idea.

Q And, if you go down further, we'll flip to January 3rd now, still on that same page, though, just one down more.

So, at 1:39 p.m., do you see that Ms. Pierson tells Mr. Meadows: Scratch that, Caroline Wren has decided to move forward with the original psycho list. Apparently Dan Scavino approved.

So was Mr. Scavino one of the people you were aware of was weighing in on who should speak and who should not speak on the 6th?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what do you remember about Mr. Scavino and what he said about the

event?

A I don't recall any specifics about what Mr. Scavino said about the event. I recall his involvement because of his proximity to the President, and him and Mr. Meadows frequently worked closely on his -- on the President's behalf.

I don't recall anything specifically right now that he would've said about -- on January 3rd about the list of the people.

Q The strength of the language Ms. Pierson uses there, that she calls the list from Ms. Wren the original psycho list. Did you have any reaction to seeing that? Did you hear it talked about in that way?

A In that exact phrasing?

Q To that effect, referring to the people as psychos, that Ms. Wren was recommending speak at the Ellipse?

Mr. Passantino. He asked you a couple questions in there, but I think the question is, do you recall the list being referred to as the psycho list?

I hope I didn't mischaracterize your question.

Mr. [redacted]. You put it just right.

Mr. Passantino. But I think it's a reaction question --

Mr. [redacted]. Right.

Mr. Passantino. -- and then a --

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah.

Ms. Hutchinson. There was frequently colorful adjectives that were used to describe certain individuals that wanted to speak at the rally.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And -- and Ms. Wren, were you aware who she was at that time?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what did you understand her connection to the event to be?

A As a former campaign official, I believe, and a fundraiser, similar to Ms. Pierson's. Again, I -- I had never worked on the campaign or in an official campaign capacity, so I didn't have a personal relationship with these people, other than the one that I had built working for Mr. Meadows, which was not anything very extensive.

But I knew that she was involved in planning the rally and identifying potential speakers, and I knew that there was a rift between her and other people involved.

Q And settling that rift, is that what you understood the point of the meeting between Ms. Pierson and the President to be about?

A I understood that more a meeting to finalize or work towards finalizing the plan of events for January 6th. I didn't -- at this time that I can recall now. If I think about it and I can, I will certainly let you know, but at the time, I don't recall it being about Caroline Wren. But I'm not sure that would've been something that I would've been read in on to be honest with you.

Q And did you know at the time, if you knew, who else Ms. Wren was working with on the rally that was putting forward this list of speakers? Was there anyone else with Ms. Wren that was advocating for these folks?

A I wasn't aware of anything else at the time.

Q And I'll note for the record Mr. Aguilar has joined. Thank you for being here.

If we continue on, and the easiest way is to look at the Bates numbers Ms. Pierson used, so see it if you look at Bates number 926. [Inaudible] excuse me.

If you see it at the top, at 5:03 p.m., Ms. Pierson is describing for Mr. Meadows, you know, about people proposed to speak: These are the grifter fringe of the right, the crazies.

Do you remember discussions about people who were proposed to speak being referred to as grifters and who that might've been about in particular, if you recall?

A I'll refer to my previous statement that there was frequently colorful language used to describe particular individuals that were hoping to speak at the rally or by nature involved with anything of rally-planning. I don't specifically recall "grifter," "psycho," "crazies," but it's not words that would've been out of the ordinary to mention.

Q If we just go up to the bottom of page 5, I apologize for not starting there, but her comments came after referring to a man named Ali Akbar, if you see that at 5:02 p.m. on the 3rd.

A Uh-huh.

Q Do you know who that is or know of Mr. Akbar, otherwise known as Ali Alexander?

A I'd read about him before, yes, sir.

Q Did he come up as a topic of conversation, to your knowledge, as a potential speaker for the Ellipse event?

A Not that I recall.

Q So, if we go back down to the next page and you continue down --

A -- may I just --

Q Sure.

A -- with you what I've said. I -- I recall people talking about him in the rally. I don't recall if they had spoken about him speaking at the rally on January 6th or if he was just going to be in town and helping form groups of people or assemble mini rallies throughout D.C., outside the Willard Hotel, outside, I believe, Freedom Plaza, but I don't -- I recall his involvement and people having discussions about him. I don't specifically recall about the 6th. Does that make sense?

Q It does. And, in fact, were you aware that he had an event planned for the Capitol Grounds on the 6th, that being Mr. Alexander?

A No, sir.

Q So who is discussing, to the best of your memory, Mr. Alexander and his efforts to hold other rallies and otherwise bring people to D.C. for the 6th?

A I don't recall anybody specifically that mentioned his name. I'm sorry if that's not helpful. I recall his name coming up, and I recall his name being brought to Mr. Meadows' attention, but I don't remember who -- who it was that did.

Q Do you remember anybody raising concerns about the nature of the rhetoric Mr. Alexander used at events and rallies?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what do you remember people raising as a concern about that rhetoric?

A That there were concerns about the nature of his rhetoric and how his comments were sometimes a bit politically incorrect and the effect that that could have on the President's or the overall event and goals of the January 6th rally was intended for and how it might not align with having wanted it to be portrayed. They didn't want to take away from his messaging that day.

And there were spirited discussions about those matters, but there wasn't -- to my recollection right now, that pops in my head, there wasn't anything particularly alarming or didn't raise any red flags to me. It was -- I thought they were valid concerns.

Q What were the concerns, though, to be more particular, Ms. Hutchinson, about the language and why it was different than the message you understood the President wanted to put out on the 6th?

A Just that he had a tendency to have a little bit of an obscene or extremist way of delivering certain things and how it wasn't always the most politically correct way

to address messages that we also might want to convey but in a less prolific way.

Q And so, for instance, did people raise the fact that he would use violent rhetoric?

A Yes, sir.

Q And one of the concerns you talked about was not just that -- that that being divergent from President Trump's message but also the effect on the crowd. Did I hear you right about that?

A Sorry. Could you repeat that one time, please.

Q You mentioned earlier that there was concern raised -- two types of concerns about Mr. Alexander's rhetoric. On the one hand, it's divergent from what the President, the message he wanted to put out. Is that right?

A Yeah. And I -- I want to make sure I was clear on that. I meant that more along the lines of, the President might convey a similar message -- I'll use the example "stop the steal" -- but the President might have a different way of delivering it than Mr. Alexander would have a way of delivering it.

Although it could be a similar or the same message, the rhetoric could get lost in translation had Mr. Alexander been involved with delivering that rhetoric as a keynote speaker on behalf of President Trump.

Q I think we all understand, Ms. Hutchinson, that I think what you're saying is Mr. Alexander supported President Trump and wanted to see him win a second term. Is that fair?

A Yes, sir.

Q But the language that he used in talking about that at rallies was what caused people to raise concerns? Did I also hear you talk about that?

A Yes, sir.

Q All right. Were you aware that, on January 5th, Mr. Alexander, speaking to rally-goers, was leading a chant of "victory or death"?

A No, sir. Well, at the time, no, sir.

Mr. Passantino. [Inaudible.]

Ms. Hutchinson. No.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Who raised concerns before the 6th to your knowledge, about Mr. Alexander's rhetoric?

A Could you specify to whom?

Q I don't know because -- I'm not trying to be cute. I don't know who you were talking to and who raised these concerns that you talked about. You called them spirited discussions. Who was having these -- who was raising the concerns?

A Again, and I believe I previously said this, but there was a lot -- there were a lot of conversations that happened in that period. Ms. Pierson came in and spoke with Mr. Meadows and Mr. Trump.

I knew that there was correspondence going back and forth happening and there were rifts happening between certain camps and Ms. Caroline Wren. I don't recall any individuals off the top of my head right now raising a very specific concern about Mr. Alexander.

I remember it more being a general concern to those involved in those discussions, but they weren't discussions that I was heavily involved in. I was aware of them by nature of my proximity, but I wasn't sitting in the room for many of these at the time, especially ones involving Mr. Alexander.

Q Did the name of Alex Jones come up as well?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what do you recall the discussions about Mr. Jones to have been about?

A That Mr. Jones was in town and wanted to participate in rally-planning, rally-speaking, whether that was on the 6th or the 5th, events around Washington, D.C. --

Q Was --

A -- pardon me?

Q I'm sorry. Go ahead. You paused. I shouldn't have jumped in.

A It's okay. I just -- more top line I recall individuals trying to figure out if he had a role or could play a role in the 6th or the 5th and what that role may look like.

Q Was there also a concern about the rhetoric Mr. Jones uses and him being associated with the Ellipse event?

A Yes, sir. But I think that there was a lot of opinions about a lot of people, if not most individuals that were involved as speakers. I also think that's just kind of the nature of some of these events. There's a lot of cooks in the kitchen. There's a lot of people that want to be involved, but you have to be careful about vetting who is actually granted that permission.

Q And so, on that point, if we go down on this exhibit we're still looking at, just a little bit further, you will see that, at 5:15 p.m., on the 3rd of January, Mr. Meadows says to Ms. Pierson: Talk it over with Scavino. Were you aware that Ms. Pierson was talking to Mr. Scavino about the speakers as well?

A At the time, not that I can recall.

Q If we look at --

A I'm sorry. At the time of this text, not that I can recall.

Q Do you know how it came to be that Ms. Pierson got scheduled to meet with President Trump on January 4th?

A Not that I can recall right now. Ms. Pierson would frequently reach out to

individuals in the White House throughout the campaign, hoping to get a meeting with Mr. Trump, and that wasn't out of the ordinary for campaign officials and various media surrogates.

However, I recall her name being brought up by Mr. Meadows to -- Mr. Trump's scheduler at the time was Mr. Michael Haidet, and he asked if he -- Mr. Meadows asked Mr. Haidet if he had time in his schedule to plan for a meeting with Ms. Pierson. I'm not sure if a conversation happened between Mr. Trump, Mr. Scavino, and Mr. Meadows, or how that conversation came to fruition to elevate it to Mr. Haidet, but I just recall Mr. Meadows talking to Mr. Haidet about it, and they made room in the schedule to have that meeting happen.

Q If we look at exhibit 38 -- this is another one that I understand you were provided -- it's an agenda that Ms. Pierson typed up for her meeting with the President on January 4th. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. You can tell by the agenda, the understanding going in for the meeting was that the President would be there, Mr. Meadows would be there, and so would Mr. Scavino. Did you understand before the meeting that Mr. Meadows was supposed to participate in the discussion?

A Yes, sir.

Q And did you also understand that --

A I recall -- I recall that being on his calendar.

Q Do you know whether he did, in fact, meet with the President and Ms. Pierson on the 4th?

A I wasn't physically at the White House at that time because that was the day that we traveled to Georgia for the rally the night before the Georgia Senate runoff

election. So I believe -- now, I don't have my -- my records just by being out of the White House, like, I don't know specifically, but in my head recalling the timing of -- that I would've had to depart the White House, I would've already been gone and driving to Joint Base Andrews to get on the plane. So I wasn't -- I wouldn't have physically been at the White House to see Mr. Meadows walk into the Oval Office for that meeting.

Q Do you know whether before that meeting Mr. Meadows had a conversation with the President about who should or should not speak at the rally on the 6th?

A Mr. Meadows and Mr. Trump had many discussions about planning the rally and potential speakers for the rally. I don't recall any specific conversation that they had about this specific meeting with Ms. Pierson.

Q How about before, were you a part of any conversations personally between Mr. Meadows and the President about who should speak?

A I had been a participant in those discussions, and I had been a bystander at some discussions, but I wasn't an active participant to give my opinion about any rally speakers.

Q Understood. Where did those meetings take place, if you remember?

A Sometimes in the Oval Dining Room, sometimes in the Oval Office, on the plane, Air Force 1. And Mr. Meadows and Mr. Trump frequently spoke on the -- on the phone.

Q Ms. Pierson, in other messages, represented to people she was working with, that after speaking with Mr. Meadows on January 2nd, she understood the President planned to tell the rally-goers to march to the Capitol after he was done speaking. Is that consistent with what you understood the President planned to do or had been talking about planning to do at the rally?

A I'm sorry. Could you please repeat that question?

Q Yes. Ms. Pierson, after talking to Mr. Meadows on January 2nd, told others she was working with that she understood the President planned to tell the rally-goers on the 6th to march to the Capitol after he was done speaking.

In other words, 4 days before the event, she knew the President was going to tell people to march to the Capitol. Is that consistent with what you understood the President planned to do?

A Thank you for clarifying. I don't recall that exact phrasing coming up on January 2nd, and if I'm remembering correctly, that was a Saturday, I believe. I don't recall, on January 2nd, whether or not "march to the Capitol" was a specific phrase raised to the President and one that he was supportive of, right now.

I recall it definitely being raised, likely the 4th or the 5th, perhaps even the 3rd, but I -- I don't recall. The 2nd seems like a little early for me to remember that, but there's a chance it did. I just can't recall at this time.

Q But whether the 2nd or 3rd or 4th before the rally, you understood the President planned to tell the people who attended his speech to go to the Capitol once he was done?

A I want to be careful with phrasing because I don't know if he wanted to use the phrase march to the -- I don't want to give a verbatim message that he wanted to deliver if he had worked through any variations of it or if Mr. Meadows had thoughts about variations of phrasing. But "march to the Capitol" or a phrase along those lines I do recall being raised ahead of the January 6th rally.

Q The spirited discussions about who should speak at the rally, did these spirited discussions include the ones that you were personally present for with President Trump?

A No. He -- this conversation that I recall happened on Air Force 1 going back

to Washington, D.C., on January 4th after the rally, and there were a few Members that were traveling with us that evening. And I remember, I recall the topic of rally speakers coming up in the conference room, and I recall Mr. Mo Brooks' name being brought up.

And Mr. Meadows, at some point, something along the lines had said something to me of: We'll make it happen; Cassidy will reach out. And I had opinions about that, and I had private conversations with Mr. Meadows about that, but I -- that's the only conversation that I can specifically recall there being any controversy that I was physically a part of between Mr. Meadows and Mr. Trump.

Q Well, we'll come back to Mr. Brooks, but how about whether Mr. Meadows -- even if Mr. Meadows was not involved, were you present for a discussion with the President about who should speak or not speak at the rally?

A No, sir.

Q Whether spirited or not, in the conversations you were present for with the President about who should speak at the rally, did anybody raise any concerns about the rhetoric used by people who were proposed to speak with the President?

A No. Referring to a previous statement of mine, I believe this is not verbatim, and I apologize for that, but there were frequently a lot of opinions about being careful with the individuals that would speak because we wanted to make sure we -- individuals involved in the planning of the rally wanted to ensure that the message that the rally speakers would deliver was similar, if not the same, as the rhetoric that Mr. Trump wanted to use. We didn't -- they did not want anything to be taken out of context, and it -- for it be reflected poorly on Mr. Trump.

Mr. Passantino. Did you understand -- pardon me, [redacted] -- that I believe the question was whether you -- the President was aware of those conversations, not --

Ms. Hutchinson. Oh.

Mr. Passantino. -- I think, if I'm not mischaracterizing your question -- I think he was asking about your awareness of the President being involved.

Ms. Hutchinson. I -- I'm not aware whether or not the President knew that there was differing opinions or controversy about rally speakers. And I apologize if my first response was not clear enough.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q No, it's fine. You don't have to apologize. And, if you look at that agenda that Ms. Pierson prepared, it speaks right to this. And, if you look at the bottom under the recommendations, I'll just ask if this is consistent with the discussions you were hearing about the rally speakers.

The first point she makes is: Keep the Ellipse portion intimate and official to control the narrative.

But she thinks, says: Limit to 2016 surrogates vetted and on your team, not their own.

The next is: Eliminate convicted felons that could damage the other speakers.

And the last is: Keep the fringe on the fringe. We have alternative -- I think that's a typo -- but states, or stages, available.

Is that all consistent with the types of discussions you heard about who should speak or not speak at the Ellipse --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- rally? All right.

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, if you look at, there's a set of text messages you have where the first one is an Emoji of Ms. Pierson popping a champagne bottle. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q I'll represent to you, these are actually messages produced by Max Miller, that he had with Katrina Pierson. Do you know Mr. Miller?

A Yes, sir.

Q Fair to say he would work on events for the President?

A Yes, sir.

Q He was in the meeting with the President and Ms. Pierson on January 4th. And I just want to direct your attention to just the first part, just to set the context. He says to her -- he's in blue because he produced these messages. She's in gray. Okay? And she says on the first page, she has the Emoji, and he says: You did a great job killing some of those speakers.

She says: Hallelujah, praise the Lord Jesus, Amen.

Did you understand it going into that meeting, Ms. Hutchinson, that it was an active debate with the -- rather that the President was pushing back on any recommendations Ms. Pierson had for who should speak, that it was, in other words, something that she needed to celebrate after she was done killing some of those speakers from the list?

A I did believe that there was a reason for celebration when they were successful in ensuring that the President was as best to the ability of staffers protected on the day of the rally in terms of ensuring that the individuals speaking ahead of him were properly vetted.

Q Why would it even be an issue or something you would have to celebrate, being able to protect the President in that way? Who -- who was pushing for it to be otherwise, to your knowledge?

A As we've previously discussed, I recall there being certain individuals involved, such as Ms. Caroline Wren, that had opinions about who should speak that

might be different from those perhaps of Ms. Pierson and Mr. Miller. And the reason to celebrate would be because they wanted to accomplish eliminating or mitigating any individuals from speaking, such as Mr. Alexander, that could have a negative reflection on the President's message that day.

Q And, again, just trying -- Ms. Wren wasn't within the White House, right? As you said, she was a fundraiser?

A I don't know the specific role she played at the time, but she has participated in fundraising. She has participated in campaign activities. I don't know her official title or role on that day.

Q Was there -- was there anyone within the White House that you understood was on her side, so to speak, in pushing for the speakers that she wanted? Ms. Pierson mentioned in her message to Mr. Meadows whether Mr. Scavino was pushing for Ms. Wren's speakers, do you know?

A I don't recall if there was any -- if there were any individuals supportive of the speakers that she wanted, yeah.

Q Okay. Well, if we look at -- you have a set of -- and we're almost done here, you have a set of text messages between Ms. Pierson and Mr. Scavino. Do you see that on the first page? It's a Bates number of 904.

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. If you turn to 906, near the top of the page, the messages in blue are from Ms. Pierson and in gray is Mr. Scavino. At 5:39 p.m., Ms. Pierson says -- this is after her meeting with the President -- she says to Mr. Scavino: He basically pushed everyone to another stage, which is fine by me, but he did ask me to check with you on Ali. Sorry.

And then, if you go down the next -- Mr. Scavino's first response, it's at 4:23 a.m. on January 5th, and I'll read it in a second, but I'll ask this, did Mr. Scavino go down to

Dalton, Georgia, for the rally the night of the 4th, to your memory?

A Yes, Mr. Scavino traveled with us to Dalton, Georgia, the night of the 4th.

Q And presumably then he was on the flight back also to D.C. from Dalton?

A Yes, sir. He would've flown with the President on Marine One round trip and Air Force One round trip.

Q And so his response to Ms. Pierson is: Hey, sorry, been out of pocket on this cell. Just got in from Georgia a couple of hours ago. He brought up Ali. Just keep him on stage, not associated with POTUS or main event. POTUS said. We talked about on the way back.

Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Were you present for that conversation between the President and Mr. Scavino about Ali?

A No, sir.

Q Were you aware that it happened?

A I was aware Mr. Scavino had conversations with Mr. Trump on that flight, but that was not out of the ordinary for flights. Mr. Scavino frequently had close contact and individual conversations with the President.

Q Now --

A -- Mr. Scavino walk into Mr. Trump's office that evening, but I don't recall this topic being a specific one that Mr. Scavino wanted to discuss with him.

Q Now, in the conversations you had had where you were present for conversations with President Trump about the Ellipse rally, did Mr. Trump acknowledge that he knew who Ali Alexander was?

A I don't recall in spec- -- I recall Mr. Alexander's name being brought up in the

conference room that evening, but I don't recall Mr. Trump being the individual to raise the name. I want to be careful because I don't want to pin it on somebody, but I believe it was Ms. Marjorie Taylor Greene that had mentioned Mr. Alexander's name and the conversation had started. But I -- to be honest, I was in there, there were other individuals in there, in the conference room, and I believe at the time Mr. Meadows and I were sitting on a couch at the back of the conference room. So it was just, to me, passerby conversation that I wasn't paying attention to.

Q Just so -- just to the best of your memory, who else in the room -- the conference room at that time?

A Ms. Marjorie Taylor Greene, Mr. Lindsey Graham -- Senator Lindsey Graham, Mr. Meadows, myself, Mr. Trump, Johnny McEntee -- Mr. Johnny McEntee. There were other individuals in and out of the conference room. I wasn't -- I wasn't in there the entire duration of the flight, though.

Q Was Mr. Scavino --

A [Inaudible.]

Q Oh, I'm sorry. Was Mr. Scavino in there at the time that Mr. Alexander's name came up, that you can remember?

A I don't remember. I'm sorry.

Q What did Ms. Taylor Greene say about him or as best you can remember?

A I don't -- I don't recall any specific quotes or deliverable messages that were brought up about Mr. Alexander. I just recall hearing the name Alexander, and it just perked my attention for a moment, knowing that Mr. Meadows had had discussions about him earlier that day and likely the day before.

So I remember hearing his name, thinking it might be something I should pay attention to, but it seemed more of a casual conversation, so it wasn't anything that I felt

that he needed to participate in or raise to his attention in case he wanted to chime in at any point. It didn't seem like anything revolutionary.

Q Good word. Okay.

A I apologize for that.

Q Oh, you heard that comment. Okay. That was to myself.

A It's okay --

Q So you mentioned that Mr. Brooks came up as a conversation between you and Mr. Meadows and about whether you would reach out to Mr. Brooks. Is that right?

A Mr. Brooks had come up in a conversation between me and Mr. Meadows, yes. I had not actively told Mr. Meadows that I had or was willing to reach out to Mr. Brooks.

Q And why is that?

A At this point, I wanted to be careful about my outreach to Members, and I had personal thoughts about this decision, and I thought that Mr. Meadows should hear them prior to me reaching out. It shouldn't just be a -- a conversation that should happen lightly, knowing the direction it could take. And I wanted to ensure it was properly vetted before it was actually elevated and acted upon. I didn't want to preempt anything in case there was a reason to draw discussions back or outreach back.

Q Okay. I apologize; I was having a hard time kind of following that. So I'll just ask you to unpack it a bit. What was your concern about the direction it could go with Mr. Brooks?

A I believe the best way of phrasing it would just be I knew that there was conversations about carefully vetting rally speakers. I knew that Mr. Brooks had very strong opinions and had been known historically to deliver comments that might not be that well received by a lot of people.

So my concerns were more in my peripheral of wanting to ensure that the President was protected that day and that we were truly being careful about inviting people to speak at the rally. And knowing Mr. Brooks' involvement and his historical record of being a little more to the right on his rhetoric, I just wanted to make sure that I was not going to preempt any conversations with him if it wasn't going to actually turn into something and he wasn't actually going to be able to attend because I didn't want to have to be the one to walk that back.

Mr. Brooks had reached out to me a few times, but I believe, at this point, I had ignored most of his outreach, until there was a final decision made by either Mr. Meadows or whoever was in charge of making the decision.

Q And so Mr. Brooks had reached out to you because he wanted to speak at the Ellipse on the 6th?

A These texts were on my work phone. So I don't have them, and I don't recall what he specifically said at the time. But I recall Mr. Brooks reaching out to me, saying that he had heard he would speak on the 6th and if I knew anything about how he could get there or any timing. And I -- I don't recall the specific day. I remember he had sent me a few text messages in the days leading up to January 6th, but that was the overall message that had been portrayed to me.

Q And so, ultimately, you tell me if I'm wrong, but we understand that Brian Jack and Megan Powers coordinated making the invitation to Mr. Brooks to speak. Is that right, to your knowledge?

A Yes, sir. Me and Mr. Jack had conversations as well.

Q Is it something you didn't want to be involved in yourself?

A That's accurate.

Q And the rhetoric you're talking about with regard to Mr. Brooks, and the

reaction to it, in thinking about whether he should speak, was that similar to the reactions that people were having about Mr. Alexander and the rhetoric he would use?

A I don't know -- I don't recall whether they were concerned about the same exact issues, but overall, yes.

Q Again, just to put a finer point on it, was it that they were -- that their language was too extreme, or whatever word you want to use, but that it was -- it just -- it was not of the --

A [Inaudible.]

Mr. Passantino. Go ahead. Let him ask the question.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So politically correct can be using curse words. It can be you saying things that are, you know, frankly, could be, you know, insensitive in a lot of ways, but we're trying to get to a broader point. Mr. Brooks and Mr. Alexander would say things, talk about revolution. They would talk about -- invoke the imagery of 1776. You know, I talked to you about victory or death. And I know you don't probably remember the particulars, but was this the type of language that was giving people pause about their being speakers on the 6th at the Ellipse?

A I don't want my response to be attributed to the exact phrases you had just outlined, but along those lines, yes, sir.

Q If we -- if we look at the Max Miller texts with Ms. Pierson, again the one with the champagne Emoji on the -- at the top, and I direct you near toward the bottom of that first page. You see the comment from Mr. Miller saying: Just glad we killed the National Guard and a procession.

Had you heard the term or the concept of a "procession" come up prior to January 6th, that is, the President processing from the Ellipse up to the Capitol?

A I don't recall there being conversations specifically about the phrase "procession." I recall general conversations about whether he would go to the Capitol or if it was possible for him to go to the Capitol, but I do not recall that movement being referred to as a procession.

Q And, as I understand, you covered this in detail your last time meeting with the committee, so I won't go over that again. But this concept of the National Guard, I'm not aware whether that had come up previously. Had you heard about, prior to January 6th, discussions of whether the National Guard should be deployed that day for security purposes?

A I recall -- can you rephrase the -- or repeat the question. I'm sorry.

Q That's fine. You see there that Mr. Miller says to Ms. Pierson: Just glad we killed the National Guard and a procession. Had you, at that time, prior to January 6th, were you aware of discussions within the White House about whether the National Guard should be deployed for security on the 6th?

A In the -- I just want to be careful because I just feel like the question is overlapping with Max's text, and I -- this text makes no sense to me, to be frank. I don't know why that would've been used in the same context, and I don't know what "kill the National Guard" means. But I recall the National Guard being a topic of discussion -- to answer the last part of your question, I recall the National Guard being part of discussions that would be available as a resource that day. I recall Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows having conversations about the National Guard, but I don't know what it means in context of this specific text with Mr. Max Miller.

Q No, that's fair. I know you weren't there.

What were the discussions that you're aware of that took place between Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows about the National Guard?

A I recall them broadly speaking about having the National Guard in Washington, D.C., as a presence that day, in case it was necessary to control forces, the same way that the National Guard had been involved in riots during the previous summer in Washington, D.C., as a preemptive security measure.

And I -- yeah, that's -- if you have further questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Q We do. And so was there discussion about the risk of violence breaking out on the 6th and thus whether the National Guard should be deployed? And, again, we're talking about between Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows.

A Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows frequently had conversations about security protocol, and whenever there was going to be -- and generally speaking whenever there is -- a large crowd of individuals in a small area, you want to preemptively plan in case there is a necessity to have individuals that are equipped to manage crowd control and potential violence that could break out. The 6th was one of the events clearly that was brought into light with Mr. Ornato -- Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows.

But I don't recall it being a specific conversation with them as a preemptive measure because the individuals might be violent that day. It was more of: We want to be careful in case there is violence or conflict breaks out. There's going to be a lot of people in Washington, D.C.; let's work to have the necessary means so nothing bad happens.

Q Was -- in the context of those conversations, was it discussed, to your knowledge, the fact that the President would be -- whatever the verb is -- sending, asking, telling people at the rally to go to the Capitol afterwards while the Capitol was in session, was that a factor that they talked about in discussions of security on the 6th?

A May I have a moment to speak with my attorney, please?

Q Sure.

A Thank you.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Passantino. Mr[redacted] so the reason why we had the break, the issue of concern that Ms. Hutchinson has, is, in the last time we were here speaking, there was sort of extensive discussion about National Guard generally as a security measure because of January 6th and that Congress was in session. And she's concerned about the testimony that she'd given there and something that we've gone over, and she obviously wants to be really careful not to say anything that's inaccurate or inconsistent with what she said before.

I understood your question to be in the context of National Guard with respect to a procession, which is a new -- I'm letting her go because that is new topic and using National Guard as a security vehicle if the President was going to march.

And so what Ms. Hutchinson's concern was, as you start drifting into just sort of generalize National Guard as a security means around the Capitol, she's talked about that a lot and just wants to be really careful she's not replowing ground so that something doesn't get inadvertently -- understood.

I think if you -- if you narrow your questions to where I understood you to be starting, which was National Guard as a security vehicle with respect to a planned procession to the Capitol, that would be new for her, and she certainly wouldn't have any problem talking about it. But that was -- it was that overlap to what she had talked about before as a general security measure at the Capitol before, which was the source of the concern.

Mr. [redacted] Understood.

Mr. Passantino. Okay.

Mr. [redacted]. Thank you for that. And Mr. Raskin has joined us, so thank you for

being here.

Certainly didn't mean to drift, and as I understood it, I'll ask you, Ms. Hutchinson, I think you said you had never heard of the concept of a procession prior to January 6th. Is that right?

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't recall his potential trip or travel to the Capitol being referred to specifically as a procession, but I recall discussions about whether or not he would go to the Capitol.

[1:06 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Right. And I wasn't trying to ask about whether he would have security going up to the Capitol for him, but I'll ask because it's been raised. Was there a discussion about whether he should have National Guard for that movement potentially from the Ellipse to the Capitol as security?

A I just want to break that into just two parts.

The first part is, yes, I -- and we talked about it extensively last time. We've talked internally at the White House extensively about security protocol with the Secret Service and what it would -- the assets that would be required to take him to the Capitol if that's what he wanted to do. And I'm happy to have another discussion about that, but --

Mr. Passantino. No, we won't do that.

Ms. Hutchinson. -- I don't recall there being a discussion about the National Guard being in Washington, D.C., intended for the purpose of him going to the Capitol that day.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q If you look at the exhibit of Ms. Pierson's agenda for the meeting on the 4th -- do you see that one page again in front of you? Do you see in the middle in handwriting on the right edge "10K Nat Guard"? Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay.

There's also been public reporting after the 6th that President Trump had discussed internally at the White House this concept of having 10,000 National Guard

troops.

Did you ever hear any discussion either by President Trump himself or others speaking about the President and this idea of having 10,000 National Guard troops deployed on January 6th?

A I recall the number 10,000 being generally mentioned as the number that could be associated. I don't recall if that's the number that they wanted it to be or if that was just how many National Guard troops were available to come to D.C. that day.

Q When you say "they wanted it to be," who's "they"?

A I apologize. When Mr. Meadows and Mr. Ornato had conversations and -- or if that was elevated to Mr. Trump. I just recall Mr. Meadows and Mr. Ornato having discussions about 10,000 National Guard troops, National Guard, D.C. rally, things along those lines. I don't recall if Mr. Meadows and Mr. Ornato had discussions about if the goal was to have 10,000 National Guard troops in Washington, D.C., on January 6, 2021, or if that's just how many would be in Washington, D.C., that day.

Q To your knowledge, was any order ever given from anyone at the White House to the National Guard to have any troops available on January 6th before that day?

A Available on standby, posted throughout the city, or just in D.C. preempting travel and the events of January 6th?

Q Either way you heard about it. I mean, however you heard about it, did you hear about any sort of order being given prior to January 6th that you know of with regard to the National Guard?

A I knew that they would be here prior to January 6th because it wouldn't make sense for them to come the morning of January 6th. But I don't recall them being in town -- there being discussions of National Guard being in town prior to January 6th for

any other purpose other than having a presence in Washington, D.C., on January 6th.

Q Uh-huh.

So, if you go back to the text between Ms. Pierson and Mr. Miller -- and remember, he made the comment about killing the National Guard and the procession. If you turn to page 2 of that text exchange, you see at the bottom, at January 4th at 8:09 p.m., it's Ms. Pierson who sends a link to a Politico article about Mayor Bowser requesting National Guard.

Do you see that?

A I see the Politico article titled "D.C. National Guard Activated to Respond to Pro-Trump Protests." I don't -- I don't --

Mr. Passantino. Let him -- he'll ask you the question.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q No, that's fine, it's fine. You see the link?

A Yes.

Q If you go to the next page, on page 3 of that, do you see at the top there Mr. Miller follows up? It's in blue. And he laughs and makes a comment in the first bubble. But in the second one, he said, "But chief already had said no for days!" and then, "The man is never wrong."

So I'll start on the first part of that message, the first sentence. Did you understand people to refer to Mr. Meadows as "chief" during his time, just for short?

A Yes, sir.

Q And did you understand Mr. Miller to refer to him as "chief" when he would talk about Mr. Meadows?

A Yes, sir.

Q So, as we understand this, he was conveying that Mr. Meadows had said

repeatedly for days "no" to the idea of the National Guard being deployed in the city on the 6th. Is that consistent with what you understood at that time?

A I apologize. Would you mind repeating that question one time, please?

Q Yes. We understood that, when Mr. Meadows said this, it reflected that Mark Meadows had said for several days -- and this is January 4th now -- had said for several days "no" to the idea of having National Guard troops deployed in D.C. on January 6th.

Was that consistent with what you understood Mr. Meadows' position to be at this point in time?

A Honestly, I don't recall any specific opinion that he had. I recall him having a lot of discussions about National Guard. I'll say Max's text is confusing, I think, from your overall question here. I was under the impression that Mr. Meadows was supportive of having National Guard in Washington, D.C., in some capacity. But if the text is specifically about -- or if your question is specifically about Max's text here, the "days" part is confusing for me.

I don't recall Mr. Meadows having an opinion or us having a conversation about where their presence would be at the time that they would be. I just recall him coordinating with the necessary individuals internally and at agencies to have them here if necessary.

Q Thank you.

I think Mr. [redacted] might have a followup question or two.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Yeah, I did, just briefly. I know we've got some members on, and I want to make sure they have a chance to ask their questions.

But before we do that, I just wanted to go back, Ms. Hutchinson, to the text

exchange, [redacted], in which Meadows suggests that somebody talk to Dan Scavino. I don't remember the exhibit number. But I think Mr. [redacted] asked you some questions before on this issue of who was going to be on the stage -- there it is. And I think Meadows is texting with Katrina, and he says, "Talk it over with Scavino."

I'm trying to get a sense, Ms. Hutchinson, if Dan Scavino was sort of more responsible for or in charge of who ultimately would speak at the rally than Mr. Meadows. It sounds to me, just from reading this, like Meadows refers Katrina on this issue to Dan Scavino. And I'm just wondering if that's consistent with your sense as to sort of who was in charge or was closest to the President when it came to the issue of speakers.

A Mr. Meadows was intimately involved with these discussions, but Mr. Meadows also had a very limited bandwidth at this time.

Mr. Scavino, as you all know, has a very active role in helping the President plan messaging and social media outreach and that aspect prior to Mr. Trump even becoming a candidate for President.

So for Mr. Meadows to tell Ms. Pierson to have the conversation with Scavino, it wouldn't have been anything out of the ordinary if Mr. Meadows had limited time and resources because he was working on other things actively and wasn't just focused on speakers.

Q Yeah.

A He was focused on other things too. He would've naturally told her to go speak with Dan, because Dan would have the most updated -- Mr. Scavino would have the most up-to-date information.

Q Yeah.

A lot of the people that were sort of the subject of the dispute -- Ali Alexander,

Alex Jones -- are very active on social media, which I understand was kind of Dan Scavino's area.

Again, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I'm wondering whether or not the reference to go talk to Dan is because he was more familiar with them, had more of a relationship with them, with some of the people that were being proposed as speakers. Is that right, or am I reading that wrong?

A Could you repeat that one more time, please?

Q Yeah. A lot of the people that we're talking about here as, you know, will they or will they not speak or be on the stage are, sort of, far-right social media or regular media personalities. And I'm wondering if Mr. Scavino had more of a familiarity with them, a relationship with them, and that's why Mr. Meadows was suggesting that Katrina Pierson speak to him.

That's my one possible interpretation. I'm just wondering if that's accurate, if you have any thought on that.

A I don't want to speak on behalf of Mr. Meadows and his intentions with telling Ms. Pierson to have the conversation with Mr. Scavino. And I certainly don't want to speak on Mr. Scavino's behalf about his personal relationships with people.

But I will say -- and, again, reverting to my previous statement -- and I apologize if this is not answering your question, but -- Mr. Meadows knows that Mr. Scavino has relationships with a lot of people. And Mr. Scavino was also, like Mr. Meadows, involved in planning the rally. And because Mr. Meadows had his hands dipped in a lot of different buckets at this time, it was not out of the ordinary or out of context for him to tell an individual to have discussions with Mr. Scavino either because he had the most up-to-date information or because he was more actively involved in planning this one area of the rally.

But I don't know the intentions behind either of them, and I can't speak on their behalf. Those are questions that you'll have to ask them.

Q Yeah, no, and I appreciate that. And I don't mean to ask you an unfair question. It just seems like Scavino potentially has much more of a relationship with some of the people involved in this discussion, given his unique role in the White House and what he does, than Mr. Meadows and that that was perhaps a reason for him to direct Katrina Pierson to Mr. Scavino.

If you don't know whether that's what Mr. Meadows was thinking, I understand. But do you know why it is he sends her to Scavino to discuss this issue of who should speak at the rally?

A No, sir.

Q Okay.

Scavino was present, according to the agenda, in the discussion when Ms. Pierson actually goes to the White House. Is that right?

A It's correct on this paper right here. Now, this is not an official White House schedule proposal --

Q Yeah, I know.

A -- so --

Q And you weren't -- yeah. And you weren't there anyway, so I guess the document --

A Well, so --

Q -- speaks for itself.

A Yeah, I was not there. But this was something that was submitted to the White House, likely from Ms. Pierson, so it would've gone into White House format, and the participants very likely could've changed. I don't know if you have the official

White House schedule proposal. But those are just the people that she had proposed to be in that meeting that day.

Mr. Passantino. I think what he's asking is, do you know from personal knowledge whether Mr. Scavino was in this meeting at the time?

Ms. Hutchinson. No. I wasn't at the White House that time.

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. Big picture, Ms. Hutchinson, I'm just trying to get a sense as to whether Mr. Scavino was, sort of, more actively involved in navigating this issue than Mr. Meadows, if you know.

Mr. Passantino. "This issue"?

Mr. [redacted]. "This issue" being who --

Ms. Hutchinson. I'm sorry --

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. Sorry, Steve. Who's going to speak at the rally, that's what we're talking about. That's the issue.

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't have the ability to quantify who had more correspondence -- between Mr. Scavino and Mr. Meadows, about who had more correspondence with individuals planning the rally. If Mr. Scavino sent 101 texts to rally planners and Mr. Meadows sent 100 texts to rally planners, then yes. I don't have the ability to quantify that.

I know that they were both were involved in planning the rally. I know that Mr. Scavino would frequently brief Mr. Meadows on conversations about rally speakers. But I don't want to speak and I can't speak and attest to whether he was more intimately involved than Mr. Meadows was.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. That's all I have.

Why don't we turn to Ms. Cheney and Mr. Raskin, Mr. Aguilar, and Mr. Kinzinger? If any of you have questions, now would be a good time.

Mr. Kinzinger. None for me. Thanks.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

Are you done, [redacted]?

Mr. [redacted]. Thank you. Nice to meet you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. How are you doing on time? Do you want to take a break or keep going?

Mr. Passantino. Do you mind if we take a 5-minute break?

Mr. [redacted]. No, absolutely not.

Mr. [redacted]. Of course.

Mr. [redacted]. That's fine. We'll take 5.

Mr. Passantino. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. We'll go off the record.

[Recess.]

Mr. [redacted]. Why don't we go back on the record? It's 1:25 p.m. on March 7th, and we're resuming the interview of Ms. Cassidy Hutchinson.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So, when we left off in the last session, Ms. Hutchinson, we were talking a little bit about John Eastman. And I just want to show you two documents to see if they look familiar to you.

So, [redacted], if you could please pull up exhibit No. 31.

Now, this has been widely reported on, and so my questions to you are going to be based on what you knew at the time, so before January 20th in particular and January 6th even more specifically, not on what you've read since then.

This is one of John Eastman's memos, and it talks about his theory related to the

Vice President during the joint session as president of the Senate to count or not count certain electoral votes.

I'm also going to show you the top of the next exhibit, which is exhibit No. 32, which looks very similar. And I'll give you as much time as you need with these, if you'd like it.

But do you remember seeing these memos drafted by John Eastman before January 6, 2021?

A Could you scroll down, please? Thank you.

At the time, no, I don't recall these specific documents coming across my desk prior to January 6th.

Q Do you remember Mr. Meadows or anybody else giving you any documents related to John Eastman and his theories about the Vice President and his role on January 6th?

A Yes, sir.

Q What were those documents that you remember?

A Do you mean in terms of, like, the format they were in or the context of the documents?

Q Yeah, what were they? Were they memos? Were they notes?

A I recall a lot of memos, PowerPoints with Mr. Eastman's information. I don't know if Mr. Eastman or his team put the PowerPoints together -- I didn't know at the time whether Mr. Eastman or his team put PowerPoints together. But I recall memos, notes, documents, briefing material, binders with Mr. Eastman's theories, certain messages that he wanted conveyed and his research prior to leading up to January 6th.

Q One of the things you just mentioned was they contained certain messages that Mr. Eastman wanted conveyed prior to January 6th. Do you remember the gist of

those messages?

A Broadly speaking, that the Vice President had authority to participate -- "participate" is not the right word -- that Mr. Eastman believed that the Vice President had the authority to act on January 6th in ways that had not previously been exercised by Vice Presidents -- and which is now widely circulated -- at the time, is the gist and context of the documents.

Q Do you know why Mr. Meadows had them -- had the documents?

A I know Mr. Meadows had the documents because it was a legal theory that people in the White House and out of the White House were interested in pursuing or at least hearing. So those materials had been elevated and brought to Mr. Meadows' attention for his review and his insight in any meetings that he might participate in.

Q And do you know what he did with those documents? Did he pass them along to anybody else that you're aware of?

A I don't know if he would've passed an original copy off to someone or if he would've forwarded emails to people, no. He had me print out two copies of the PowerPoint, one for myself and one for him. I don't know if he would've given his copy, his only copy, to somebody. But I know that he had shared information with people, both internal staffers at the White House and with external individuals as well. But if we're just talking, like, logistical distribution, I don't know.

Q Were you asked to share them with Members of Congress, those materials that John Eastman provided?

A Yes, sir.

Q Who'd you share them with?

A Members of Congress.

Q Do you remember anybody specifically?

A Broadly speaking?

Q Sure.

Mr. Passantino. I think he's asking if you specifically --

Ms. Hutchinson. Well, if we're talking about specific documents, I don't recall that -- I mean, there were certain documents -- let's say there's document A. Mr. Meadows might've said, could you forward this off to Mr. Jim Jordan and Warren Davidson?

So, I mean, do you want me to go through and list Members --

Mr. Passantino. So I think, in fairness -- I think -- and don't let me mischaracterize your question -- he's talking about documents pertaining to the legal theory. Which Member, not which document --

Mr. [redacted]. Correct.

Mr. Passantino. -- if I'm characterizing correctly.

Ms. Hutchinson. I mean, there -- and I'm just trying to be careful, and please excuse me. I'm not trying to be difficult in my response here. I just -- there was a lot of document-passing back and forth at this time, and I don't want to falsely attribute anything specifically to Mr. Eastman's documents to individual Members of Congress. Because, to be honest, I think the first time I heard the name John Eastman was January 1st or 2nd. But I know now, looking back, that a lot of what was passed off to Members had to do with his theories.

So I can't attribute specific documents to specific Members, but, broadly speaking, I know a lot of what I had passed along, now, had to do with Mr. Eastman's theories. Does that make sense?

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah, that makes --

Mr. Passantino. And I think -- yeah. I'm sorry to interrupt you.

He is not asking what you subsequently learned. He's asking about what you specifically --

Ms. Hutchinson. Right.

Mr. Passantino. -- recall at the time. If you know, you know. If you don't know, you don't know. That's what he's asking.

Ms. Hutchinson. I mean, at the time, I recall both Mr. Meadows and Mr. Giuliani asking me to pass along a few documents specifically to Senator Lindsey Graham, Congressman Mo Brooks. This was after -- I'm trying to use the benchmark in my head of the first time that I had heard Mr. Eastman's name. And this list isn't extensive, but I know Mr. Graham, Mr. Brooks, a lot of -- Mr. Perry -- a lot of Members involved in the Freedom Caucus.

Again, I mean, if you have more specific questions, I'm happy to try to answer them. It's just difficult for me to distinguish and draw the line between what I passed off at the time knowing it was Mr. Eastman's stuff and looking back now.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q That's fine. And I understand how careful you're trying to be, and appreciate that.

I will say, just switching gears a little bit, Mr. Eastman's theory and what's shown in the memos that I just showed you is that the Vice President could take some kind of action because certain States had transmitted dual slates of electors. Or, at least, that's what he wrote down. So I want to ask you a few questions about these dual slates of electors.

Were you aware of an effort to have Trump electors vote for then-President Trump in States that he had lost?

A Could you repeat that one time, please?

Q Sure, yep. Are you aware of any effort -- or the effort, rather, to have Trump or Republican electors send in electoral college votes for Mr. Trump in States that Mr. Trump had lost in the election?

A Could I have one moment to speak with my attorney?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course.

Mr. Passantino. And, actually, before we even do that, are you talking about, is she aware today of the fact that that was a theory? Or are you asking, at the time was she aware that that was a theory that Mr. Eastman had propounded? Because maybe I'm anticipating her question, but I --

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. No, it would be back in the time period we're talking about, so pre-January 6th. I can represent to you and Ms. Hutchinson that Republican electors in States that Mr. Trump had lost sent in electoral college votes for Mr. Trump despite the fact that he lost that State. And so that's what I'm getting to. They sent them in at the same time as the electoral college met, on December 14th.

Mr. Passantino. Right. And so the question -- because that's widely reported, obviously, now. So the question is, was she aware -- were you aware at the time that this was the theory that Mr. Eastman was propounding?

Mr. [redacted]. Oh, no, no, no. This is just factually -- this has nothing to do with Eastman yet. Just the fact that this was going on, that Trump electors were meeting to cast electoral votes for Trump despite that he had lost in the State, divorced from Eastman.

Mr. Passantino. Okay. And I'm denying my -- my client here wants to talk to me real quick. Do you mind if we take just a minute then?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course. Absolutely.

Mr. Passantino. All right. Thank you.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. [redacted]. All right. I see you're back.

Mr. Passantino. Okay. Yeah. Thanks.

So where I think -- I think what we would look for some help just on clarifying: There were a lot of theories that were passed around. You're focusing on a specific theory. Ms. Hutchinson wants to be super-careful that she's not, sort of, speculating about, okay, was that specific theory about the alternate electors in Georgia and Wisconsin or wherever it was.

I think where she's just going to ask for some specificity is with respect to which specific legal theory, because -- and, again, I'll let her testify. I'm not going to talk for her. But there were a lot of theories, and so she just doesn't want to get confused, speculating about one theory versus another maybe getting passed along.

But --

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah.

Mr. Passantino. -- I hope I -- yeah.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. That's --

Ms. Hutchinson. We could --

Mr [redacted]. Go ahead. Sorry.

Ms. Hutchinson. No, it was fine. We can go into theories here if that's what you'd like to proceed with, but I just want to make sure I understand each one individually just because --

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Yep. And so, just to be clear, at this point, I'm not going to ask about any theories or how something might operate. I'm just asking, did you know of the efforts to have alternate Trump electors meet in States where Mr. Trump had lost?

A That's helpful. Thank you for clarifying.

And, yes, sir, to answer your question.

Q Okay. When did you first hear about this idea of having Trump electors meet and cast electoral college votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost? Was it before the election or after?

A After the election.

Q Do you remember approximately when you first heard that Trump electors would be meeting to cast electoral votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

A Could you repeat that one time? I'm sorry.

Q No, that's fine. Do you remember approximately when you first heard about this effort to have Trump electors meet and cast electoral college votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

A Around Thanksgiving 2020.

Q What do you remember about it?

A It would've been prior to Thanksgiving. I don't remember if it was the week before -- I don't have dates in front of me. I don't remember if it would've been the week before or perhaps 2 days before Thanksgiving.

I just recall, as legal battles in States that were contested at the time were gaining more traction in conversations internally at the White House, there were theories. And that's kind of the benchmark in my head of when I first started seeing documents and remember discussions of meetings happening with individuals involved in -- or with individuals with knowledge of that theory or how to perhaps entertain that moving forward as, you know, they worked on a tight deadline as, like, the benchmark dates were coming up in individual States.

Q Okay. You said quite a lot there. And the benchmark dates, are you

talking about, like, the safe harbor date for the electoral college sending in their electors, as well as then the electoral college meeting on December 14th? Are those some of the dates you're referring to?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay.

Who do you remember being involved in those early discussions around the Thanksgiving time regarding having alternate electors meet?

A Mr. Giuliani; several of Mr. Giuliani's associates; Mr. Meadows; Members of Congress, although it's difficult to distinguish if the Members that I'm thinking of were involved during Thanksgiving or if they were involved as we progressed through December.

Does that help clarify?

Q It does, yes. As far as Mr. Giuliani's associates, do you remember anybody in particular by name?

A Mr. Bernie Kerik. I remember Mr. Boris Epshteyn being involved, but I -- I can see their faces in my head; I can't recall their names. Oh, Mr. Phil Waldron. That's all I can recall right now.

Q And those people you just identified, they were involved in the discussions about the alternate electors?

A In discussing the theories of alternate electors, yes.

Q Do you remember any meetings with the President where this idea of having alternate electors meet and cast electoral college votes in States that he had lost came up?

A I don't recall any specific -- I don't recall meetings scheduled specifically to discuss that topic. I recall hearing after the fact that it had been brought up in the Oval

Office or in the Oval dining room. But during this time, I don't recall any meetings on his schedule with the intention of discussing that topic --

Q Okay.

A -- extensively.

Q Do you know -- okay. Do you know what the President's views were about this topic, alternate electors, after they'd come up in gatherings in the Oval Office or the dining room, even if not scheduled?

A Oh, I can't speak to Mr. Trump's personal thoughts on that topic.

Q And not to say that I'm going to ask you to speculate for the President, but did you hear what his thoughts or opinions were about this plan to have alternate electors meet in States that he had lost?

A All I knew and know, looking back now, is during this time period that Mr. Trump was willing to hear theories and would ask his people -- Mr. Giuliani, Mr. Meadows -- to look into it. I don't know whether he supported it, but I know that he supported his trusted confidants to explore those theories at the time.

Q And this was one of the theories that he asked his trusted confidants to explore, to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, when those discussions would come up about alternate electors -- I'm just going to refer to them as that, if that's okay. But when those discussions about alternate electors would come up, do you remember there being discussions about the Vice President and his role on January 6th coming up at the same time?

A Could you specify a time period?

Q Pre-Thanksgiving, so those early discussions about alternate electors.

A I don't recall specifically right now if or how it was elevated to Mr. Pence's

team or Mr. Pence himself pre-Thanksgiving.

Q Okay.

What about post-Thanksgiving, when these discussions with -- and maybe I'll use another benchmark date. Pre-electoral-college-meeting-date -- which is December the 14th, if there's any significance to that to you -- in discussions about alternate electors at the White House, do you remember the Vice President's authority also coming up as part of those discussions?

A If we're looking at the time period between Thanksgiving and December 14th, I recall somewhere in that time period, whether it be December 13th or November 30th, Mr. Pence's name coming up because of the role that he would play on January 6th.

But I don't recall really until probably December -- between December 15th and 20th a more explicit role that Mr. Pence could play and how that was being evaluated internally.

Q What do you remember about that discussion in the timeframe you just provided, approximately the 15th through the 20th of December maybe, about Mr. Pence's explicit role in that discussion?

A I just recall, somewhere in that timeframe -- now, again, I apologize, it could've been December 8th -- between December 8th and the 20th. I can't specifically recall, and I just don't want to, like, categorize anything too definitively. But I do recall, somewhere in mid-December, early to mid-December, starting to receive materials either for meetings or from Members of Congress about Mr. Pence's role and that, kind of, being the first time that I had read materials of that nature, if that makes any sense.

Q It does. Do you remember generally what those materials were? Were they PowerPoints? Memos?

A PowerPoints and memos.

Q And do you remember who provided the PowerPoints in particular?

A I don't remember who would've emailed them to me. Members frequently sent me a lot of stuff. I frequently received emails from a lot of people. It likely would've been from a Member directly or Mr. Meadows had given my cell phone number to somebody and said, give Cassidy a call and text this to her, or something. But I don't recall specific individuals, and I don't want to falsely attribute that to anybody.

Q Okay.

If you could please pull up exhibit 36. This is an email between Mark Meadows and Jason Miller, or a string of emails, I should say.

And we can go to the bottom of page 1. On December 6th, Mr. Meadows wrote to Jason Miller. He said, "Let's have a discussion about this tomorrow," and there's an attachment called the "Chesebro memo on real deadline2."

Do you know who Ken Chesebro is?

A No. No, sir.

Q Okay. And I'll represent to you that that memo is about January 6th and having electoral votes sent to Congress for consideration on January 6th.

Later, Jason Miller writes back. This is kind of middle of the page. He says, "You bet. So you know, Justin and I did on-background calls on this very subject with Maria, Levin, Chuck Todd and Margaret Brennan yesterday (I might be missing 1 to 2 others)." And then he signs off with something else.

And then Mark Meadows replies, "If you are on it then never mind the meeting. We just need to have someone coordinating the electors for states."

So do you know what Mr. Meadows' role was in coordinating these alternate electors in States that President Trump had lost?

A I mean, Mr. Meadows was involved -- Mr. Meadows was involved with the electors. I don't know the specific role that he played or was portraying himself to play moving forward, whether he would be the sole point of contact or advocate for that or if it was more of something that he was trying to have people coordinate through him so he would have insight on everything.

Q To the best of your knowledge, did he seem to be following the progress of having these alternate electors meet and cast votes?

A Yes, sir.

Q I saw you nodding your head. What makes you say that? What are you thinking of when I asked that question? Was there anything in particular that he was tracking?

A Nothing extremely particular. And I say that because I don't remember a particular event that makes me have that immediate reaction. I just remember him frequently having calls, meetings, and outreach with individuals and this just being a prominent topic of discussion in our office.

Q Would you say he had dozens of calls and meetings on this topic of alternate electors? And I acknowledge I'm asking you to speculate, so your best guess.

A Can you -- and thank you for acknowledging that, but would you mind giving a loose time period, if it's from the 3rd to the 20th or the beginning of December? I'm cautious about tying a number to --

Q Yeah. Sure. And I'll expand even more broadly than that. So, from the period of the election until January the 6th, I mean, was this a topic of conversation that came up in dozens -- I mean, could you guess just a range of how many calls or meetings this actually came up in for Mr. Meadows?

A Dozens would not be inaccurate.

Q Would not be inaccurate?

A Would not be -- yeah, sorry. Dozens would be accurate. But dozens could mean 24 or it could mean 96, so I --

Q Sure. Fair enough.

And in those conversations and meetings, was it the people primarily that you talked about earlier, like Mr. Giuliani, his associates, Members of Congress?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you know if White House Counsel was ever brought into the discussions about having alternate electors meet and cast votes for President Trump in States that he had lost?

Mr. Passantino. And he's just asking if you know. He's not asking for the content of those communications.

Ms. Hutchinson. Mr. Meadows would bring individuals from White House Counsel's Office into the meetings that he would have, and sometimes ask his scheduler to establish a call line or somebody to dial in if it was going to be a call. But context-wise, I don't know.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And just to be clear, I think you meant this, but I don't want to assume. And so, was White House Counsel brought in for these conversations specifically about alternate electors?

A Forgive me for taking a pause. I just want to be careful with how I phrase it, because Mr. Meadows frequently, if not almost always, would have representatives from White House Counsel's Office in his meetings. So, yes, he would request an individual from White House Counsel's Office to attend these meetings.

Now, whether that was because it was about this specific topic or if it was just

more of a procedural thing for him -- I wasn't involved in scheduling for Mr. Meadows. That was Ms. Thurston's role. And that wouldn't have even really been a conversation that they would've had.

It would've just been Mr. Meadows' train of thought of: These people are coming; I should have somebody from our legal team here too. And that's just generally how he thought.

Q Do you know if anybody from the White House Counsel's Office ever provided an opinion about the alternate electors to Mr. Meadows or Mr. Trump?

Mr. Passantino. Again, he's just asking if you know whether they provided an opinion.

Ms. Hutchinson. Yes, they did.

Mr. [redacted]. Do you know what that opinion was?

Mr. Passantino. You can just say if you know.

Ms. Hutchinson. Broadly speaking, the opinion of White House Counsel's Office --

Mr. Passantino. He just wants to know if you know, not what it was.

Ms. Hutchinson. Oh. Yes, yes, yes.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. And we're going to get to where you're going. I will ask that question, but -- and who in the White House Counsel's Office conveyed that opinion to Mr. Meadows or to Mr. Trump?

Mr. Passantino. You can answer that.

Ms. Hutchinson. It's just difficult because I don't want to attribute one lawyer or both lawyers to everything and them having the same opinion. But it was frequently Mr. Pat Cipollone or Mr. Pat Philbin that would chime in and offer their opinions to Mr. Meadows and-slash-or Mr. Trump.

Mr. [redacted]. And now I am going to ask you the question. To your knowledge, what was the White House Counsel's Office opinion with respect to the alternate electors meeting to cast electoral college votes for Mr. Trump in States that he had lost?

Mr. Passantino. Okay. I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

Can we -- I guess we'll have this conversation on the record.

I know that there has been raised executive privilege. I know that executive privilege has been litigated. I'm extremely leery right now to have this witness reveal the contents of attorney-client communications without further instruction.

Now, clearly, if there are communications in the presence of individuals who are not executive branch employees, we're not going to raise any privilege to that.

But if you're asking about the specific content of communications between White House Counsel's Office and senior executive branch officials, I'm going to instruct her not to answer, simply to give myself time to find out, make sure I understand the White House's position on that.

I will not do that with respect to prejudice of your ability if I'm incorrect. But I'm highly reluctant to let her just testify to that narrow scope without having had an opportunity to satisfy myself that she wouldn't be waiving a privilege that is still properly raised.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Fair enough.

So let me ask some additional questions at this point just on that issue.

Ms. Hutchinson, to your knowledge, was that opinion provided to Mr. Meadows?

Ms. Hutchinson. Yes, sir.

Mr. [redacted]. Was it also provided to Mr. Trump?

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. You can answer. Not what it was.

Ms. Hutchinson. Right.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah.

Ms. Hutchinson. Yes, either by White House Counsel's Office or Mr. Meadows delivering to Mr. Trump as a surrogate for White House Counsel's Office.

Mr. [redacted]. Did anybody in the White House Counsel's Office express their opinion about these alternate electors in meetings where other people were present? And I'll name some people: Mr. Giuliani? Mr. Waldron? Mr. Kerik? Mr. Epshteyn? Anybody who worked outside of the White House.

Mr. Passantino. You can answer that.

Ms. Hutchinson. Including Members of Congress?

Mr. [redacted]. Including Members of Congress, yes.

Ms. Hutchinson. Yes, sir.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

During those meetings where people who did not work in the White House or the executive branch were present, what was the White House Counsel's Office's opinion about alternate electors meeting to cast electoral college votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

Ms. Hutchinson. Could you repeat that one time, please?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course, yep. In any of those meetings in which people who were not part of the executive branch were present, what was the White House Counsel's Office opinion about alternate electors who met to cast electoral college votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

Mr. Passantino. And if I can recharacterize your question for you, not what their opinion, but what did they say, right? There might be a distinction between what they were thinking and what they said.

I'm sure what he's asking -- you can tell me if I'm wrong. You only want what

was said, not what their opinion was. Does that distinction make sense?

Mr. [redacted]. That's correct.

Mr. Passantino. Okay.

He's asking you to recount --

Ms. Hutchinson. [Inaudible.]

Mr. Passantino. Well, it might be. He's asking you to recount what you recall of conversations that might have been expressed by White House Counsel in the meeting in which people who were not executive branch were present.

Did I characterize your question right? I didn't mean to --

Mr. [redacted]. No, that's right.

And I could rephrase it, but it is what Mr. Passantino is saying. So, in meetings at which non-White-House or non-executive-branch officials were present, what did representatives from the White House Counsel's Office say about alternate electors and the effort to have them cast votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

Ms. Hutchinson. I just want to be careful with this. And if you want to ask followups, I'm more than happy to try to answer it differently or better.

But in the meetings that I have awareness of or was in where White House Counsel's Office had expressed thoughts and, generally speaking, just had words to say about this topic, the overall message --

Mr. Passantino. And I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Just limit it --

Ms. Hutchinson. Right.

Mr. Passantino. -- to conversations with third-party discussions.

Ms. Hutchinson. Right.

Mr. Passantino. Okay. Good.

Ms. Hutchinson. They wanted to be careful and ensure that whatever was being

entertained externally was being brought to the attention of necessary individuals internally to ensure that there was maximum cooperation and communication between the external and internal interests that were looking into these theories.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

In those meetings, did anybody from the White House Counsel's Office express an opinion as to whether it was legal to have the Trump electors meet and cast electoral votes in States that Mr. Trump had lost?

Ms. Hutchinson. Could we have one moment, please?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Passantino. Okay. We're back. We had a discussion about the parameters of attorney-client privilege, but ask your question again.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

And I'd just note that Mr. Kinzinger is joining now as well.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So my question was: At any of these meetings with individuals from outside the White House or the executive branch, did the White House Counsel's Office express an opinion as to whether the plan to have electors for President Trump meet and cast electoral college votes in States that President Trump had lost was legal?

A Yes.

And just to be mindful of how extensive certain discussions were, like, those were niche topics as the meetings progressed and other individuals were involved. So there were some meetings where they had expressed something along the lines of, "Let's continue to look at this, make sure you're still coordinating with us, communicating with

us, let us know if there's anything worthy of bringing to our attention, we'd be happy to look at it and schedule another meeting," to meetings where their definitive guidance to external interests was more along the lines of, "That's not legal, we're not putting ourselves in that line of fire," or, "Don't raise that to Mr. Trump, it's not appropriate, and it's not a legal theory that we want to entertain right now."

Q And, to be clear, what you just said about not being a legal theory they want to entertain right now, not legal, not putting yourself in the line of fire, that was with respect to this alternate electors plan in particular?

A I apologize, I'm just trying to be careful, because there was the alternate electors plan, but then there are groups and individuals and people that had slightly different ways of looking at things or slightly different ways of potentially addressing that. And I also don't want my words to be recorded and articulated as being any verbatim conversation, because I'm paraphrasing here.

But -- so, as we looked at the alternate electors, it was, broadly speaking, something that they were willing to hear theories about, willing to have the discussions with people.

But then there were certain meetings where White House Counsel's Office gave the guidance to external interests of, "This is fine, keep researching, keep your people on this, let's stay in touch, don't do anything, don't elevate this to Mr. Trump without us being read back in first," to meetings where they would give guidance to external participants more along the lines of, "Hey, this isn't legally sound, we have fleshed this out internally, it's fine that you think this but we're not going to entertain this in an official White House capacity on behalf of the President, we're putting a stop to this."

Q And just to be clear -- I appreciate that, and thank you for walking through the progression and the various, kind of, instances where it may have come up.

But what idea was it that -- what wasn't legally sound and they didn't want to pursue?

A I don't recall specifically right now. I just recall there would be certain meetings where individuals would raise ideas or things that they might want to vet to White House Counsel's Office, and they would have a little bit more of an explicit opinion on it, versus other instances in meetings where it was a little easier to not -- I don't want to say "easier" -- it was a little different in context from a legal standpoint of them wanting to vet it and allowing it to kind of progress a little bit more before they put a stop to things.

Q Okay. And --

A I'm just trying to be careful here with --

Mr. Passantino. You're good. You're good.

Mr. [redacted]. Yep. No, I appreciate you trying to be careful there.

I guess I want to distinguish two things on this point. The first is the plan and efforts to have alternate electors meet and cast votes for Mr. Trump in States that he had lost.

Is it your understanding that the White House Counsel's Office opinion of that was that it wasn't legally sound and that that opinion was expressed in meetings at which third parties were present?

Mr. Passantino. Well, she's only testifying to what she heard people say. She's not able to talk about what they thought.

Mr. [redacted]. Yep.

Mr. Passantino. She did say what she heard them say.

You can ask again. I'm not blocking you. But I just want to make that distinction very clear.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And so, to be clear, did you hear the White House Counsel's Office say that this plan to have alternate electors meet and cast votes for Donald Trump in States that he had lost was not legally sound?

A Yes, sir.

Q And do you remember approximately when that was?

A I'm trying to not be overly broad, but, right now, sitting here, I can recall at the time, perhaps early to mid- December. Now, it very well could've been the end of November, but I'm trying to think about benchmark events and dates in my head, and early to mid- December is the safer bet.

Q And who was present for that meeting that you remember?

A It was in our office. It was Mr. Meadows, Mr. Giuliani, and a few of Mr. Giuliani's, like -- well, I don't know if the correct term is "associates," but Mr. Giuliani's associates.

Q Do you remember who from --

A Colleagues.

Q -- White House Counsel -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

A No, I was -- associates, colleagues, however it might be characterized.

Q Do you remember who from White House Counsel's Office was there and delivered that message?

A The very first time I heard it, I know Mr. Cipollone. I'm inclined to say Mr. Pat Philbin as well. But, factually speaking, the very first, I am comfortable saying Mr. Cipollone.

Q Okay.

Do you remember -- bear with me one moment.

Were Members of Congress present for that meeting as well, either in person or by phone?

A Not at the meeting I'm thinking about.

[2:09 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Did this issue come up again where White House Counsel's Office expressed an opinion on alternate electors where Members of Congress were present?

A Yes, sir.

Q When was that and what happened?

A Sorry. Could you repeat the first part of that question? Sorry.

Q Of course, yes. So the question was, were there other meetings where the White House Counsel's Office expressed an opinion on alternate electors came up where Members of Congress were present?

A Sorry. I wanted to make sure that we weren't attributing one of the opinions that I previously stated to Members of Congress.

Yes. To answer your question broadly, yes, I do recall them raising it in meetings with Members of Congress in early to mid-December likely, though, perhaps -- I say early. Maybe like sometime after, like, December 8th. I don't have the calendar in front of me of the days of the week, but -- and I'm trying to think about when Members of Congress started coming into our office to meet. So first or second week of December.

Q Okay. And do you remember which Members of Congress were at the meeting in which White House Counsel's Office expressed their opinion that this alternate electors plan was not legally sound?

A The initial meeting that I'm thinking of or generally and broadly speaking about the events?

Q How about we start with the initial meeting and then broadly speaking, others who may have received the same message.

A Initially -- the initial meeting that I'm thinking about in my head, Mr. Scott Perry was present for, but I don't want to attribute White House counsel's opinion to that meeting being let's entertain this, keep us in the loop versus no. Just I recall their opinions being expressed in the first meeting that I'm thinking about with Mr. Scott Perry.

Q How about this: How about, in meetings -- let me back up and rephrase.

Which Members of Congress were present during meetings at which the White House Counsel's Office expressed their opinion that this plan related to alternate electors was not legally sound, as opposed to just discussions about followup or further research?

Mr. Passantino. You understand --

Ms. Hutchinson. Mr. Perry is the member that immediately jumps out to me, and I'm only -- I just want to be cautious because there frequently were Members that would dial into meetings as a presence, but they weren't physically present. And I know that sometimes there were other people on the line that I wasn't aware of. Mr. Perry is one that immediately jumps to mind as me recalling him physically being there and then pushing back on him.

Now, Mr. Jordan also would dial into meetings frequently, and I don't want to attribute White House Counsel's Office pushing back on Mr. Jordan because I don't know whether Mr. Jordan was personally pushing for that legal theory, if that makes any sense, or if it was just them broadly speaking in the presence of Mr. Jordan.

The only one that immediately jumps out to me as being there and them kind of pushing back a little bit would be both Mr. Perry, Mr. Gaetz -- Matt Gaetz -- Mr. Gohmert, Louie Gohmert of Texas.

And it's entirely possible that there was more too. I'm just -- I want to be careful and not attribute any of the actions or words from White House Counsel's Office to Members of Congress or external interests, just because it's difficult for me to look back

and recall details of those meetings or conversations that happened where the Members were advocating for those theories personally, if that makes sense.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q It does, yes.

And there's a meeting on December 2lst in the White House at which some of those Members were present. Do you think it was that meeting or a different meeting?

A I recall them having conversations with Members that were a part of that meeting, but there also were several Members that participated in that meeting that were frequently present throughout this period that we're discussing.

Q I see. Let me ask a follow-on question. It's related but not the same.

We just talked about the theory -- or excuse me -- the effort to have alternate electors meet and cast votes for then-President Trump in States that he had lost. I want to fast-forward a little bit. And the kind of follow-on theory that I know you have been trying to distinguish in your mind -- and I appreciate that -- but like the follow-on theory for John Eastman is that, because these votes now exist, because the Republican electors have met and cast their votes, then the Vice President can choose to count those or not count those during the Joint Session of Congress.

Do you remember any meetings at which third parties, so not White House personnel or not executive branch members, were present in which the White House Counsel's Office said that that, that use of the theory like that of John Eastman, was not legally sound?

A Yes. But I can't attribute a specific meeting just because I don't recall right now. But I do recall --

Q It did happen?

A Yes.

Q And you were about to say you do recall. Can you continue that?

A I was going to say I do recall there being meetings. And I feel redundant and I apologize for that, but I recall there being meetings where Mr. Eastman's name was brought in in association with the theories and White House Counsel's Office telling external interests that you have to be super careful with this, you don't find legal reason behind this, let's kind of pump the brakes a little bit more on this. But it's -- it's difficult to kind of navigate in my head what those meetings were and what individual Members of Congress would have been present or dialed in.

Q Was Mr. Trump present for any of those meetings, that you recall?

A The White House Counsel's Office pushback?

Q Yes.

Mr. Passantino. With third parties present.

Ms. Hutchinson. I'm not sure. At the time, I'm not sure.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Before we leave that topic, I know there are a number of members on as well. I'll see if they have any questions.

Okay. Mr. [redacted]?

Mr. [redacted]. I don't. No thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. All right. So we're going to switch gears now and go to the beginning of November. Did you have any role, whether formal or not, with respect to President Trump's reelection campaign?

Mr. Passantino. I'm sorry. Informal like -- I'm sorry. Define what you mean by "informal."

Mr. [redacted]. Sure, yes.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So, I guess, formal I would think of as somebody who's, you know, working,

has certain hours, you have a schedule, whether paid or not. Informal, just as things came up, you would assist with the campaign or people associated with the campaign to help.

A I traveled with Mr. Trump and Mr. Meadows I believe to every single rally in the height of the campaign. Might have been one I didn't go to in the summer, but -- yeah. So I at times had fielded incoming from individuals employed by the campaign, either on the ground, or I had a rally planning to bring things to Mr. Meadows' awareness. So informal, yes, but nothing substantive in nature of planning rallies, more of just as a conduit between the campaign and the White House.

Q So it sounds like you just kind of helped Mr. Meadows with his campaign-related functions. Is that accurate?

A Yes, sir.

Q Could you generally describe what you understood his campaign-related functions to be?

A Mr. Meadows wasn't really involved with planning who would be on the ground, either as a greeter or in a VIP section, planning what the rally would like look like, where rallies would be. Mr. Meadows frequently met with campaign officials and White House officials about logistically planning rallies but also planning speakers, participants, frequency of travel. So he had a pretty extensive role in campaign operations.

Q And what did you understand his role to be after election day with respect to the campaign, if any?

A His role after the campaign was primarily coordinating with the individuals that had not been off-boarded from the campaign and coordinating with those individuals that were still employed by the campaign and were working on looking for election fraud and making sure that they were working in connection with the White House.

Q Who were some of those people who were looking at issues of election fraud on the campaign that Mr. Meadows would coordinate with?

A It's just difficult because, at this time, there had already been people off-boarded from the campaign that we were still working with but weren't paid by the campaign.

Q Okay. And who are those people, even if they were not formally being paid by the campaign anymore?

A Yeah. I mean, Jason Miller, Bill Stepien. It's just difficult because I -- sometimes I -- to be frank and honest about this, I didn't always know who worked on the campaign and who just worked as volunteers or with other external organizations. Again, I'd never been part of the campaign, so that was like my group of people.

Q Understood. And that's totally fine.

So with respect to the fraud and the fraud allegations, there was a lot of that floating around in the postelection period, and I understand that Mr. Meadows had some role in passing them on to the Department of Justice, for example, coordinating with the campaign to look into them.

Did you ever talk to Mr. Meadows about the various claims of election fraud that were circulating after the election? Particularly, I'll start with the Dominion voting machines allegation.

A I just want to make sure I'm understanding your question correctly. Whether I had conversations with Mr. Meadows about his work with campaign officials about Dominion voting machines or subjects of that nature?

Q Well, let me clarify. Yeah. Did you ever talk to Mr. Meadows about allegations of fraud related to Dominion voting machines?

A Mr. Meadows had raised that issue with me.

Q Did he ever express that he thought it was a valid allegation that Dominion voting machines were being used to flip or had been hacked to change the outcome of the election?

A Mr. Meadows thought, as he had expressed it to me, that it was a theory worthy of exploring more extensively.

Q Do you know if it ever got beyond just being a theory, like he had actual proof or reached a conclusion that Dominion voting machines had been hacked and changed the outcome of the election, for example?

A Whether he had information that he perceived to be proof or factually correct, what he accepted as the truth?

Mr. Passantino. Don't mean to answer the question for you, but I think the question was do you know whether he subjectively believed that the theory was a proper theory.

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't want to speculate on Mr. Meadows' thoughts, but as they had been expressed to me at various points, he believed that it was something worthy of looking into and that was a strong possibility. But I don't want to speculate nor definitively say, yes, he thought that this was entirely valid or, no, he didn't think it was entirely valid.

Mr. [redacted]. And I appreciate you being -- yeah. I appreciate you being careful on that point.

I'll put it this way. In December, early December, Bill Barr came out publicly and said that he had seen no evidence of widespread fraud sufficient to change the outcome of the election. Do you know whether Mr. Meadows agreed privately, most likely, with that analysis or assessment?

Ms. Hutchinson. Privately -- in terms of my conversations with him or his private

thoughts or his conversations with Mr. Barr?

Mr. [redacted]. Any conversations you know of where Mr. Meadows expressed his thoughts on that, whether Mr. Barr's statement was accurate, that there was no evidence of widespread fraud sufficient to change the outcome of the election.

Mr. Passantino. Again, he's asking you if you know what Mr. Meadows thought based on what you said.

Ms. Hutchinson. After Mr. Barr had made that statement or even perhaps a couple of hours before -- I don't want to put a timestamp on it -- Mr. Meadows had expressed perhaps he's right. But to my recollection, it was more along the lines of -- it's my recollection it was more along the lines of he jumped the gun on saying this; it was a little premature.

Mr. [redacted]. Do you know what he meant by "jumped the gun"? In other words, when would the appropriate time be to say that?

Mr. Passantino. I'm sorry. That's not really a fair question because it assumes that there was a -- I'm not trying to coach here at all, but that was not really a fair question to ask.

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah, okay. Understood. That was somewhat loaded.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So let me ask it, I guess, this way. If Mr. Meadows said to you that Mr. Barr may have jumped the gun in making the announcement about no widespread fraud sufficient to change the outcome of the election, do you know what he meant when he said jumped the gun to you, or what did you interpret that to mean?

A I just want to be careful. "Jumped the gun" was just a phrase that popped in my head.

Q Okay.

A It wasn't verbatim. It was more along the lines of this might have been premature; this was a little early. And he frequently said things along those lines when he believed it should be more extensively looked at and researched. And, again, I know by proximity and nature of my role with him that there also were conversations that he had. Now, I didn't and don't perceive those conversations to be as --

Q Let me ask it this way.

A -- his line of thinking that what he had said to me and to others around this time, which was, you know, Okay, maybe he's right, but I -- as expressed, it was his -- they should've dedicated more time before we had a member of our administration kind of come out and say something this conclusive without vetting it or running it by anybody internally first.

Q I see.

A I think he saw it maybe as a step out of the protocol that he had wished for people to adhere to, which was elevated to him and they could have a topic -- or they could have a discussion about it prior to publicly saying something that definitive and media -- worthy of media attention.

Q So is it fair to say that Mr. Meadows thought that Mr. Barr should have come to him before making that announcement, as you understand it?

A I believe it'd be fair to say that Mr. Meadows believed that there was a disconnect with Mr. Barr. And whether he was expecting Mr. Barr to say it in that moment or later on, I'm not sure. But I think that he would have appreciated a more candid and extensive conversation internally prior to Mr. Barr making those public comments.

Q And what about in early January of 2021, so before the 6th, did Mr. Meadows ever say -- did you ever hear him say that he thought that there was proof of

widespread fraud that actually would change the outcome of the election?

A Yes, sir.

Q You did hear him say that; he thought that Mr. Trump had actually won the election?

A I'm sorry.

Mr. Passantino. Be careful. Your words, not his words.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Yeah. I guess I'll ask it in, hopefully, a little bit clearer way. Did he say in early January, before the 6th, Mr. Meadows that is, that he thought the President actually had lost?

A Mr. Meadows certainly acknowledged the fact that Mr. Trump may not have won the election as a steep of margins that individuals were saying that he had. But, definitively speaking, I can't attest or attribute any of Mr. Meadows' personal thoughts to this period. And, again, I apologize. It's difficult when I'm trying to phrase it to you and trying to look back and decipher conversations I had with him, because he certainly acknowledged that there was a chance that we hadn't won by as steep of margins, but he certainly also expressed that widespread fraud had altered the outcome of the election and that was still worthy of evaluating and looking into a little bit deeper.

Q Okay. So he thought fraud could have affected the election. But did Mr. Meadows say to you that he thought it affected the outcome; in other words, that now President Biden didn't actually win, based on evidence that he had seen?

A Would you repeat that one time? I'm sorry.

Q Sure. Yeah. So in that period, we're talking again about early January, before the 6th, essentially, did Mr. Meadows acknowledge to you privately or otherwise that he thought President Biden actually won and not Mr. Trump, despite the fact that

there may have been fraud or irregularities in the election?

Mr. Passantino. You can answer it again.

Ms. Hutchinson. My short answer is no.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

Ms. Hutchinson. But Mr. Meadows had acknowledged that -- I suppose the best way of me phrasing it is Mr. Meadows had acknowledged that, as we progressed through this period, towards the end of December, early January, prior to January 6th, that there was a fairly likely chance that Mr. Biden would be sworn in on January 20th.

But his personal opinions of fraud I can't attest to. I can attest to what I had had discussions with him about or what I had been participating in discussions with him about or overhearing. And that's, again, more along the lines of there was fraud. How much fraud, we're not sure. But he remained fairly consistent, to my recollection, in his belief that the fraud did alter the outcome of the election and tipped it in favor of Mr. Biden, President Biden, now President Biden.

Mr. [redacted]. Did you ever talk to Mr. Meadows about having the President concede the election, pending knowledge that President Biden, now President Biden, had won?

Ms. Hutchinson. Whether Mr. Meadows had conversations with Mr. Trump?

Mr. Passantino. No, no. With you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Oh, with me about --

Mr. Passantino. Yeah.

Ms. Hutchinson. Mr. Meadows and I had conversations individually together and in groups that there should be a plan in place should Mr. Trump concede or have to concede on January 6th and what that may look like.

Mr. [redacted]. Did Mr. Meadows ever tell you that he thought the President

should concede, at any point before January 6th?

Ms. Hutchinson. Mr. Meadows received a lot of communications from individuals saying that they believed that the President should concede, and he had discussed that outreach with me, but I'm not sure what his personal opinion was on it. As I recall in our discussions, it was more if we have to, how does that look, what does that look like, what should we do, and how should we approach that.

Mr. [redacted]. Do you know if he ever told the President that he should concede, at any point after the election and before January 6th?

Ms. Hutchinson. I'm not sure.

Mr. [redacted]. Any follow-up questions on that?

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. Just let us know when you're at a good breaking point. I'm sorry.

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. Let me see if there's any followup from any of the members or anybody in the room, and if there's not, this is a good spot.

Mr. Raskin. I'd like to follow up but just on the last point the witness was speaking about.

Did you ever have conversation with Mr. Meadows about the more than 60 Federal and State court decisions that rejected attacks on the election outcome, and was that something that figured into your discussions or his analysis?

Ms. Hutchinson. I apologize. Would you remind repeating the first part?

Mr. Raskin. Whether -- you know, there were dozens of Federal and State court cases brought at different points. And I'm just wondering whether that was part of the analysis at this point of whether or not Trump had really won the election or he had lost the election?

Ms. Hutchinson. So as the court cases -- the verdicts of each court case was

ruled and became public, that certainly factored into Mr. Meadows' view on what the eventual outcome of the election would be, whether or not Mr. Trump would be sworn in for a second term or Mr. Biden would be sworn in for his first term. But I don't know specifically whether Mr. Trump -- or whether Mr. Meadows felt that the court cases were wrong or right. I just know that, as the decisions came out and as -- and this is his phrasing -- but as it looked a little more grim for Mr. Trump, you know, I know that his optimism about the outcome that Mr. Trump wanted was starting to dwindle, if that helps answer your question.

Mr. Raskin. Yes. Thank you very much.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. Thank you, Mr. Raskin.

Any other members have questions at this point?

All right. Then, at this point, why don't we take a break. And let's go off the record.

[Recess.]

Mr. [redacted]. All right. Well, then, with that, let's go back on the record.

It's 2:44, and we're back on the record with the transcribed interview of Ms. Cassidy Hutchinson.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q I'm going to draw your attention to November the 25th, which is a meeting at the White House, which a number of Pennsylvania, I believe, State legislators and others attended and that you provided some documents about.

So if we could pull up [redacted], please.

And this is a text message exchange that you had with somebody named [redacted] -- or initials [redacted], named [redacted] Who is that?

A That was the assistant detail leader on Mr. Meadows' Secret Service detail, [redacted]

Q And forgive me, but you said he worked with Mr. Meadows' detail?

A Yes. He is in the Secret Service. He's still in the Secret Service. He was the assistant detail leader on our detail.

Q Okay. Now, this message string starts with you making a comment, This is such a shit show. He says, Oh, yeah.

You said, I had to cancel my hair appointment to drive to Gettysburg. This is a nightmare. He goes on, says, Oh, man, I'm sorry.

Then you said, You heard how Mark is motorcading to G'burg right now and POTUS isn't anymore. And then at the end you say, Now Mark said there's a chance they won't go to G'burg.

So can you explain the context for these messages?

A Yeah. Just so as a brief background, [redacted], was in -- Mr.

Meadows was flying to Plant City, Florida, this night, for Thanksgiving. So [redacted] was down waiting to pick him up at the airport in Florida. Mr. Meadows was supposed to leave earlier in the afternoon, and then he ended up going into work for a full day. So I was trying to keep our guys down in Florida looped into that timing was shifting.

Now, with these messages specifically, there was hearings in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, this day about election fraud issues, and Mr. Trump had entertained potentially going to Gettysburg. I don't recall whether he wanted to sit in on the meetings or just be in the back or say anything. I don't recall why he wanted to go, but I do recall him wanting to potentially go, and we were looking into that.

That morning, we had pulled his trip down, Mr. Meadows offered to go in his place, and we had our team ready to take us up to Gettysburg, be there for the day, and then Mr. Meadows and I would have come back to D.C. that night, and then he would have flown to Georgia or to -- yeah, to Plant City, Florida, from there.

However, once we had communicated with people who were at the hearings in Pennsylvania -- and I don't recall everybody, but I do recall Ms. Jenna Ellis being the primary point of contact. And I know Mr. Giuliani, although I don't recall if Mr. Rudy Giuliani was in Pennsylvania that day. So we decided -- Mr. Meadows had decided that it was better for him to stay back at the White House, keep working from his office, and then bring the people that Mr. Trump wanted to meet with in Pennsylvania to the White House that evening.

Q And that, of course, is eventually what happened, right? A bunch of people who -- from Pennsylvania, rather, drove down from Pennsylvania and met with the President at the White House that night?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, in something like that, if you could just educate me a little bit, what would be your role in going to Pennsylvania with Mark Meadows?

A I just traveled with him wherever he went, so it was only natural for me to go on that trip with him too.

Q And in response to your last question, you had gone through a number of what I wanted to address with you, so if you don't mind just bearing with me a moment.

I think you mentioned that Ms. Ellis was the primary point of contact for the hearing in Pennsylvania. Is that right?

A Ms. Ellis was there, and she was somebody that Mr. Meadows and other individuals that were at the White House that day were communicating with about us going to Gettysburg. I don't want to say she was the sole primary point of contact, just because I know that there was other people that were involved in these discussions that were physically in Gettysburg, but I don't recall who they are right now. But I do know that Ms. Ellis had a pretty significant role in those conversations.

Q And to your knowledge, with respect to Ms. Ellis, did she actually represent Mr. Trump or the campaign, or was she an outside advisor who didn't actually have a legal agreement to represent either of them, if you know?

A I just want to make sure I'm understanding your question correctly.

Mr. Passantino. He's just asking if you know whether she was legally representing him or just an advisor.

Ms. Hutchinson. No, I don't know specifically. Ms. Ellis, I think, is a lawyer.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. Fair enough. And I won't ask you to --

A I don't know, like, if whether -- I didn't and I don't know whether she was specifically appointed by him or asked by him to represent him on anything.

Q Okay. And those can be complicated issues, so I won't ask you to opine on them.

Now, in addition to this hearing in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, Mr. Trump's campaign, along with Mr. Giuliani, had other what I'll call hearings in other States, such as Georgia and Arizona. Are you familiar with those other hearings as well?

A Yes.

Q Did you go to any of those hearings?

A No, sir.

Q What was your understanding of the purpose of those hearings, some of which, you know, occurred in hotel ballrooms, for example?

A To be honest, I didn't watch any of them. I know the purpose was to discuss on a State level with State legislatures -- legislators instances of fraud that could perhaps percolate into something that was on our message of -- of the White House's message of -- campaign's message of the election was stolen; there was widespread fraud; Mr. Trump won the election, not Mr. Biden.

Q And, earlier, we talked about the alternate electors idea. Do you know if these hearings were intended or related to efforts to have State legislatures choose Republican electors as opposed to Democrat electors in States that the President had lost?

A At the time, I didn't follow the hearings very much, so I don't know.

Q Whose idea after the Gettysburg hearing on November 25th was it to have various people, including State legislators, come down and meet with the President in the White House?

Mr. Passantino. If you know.

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't know if the idea -- I don't know. And I don't know if

the idea could be attributed to one specific person. I recall Mr. Meadows getting outreach from several individuals saying that it would be a good idea, but I don't recall if it was always just from one person that was taking the lead on the efforts or if it was more of a collective understanding of people involved that were sort of closely read in on activities going on in the States.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And before we get to that, I should back up just very briefly.

Do you know whether Mr. Meadows or anybody else in the White House expressed concern about having these hearings in various States at which Mr. Giuliani was a witness or participated and presented evidence of purported fraud?

A I know there were concerns raised internally, but I don't want to speculate or pin anybody's personal opinions on them.

Q Okay. Do you remember what the concerns were? Oh, I'm sorry.

Do you remember what the concerns -- sorry.

This is the hard part about doing video depositions -- or interviews rather. I apologize, Ms. Hutchison.

Do you remember what the concerns were about the hearings and who raised them?

A Broadly speaking, a lot of the concerns were just around the legitimacy and distinguishing whether this was an official position that the White House was going to adopt, meaning Mr. Trump was going to adopt, or if this was efforts that the White House was read in on and was aware of but wasn't taking a definitive response on. And I believe the individuals that expressed those concerns wanted there to be a clear distinction favoring more of the side of, we're listening, this is good, or they're exchanging in civil discourse, they are raising those concerns, but we're not going to take an official

position on this. Attributing that to specific individuals, I can't and I don't recall.

The conversations about this were pretty widespread. So if you have any individuals that you would like to ask about or more specifics involving Mr. Meadows and his conversations, I'm happy to help answer that a little bit more.

Q Okay. Did Mr. Meadows have those concerns?

A Broadly speaking, Mr. Meadows' concerns about this topic that him and I had conversations about or I was present or overheard his conversations was mainly around the idea of everybody continued to talk to me, work with me, let's make sure we're all on the same message. Let's not say the President has an opinion on anything. So it was him looking out for Mr. Trump and people not attributing anything directly to Mr. Trump without Mr. Trump or Mr. Meadows' guidance or final word.

Mr. Meadows also was supportive of these hearings going on in States and frequently discussed watching them or attending them and, you know, how he thought the White House could be best represented in them without walking that fine line of -- oh-oh.

Mr. Passantino. Did we lose you guys?

Mr. [redacted]. No, we're here. Have you lost video?

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. It looks like we've got a low bandwidth.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. That happens sometimes. If you give us just a couple of minutes, what we'll probably do is sign out and sign right back in.

Mr. Passantino. Okay.

Mr. [redacted]. Bear with us. Thank you.

[Video malfunction.]

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Is that better? Can you see us now?

Mr. Passantino. Yes. Yeah, we can.

Mr. [redacted]. All right. Great. Apologies.

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't remember where I left off. I apologize.

Mr. Passantino. That's all right. He'll ask another.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q I think we left off about Mr. Meadows' potential concerns with some of the hearings that were going on in the States, or your response to my question about that at least.

A And I believe the point that I was wrapping up was, you know, broadly speaking, Mr. Meadows was fond of these hearings going on at the State level because they were looking into claims that could potentially be legitimate. So Mr. Meadows' opinion on them -- you'd have to ask him his specific train of thought on them. But in my view, from conversations that I had with him that he had with others, that I am aware of, he was not opposed to anything going on at the State level at this time.

Q Okay. Did he ever tell you whether he thought that the hearings and the evidence presented there would help State legislatures understand and then do something about potentially the outcome of the election in those States?

A Yes, sir.

Q And did he, in fact, think that, that those hearings could have that effect?

A You have to ask him whether he truly personally believed it, but I'm under the expression that it was a legitimate thought of his, yes.

Q Okay. If we could pull up exhibit 21. And this is a series of text messages that you provided to us, Ms. Hutchison, from somebody named BK and with the name Bernie. I assume that's Bernie Kerik. Is that a fair assumption?

A Yes, sir.

Q Why were you texting with Mr. Kerik?

A I don't recall who put me in contact with Mr. Kerik. I believe it was Boris Epshteyn perhaps who put us in contact. And Mr. Kerik was in Pennsylvania that day.

Ah, so that's where it starts.

Q Is this the first time you remember exchanging text messages with Mr. Kerik?

A Yes, sir.

Q All right. And we'll scroll through the first page of our exhibit, which shows, it looks like a driver's identification card and the back side of the identification card.

If we can go to page 2. Shows some of the person's personal information, as well as Mr. Kerik's, and a business card for Senator Mario Scavello from the 40th District in Pennsylvania.

And then you ask for a passenger list. And it looks like you sent a list of passengers -- of people that you expected to attend or show up at the White House on November the 25th. Is that right?

A That's correct.

Q And how did you develop this list of people you expected to show up at the White House that day?

A Communications as they were -- I apologize. I want to make sure I phrase this correctly. But communications as they were a little bit sporadic and there wasn't an established channel of communications, so it was a little less organized than I think internal people would have wanted. And so I was receiving incoming from Boris Epshteyn communicating people that were going -- okay. I guess I should -- I apologize for not doing this sooner.

Mr. Meadows and Mr. Giuliani had a conversation -- several conversations earlier that day about Mr. Trump going, then not going, Mr. Meadows potentially going to go

and then not coming. And then Mr. Meadows asked Mr. Giuliani who he could have his team coordinate with. And then that's when they put me in contact with Mr. Epshteyn and Mr. Kerik.

Now, there's people's information coming from Mr. Epshteyn, Mr. Kerik. People were communicating to Ms. Molly Michael, and then Ms. Molly Michael would either call me -- I typically -- this might have been one of the first times I did meeting logistics. It wasn't something I really ever did before.

So it was a little bit more discombobulated. We were pretty short staffed that day because it was the day before Thanksgiving, so there was a lot of cooks in the kitchen on this particular event. Ms. Michael, Mr. Kerik, and Mr. Epshteyn were the primary people I think I was in contact with that day.

Q Okay. If we can scroll -- continue scrolling. I'll show you page 4 of exhibit No. 21. These are still messages with Mr. Kerik, showing his vehicle registration information. And we stop there. An identification for an individual named James Phillip Waldron. And if we keep scrolling, some personal information for him.

And then on to page 5, it says: We should be arriving just before 6. And you send what looks to be a final list, as best I can tell at this point, with 29 individuals.

Is it your understanding that all of these people showed up to meet at the White House on November the 25th after the hearing in Pennsylvania?

A Yes. And I do believe there were maybe a couple more because I do remember having to go and edit the list.

Q Okay. And Phil Waldron, had you ever talked to him before or seen him before November 25th?

A I believe November 25th is the first time I saw -- I had met Mr. Waldron. I know that we met several times after that, but I believe November 25th was the first time

that I had communicated with and met him in person.

Q What was your understanding of Mr. Waldron's role with respect to what I'll call the campaign, whatever is left over from the campaign in the postelection period?

A On November 25th, I had absolutely no idea who he was.

Q Were you in the meeting --

A I didn't know that he was -- I didn't know that he was going to end up taking a more prominent role. I thought that he would have just -- I thought at the time he was just another guest that was coming that day to meet the President.

Q And you said he did take a more prominent role ultimately?

A He came back to the White House, and he continued speaking with Mr. Meadows on and off throughout November, December, January, where a lot of these other individuals, you know, November 25th was the first and last time they came to the White House.

Q Do you know what Mr. Waldron came to talk to Mr. Meadows about throughout that period?

A Issues of election fraud.

Q Would he come by himself or with others?

A I believe he always came with others. I don't believe him and Mr. Meadows ever met individually.

Q Now, this is jumping ahead a bit, and we don't have this as an exhibit. We understand that Mr. Waldron had some role in a PowerPoint presentation about options for January the 6th. And this has been circulating more recently, so I don't want you to base your answers on anything you learned recently. But do you remember Mr. Waldron and his role in that PowerPoint at all?

A I remember Mr. Waldron bringing up the PowerPoint, and I don't recall

whether he emailed it to me or -- but I recall him saying it'll be in your email. I don't recall how. And I do recall the PowerPoint from that time.

Q Is that one of the PowerPoints you referred to earlier, do you think, when we talked about PowerPoints and Mr. Eastman and some of the other theories?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you received that PowerPoint directly from Mr. Waldron?

A I don't -- I don't recall who I received it from, but I recall Mr. Waldron discussing that PowerPoint, either that I would be soon receiving or that he would be sending me.

Q What did he ask -- or what did he want you to do with that PowerPoint, if anything, and to your understanding?

A I don't recall him asking me to take specific action on it, other than I knew that he wanted it to be discussed, knew that it would be a topic of conversations if not meetings. But I don't recall him asking me at the time to take specific instruction or action on any materials that may or may not have come across my desk that he was involved in.

Q Do you remember whether this PowerPoint was ever presented to Members of Congress?

A I guess the PowerPoint that I'm thinking of that was presented to members in the Cabinet Room meeting on December 2lst. But to be fair, there were several PowerPoints that had come across my desk. So, I mean, I'm thinking of the ones that I believe was in that meeting, but there is numerous -- a number of presentations.

Q Okay. And we'll get to that meeting in particular in a moment. But you remember discussions on December 2lst in the meeting in the Cabinet Room about something related to options for January the 6th and the Joint Session of Congress?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. And we will get to that.

Getting back to the exhibit that we had up, which is the text messages with Bernie Kerik --

A I put those away.

Q I'm sorry.

A That's okay. I jumped the gun on that one.

Mr. Passantino. Optimism.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q All right. So on page 6, you say -- this is at 1753, so 5:53, if I can do my math right. It says, You are all cleared to enter the complex at 17th Street and State Place. Secret Service will show everyone where to park.

You talk about security. And you say, From there, they'll bring you into the West Wing. I am with POTUS and the chief, but call me if you have any questions or issues.

So it seems like you were with the President and Mr. Meadows before this meeting with Pennsylvania personnel. Is that right?

A I don't recall if I was in the Oval Office at the time of sending this text message or if I had stepped out to send it or ran back to my office, but I was in and out of the Oval Office throughout that entire afternoon. So it was likely me checking in with them to let them know that they're all cleared to go in and that, like, I was available to have conversations with them if any issues happened at the gate.

Q What was your understanding of the purpose of this meeting when they came to the White House?

A My understanding at the time was it was more of a -- Mr. Trump is a very hospitable man and he's an entertainer and he likes people to feel appreciated. So my

understanding at the time was he wanted to welcome the people to the White House that night, have a conversation with them so he could personally thank them for speaking out against allegations of election fraud on the national stage that day.

Q Were you in the meeting with the President when the people identified in the list that you sent in the text showed up?

A So it wasn't a formal meeting, but I was in physical proximity with the individuals on and off throughout that night, and I was in the Oval when they went in for photos with him.

Q Okay. So they took --

A [Inaudible] from start to finish, no. I had been going in and out.

Q It sounds like they took photographs in the Oval Office. Did they also discuss what had happened that day in the hearings in Pennsylvania with the President in the Oval Office?

A Between the Oval Office and the Cabinet Room, yes.

Q And were those discussions the ones you just described about the President expressing his thanks for raising these issues?

A Broadly speaking, yes.

Q Do you remember the President making any requests of the group from Pennsylvania?

A Not specifically, no.

Q Okay. So we understand that the President may have asked the Pennsylvania delegation to hold a special session to appoint Trump and Pence electors for the purposes of the later electoral college vote, even though the certification had already happened of the vote in Pennsylvania.

Do you remember that coming up at all in the meeting with the Pennsylvania

delegation on November 25th?

A I remember that being discussed, but I don't remember interpreting that as a specific request or action that he wanted them to take. But I recall that coming up generally.

Q Can you tell us what you remember on that topic coming up?

A I don't recall any verbatim phrasing of it. I apologize if this is redundant. I recall that topic coming up in several of the individuals that traveled to see him that night saying, We'll look into it, sir, anything to keep you around, you know, more of the chummy conversation that they were engaging in at the time. It was friendly conversation, and I don't recall it being anything that was -- had nefarious intent or an explicit request.

Q Do you know if anybody from Pennsylvania who attended the meetings in the White House or the greeting in the White House on November 25th told the President that they couldn't hold a special session to appoint Trump or Pence electors?

A No, I don't recall that, but it also wasn't really a conversation I was paying super close attention to.

[3:14 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Do you remember anything else about that meeting that the President said to the group?

A Nothing specifically at this time.

Q So I understand that, I believe maybe just earlier or just after that, that two representatives from Michigan, Senate Majority Leader Shirkey and House Speaker Lee Chatfield also went to the White House and met with the President in the Oval Office. Do you know anything about that meeting?

A Could you repeat their names, please?

Q Sure. Senate Majority Leader Shirkey and House Speaker Lee Chatfield from Michigan.

A I recall the Michigan meeting, but I don't recall those certain individuals.

Q Okay. What do you remember about the Michigan meeting? And, to be clear, there were other people who attended the White House meeting along with Senator Shirkey and Speaker Chatfield.

A I honestly don't recall that many specifics about that meeting.

Q Do you remember why the President wanted to meet with them in the White House, where he specifically invited them?

A Broadly speaking, to discuss the results of the election, to discuss potential instances of voter fraud and how the State was going to approach that when addressing it on the national level, and it was elevated to Congress later the next month and the following month after that.

Q And when you say "elevated to Congress," are you referring to the joint

session on January 6th?

A That's correct.

Q Moving a little bit away from that, on December 7th, Texas, the State of Texas, filed a lawsuit in the Supreme Court against Pennsylvania related to the outcome of the election. Understand that a number of State attorneys general signed on to support in the days after it was filed.

Do you know whether the White House or -- excuse me -- anybody in the White House or with the campaign had any role in seeking support for that lawsuit from the attorneys general?

A I recall Mr. Meadows having discussions and being involved in that, but I don't recall whether he was actively supporting it or pushing for it.

Q Okay. And just to be clear, so you don't know -- or do you know if Mr. Meadows was trying to get State attorneys general to sign on to the lawsuit in the Supreme Court?

A I just recall him having conversations with State attorney generals. I don't recall whether he was trying to coerce them into signing on or make a case for them signing on. But I do recall him wanting to reach out and reaching out to State attorney generals on that matter.

Q Do you remember anything he told them or said to them in that outreach?

A I don't recall specifically. I don't think I was present. I might've been present for some of the conversations, but I don't -- I don't recall any, like, specifics of them.

Q Did he ask anybody else in the White House to help with that effort, that you're aware of, the outreach to State attorneys general?

A I'm not sure.

Q So that same lawsuit, over 120 Members of Congress signed on as well. Was Mr. Meadows involved in any effort to get Members of Congress to sign on to the lawsuit, Texas v. Pennsylvania?

A Mr. Meadows communicated with Members of Congress about that lawsuit, but I'm not sure if he communicated with them to convince them to sign on or to inquire whether they were going to sign on or gauge their interest level on it.

Q Do you know --

A You know, there's individual Members I might recall, but, you know, broadly speaking, it's kind of difficult because that's a lot of Members.

Q Sure, it is a lot of Members. Do you remember for either of those groups that we just talked about, the State attorneys general or the Members of Congress, do you know if Mr. Trump asked Mr. Meadows to get in touch with those groups about Texas v. Pennsylvania?

A When you say "those groups," meaning attorney generals, Members?

Q Correct.

Mr. Passantino. It's not an -- he's just asking if you know, if you did.

Ms. Hutchinson. I know they had discussions about Mr. Meadows having outreach to them.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q What were those discussions if you know? What did Mr. Trump say to Mr. Meadows about the outreach?

A Can I have one moment with my attorney, please?

Q Of course.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. [redacted]. All right. We see you're back.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah, we're back. Just for my -- and we'll let her answer the question, but my understanding is, on any issues with respect to executive privilege, that's been fully litigated at this point. I want to just make sure that I'm clear that that issue has been raised and has not been fully litigated. I don't plan on asserting executive privilege for her if she was in the room, but I just -- I'm asking you if my understanding is correct with respect to the position that's been taken by the White House on executive privilege.

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. So, with respect to Ms. Hutchinson, the White House has said that they're not going to make any assertions of executive privilege. In the litigation -- I think you're referring to Trump v. Thompson -- that was specifically about archives documents, but the issue of --

Mr. Passantino. Right.

Mr. [redacted]. -- executive privilege and the topics related to January 6th came up. And, in that case and related to that stuff, the courts did find that it did not bar the production of these types of materials that were in issue.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah.

Ms. Hutchinson. Could you repeat your question, please?

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Absolutely. So my question to you was, what did Mr. Trump say to Mr. Meadows with respect to outreach to State attorneys general or Members of Congress related to the Texas v. Pennsylvania litigation?

A This is not verbatim, and I don't want to attribute as false plugs or put words in anybody's mouth, but the conversations that I recall, generally speaking, were along the lines of: just make sure our people are on it. Make sure our people are paying attention to this. Make sure it happens. Make it happen. Make some calls.

Q And your general recollection about Mr. Trump telling Mr. Meadows make it happen, make some calls, what was make it happen? What was the "it" that you understood?

A I just understood that as one of their efforts in conversations to ensure that there were people on our team fighting for him. And I'm now very cautious about using the phrase -- please forgive me, but that were supporting him and ensuring that that was public information. And the goal of having Mr. Meadows involved in that was because Mr. Trump trusted Mr. Meadows to act as a reliable surrogate and communicator for him and wanted Mr. Meadows to make sure that his position was clearly conveyed, and it would be appreciated if they would work with us, work with the White House on that.

Q Did Mr. Trump or Mr. Meadows, to the best of your knowledge, ever offer any kind of incentive, you know, for having State attorneys general or Members of Congress help with the effort related to Texas v. Pennsylvania?

A Are you implying quid pro quo?

Q Not implying anything. Political benefit, anything at all.

A I don't recall specific incentives. If you could be more specific.

Q Yeah. So you don't recall any specific incentives. Is there anything that you do recall generally on that topic or issue? And the only reason I ask is that you're hesitating as if there's something there.

A Can I just have one moment, please?

Q Of course.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. [redacted]. All right. I see you're back.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. Sorry about that.

Ms. Hutchinson. Could you repeat your question one more time, please? I

apologize.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q I think my question was something along the lines of, if you don't remember any specific incentives that the President or Mr. Meadows discussed in relation to support for Texas v. Pennsylvania, but do you remember any generally, any incentives that Mr. Trump or Mr. Meadows may have mentioned?

A I just want to be careful of the term "incentives," but generally speaking, it was, you know: Mr. Meadows, Mark, Chief, take care of this, make the calls, make it happen, let them know that they're on our team. We know they're on our team. Make sure that they know that, if they do this, they're in our corner, and they're team Trump.

Q Okay. Did he offer to campaign, for example, for anybody or --

A Mr. Meadows?

Q No. Mr. Trump. I'm sorry.

A Oh. I don't recall whether he suggested or implied that he would campaign for certain individuals.

Q Okay.

Ms. Cheney. [redacted], could I --

Mr. [redacted] Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Ms. Cheney. Could I ask a question?

Cassidy, did he say what would happen if they didn't do it?

Ms. Hutchinson. Did Mr. Trump tell Mr. Meadows what would happen if Mr. Meadows didn't make the call or what would happen if they didn't sign?

Ms. Cheney. No. You said -- that you said, you know: Tell them if they do this, they're team Trump.

Ms. Hutchinson. Oh, okay.

Ms. Cheney. So was there, if they didn't do it, what did they say would happen?

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't recall anything that would've been indicative of punishment, per se, but, you know, you take that in context if they do, like, they're team Trump, they're our people, they're on our team. You know, the contrary to that is, if they don't, they're not.

Mr. Passantino. And I think -- and I don't want to put words in the Congresswoman's -- I think she's asking, if he said something, clearly there's an implication.

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah.

Mr. Passantino. But I believe she's asking --

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah, I'm not aware of any specifics of if they don't do it, then X, Y, Z.

Ms. Cheney. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. Stop there to see if anybody has any followup to anything we've discussed recently? Nope? Okay.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Somewhat separately, we understand that Mr. Meadows, at one point, suggested replacing FBI Director Chris Wray with Kash Patel. Do you have any information related to that potential change in leadership?

A I'd just ask that you'd ask a little bit more of a specific question on that one.

Q Yeah. Do you know whether Mr. Meadows recommended to anybody in the White House that Director Wray be replaced with Kash Patel?

Mr. Passantino. It's sort of a standing -- he's not asking what you've heard and

read in the press now.

Ms. Hutchinson. Right, right.

Mr. Passantino. I think he's asking about at the time.

Ms. Hutchinson. At the time. I knew that Mr. Meadows had several conversations about that matter going --

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q With whom?

A Mr. Trump, Mr. McEntee, Mr. Ornato, individuals from Mark's and White House Counsel's Office, Mr. O'Brien, National Security Advisor.

Q And who brought it up, the potential of, if you know, replacing Director Wray with Kash Patel, the first time?

A I'm not sure the first time.

Q Do you know whether that's something that Mr. Trump wanted to do?

A I wasn't privy to any personal conversations that the President had regarding replacing Mr. Wray with Mr. Patel.

Q Okay. Relatedly, do you know why people were discussing replacing Director Wray with Mr. Patel, what the purpose of it would be?

A At the time I recall the discussions happening, I recall it being mentioned that Mr. Patel -- that Mr. Patel would be well suited for the role in the eyes and opinions of some people, but I don't know if there was one -- I didn't know if whether there was one explicit reason or whether it was just being more broadly entertained and people's thoughts were being heard, and it was more of a collective decision.

Q All right. And I'll ask you specifically, maybe it's not kind of the one reason that someone might entertain replacing Director Wray with Kash Patel, but did election fraud and investigations into election fraud, was that ever mentioned as a reason for

replacing Director Wray with Kash Patel?

A It was -- I know that was evaluated when determining whether that was a plan that they wanted to take action on, but I'm not sure if that was the sole reason or if there was others that were of equal importance and significance.

Q Do you know whether Mr. Meadows was advocating for replacing Director Wray?

A I don't recall Mr. Meadows -- to my recollection, Mr. Meadows participated in all the conversations, but in my experience, in my recollection, never seemed particularly sold on one option or the other.

Q Do you know whether Mr. McEntee recommended that the President replace Director Wray with Kash Patel?

A I know Mr. McEntee thought it was a viable option. I'm not sure whether he personally raised it with Mr. Trump or if he was personally advocating for it, or if it was more of an action that others wanted to take or just to explore and he was willing to evaluate it at the time. But it was -- the conversations were more extensive.

Q And earlier you mentioned that, in some people's eyes, Mr. Patel was well suited for the job of FBI Director. Whose eyes? Who had those eyes? This is a bad question, but in whose eyes was Patel well suited for the job of FBI director?

A It wasn't a bad question. It was a bad phrasing on my part. I apologize for that. Honestly, and I apologize for this, I -- I don't recall. There was a lot -- if I'm thinking about the right period with this, I recall, I think, being on the Hill a lot as the conversations were happening, but I wasn't physically present for a lot of them. And a lot of people wouldn't have elevated that to me, and honestly I didn't really want a part of that.

But I know that there were people pushing for it, and I know that it was an idea

that certain people were fond of, and I know that Mr. Meadows had deeply considered it, but specifics of the conversation or participants, you know, I -- I just -- I wasn't around for that. And, even if I was, I was preoccupied doing other things.

Q Okay. I understand that Mr. Patel was also considered or recommended for a role in the CIA. Are you aware of that as well?

A Yes. Yes, sir.

Q Okay. What do you remember about that coming up?

A I recall the day that I heard about that, Ms. Haspel was at the White House, came in to talk to Mr. Meadows, and they had a discussion about it. You know, if you have more -- I'm trying to be delicate, but if you have more followup questions --

Q Sure. And I may have this wrong; I'm just going based off of memory. But my understanding of that conversation or meeting is that Ms. Haspel was not pleased with the idea of Kash Patel coming to the CIA and said so to Mr. Meadows as well. Is that your recollection as well?

A Your recollection is correct.

Q Did Ms. Haspel threaten to resign if Mr. Patel was appointed to a position in the CIA?

A That's accurate.

Q And do you know why he was recommended for a post in the CIA? Did it have anything to do with the election, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. Passantino. If you know.

Ms. Hutchinson. I'll just -- I want to reference my prior statement, and I don't remember how I phrased it, but Mr. Patel was somebody that was recognizing -- was recognized internally as somebody that could be trusted and was a frequent communicator, in this context, good communicator with staffers and with Mr. Trump.

So it was explored about him fulfilling that role.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And just to be a little bit more specific for the record, Ms. Hutchinson, so did people think, anybody in the White House think that if Kash Patel went to the CIA, he'd have a role looking into, for example, foreign interference claims related to the election?

A Well, that's the natural nature of what the CIA does. I think that that would be --

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. And I was going to say, he's not asking what they think. He's asking what you --

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah.

Mr. Passantino. -- heard people say that would give you that impression.

Ms. Hutchinson. Could you repeat it one more time, please?

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Yeah, sure. I mean, was one of the reasons for considering Mr. Patel for a position with the CIA that he could use his position to look into issues related to the election, including claims of foreign interference?

A I don't want to speak to everyone's conversations, but I know that it was raised with Mr. Meadows, that -- because of what was unfolding as foreign interference claims had been elevated to the White House's level, that it would potentially be a natural thing for Mr. Patel to evaluate, if he were to take on a role of that nature. I don't recall whether that was the primary reason or an important incentive to have him take that role, but I do recall it coming up in conversations as prospects were being evaluated.

Q And do you know why ultimately Mr. Trump decided not to appoint Mr. Patel to the FBI or the CIA? And maybe "appoint" is not the right word, but install

him in either of those agencies.

A I don't recall at the time. At the time, I wasn't -- I wasn't tracking it, and I -- I'm not -- not sure I would've really paid attention to it, to be honest with you.

Ms. Cheney. Can I ask a question, [redacted]?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course, Ms. Cheney.

Ms. Cheney. Thanks.

Cassidy, when you said -- you mentioned just a minute ago that people brought this up in conversation to Mr. Meadows. Can you tell us who?

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah. I believe I previously mentioned some of the attorneys in the White House Counsel's Office, Mr. Ornato, Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Ratcliffe came in and talked to him -- talked to Mr. Meadows about it at one point, but it wasn't a thorough conversation by any means. It was -- I took it as more of a passerby. They had had separate meetings, touched base on a few items, and then, as he was walking out, they had a brief conversation about it.

And I know Mr. Meadows met with Mr. Patel a couple times, but the specifics of the meetings and when and -- you know, there were groups of those people together, I don't remember that. Now, if there's anything that would indicate otherwise, that might help jog my memory, I'm happy to think about it or look at it in that light, but just the people I remember initially and, you know, as I've kind of continued to think through this.

Ms. Cheney. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q One followup on that, Ms. Hutchinson, is, do you know whether Mr. Patel asked to be considered for positions with the FBI or CIA or whether somebody had

recommended that he be appointed to a position in either of those?

A Yeah, I'm not sure. I know Mr. Patel was open to accepting something had it been formally offered to him, but I don't know whether he was personally advocating for himself or if others were advocating, and he was sitting back, but I -- I do know that he was willing to say yes.

Q And you know that because he told that to Mr. Meadows?

A He, or individuals on his behalf, had said that to Mr. Meadows, that's correct.

Q Who is the people -- who were -- excuse me -- the people, you say, on his behalf, making those representations?

A I don't recall the specific people. I just -- but I do remember Mr. Meadows receiving phone calls and him making comments about it, like, so and so is calling me about Mr. Patel, or people are calling me about Mr. Patel. I don't recall the specific people. They're calling to see the status on this.

Q Did Mr. Meadows ever express to you whether he thought it was a good idea to have Mr. Patel at the CIA or FBI?

A Mr. Meadows honestly didn't express whether -- to me personally -- whether he thought it was a bad or good idea. I had interpreted his commentary on it as more of just a neutral -- yeah, this is him to me -- as more of a, people want this to happen, what do you think, I'm not sure what to do, do you have any thoughts, type of thing. And I didn't entertain it further on his behalf.

Q Okay. And, just to be clear, did he say who the people were that were calling him?

A Not that I can recall right now, I'm sorry.

Q Okay.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And just a quick followup, Ms. Hutchinson, the discussion about Mr. Patel -- I know we spent a lot of time on it -- in your view was that motivated more by the desire to find a role for Mr. Patel or frustration with the existing chain of command at FBI or CIA?

A I'm trying to get the timeline right in my head, and I apologize for that, and I'm not sure if you all would be able to provide this answer. We have it somewhere. But I don't remember if he was already the chief of staff at UMD at the time.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. I believe the question is if you know --

Ms. Hutchinson. You said find a role for him.

Mr. Passantino. Correct.

Ms. Hutchinson. I believe he already had a role in the administration.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Right. Yeah. I mean, it's unclear exactly when this conversation started. I think it went all the way very close to the end. And we've heard, for instance, that there was discussion of this at the Army-Navy game, when he was already the chief of staff at DOD, about the possibility of him moving over to one of those agencies. And I'm just wondering if you ever heard anyone say -- I'm not asking you to speculate -- did anyone say, "Hey, we need to get Kash in there," or, "We need to get Chris Wray," or whomever at CIA, "out of there"? Did you hear criticism of the existing people that Mr. Patel may have replaced?

A The conversations that I recall overhearing was more of the latter, of Mr. Patel would be a viable option to replace these individuals should they not continue holding that position.

Q Right. And I guess my question is whether you heard criticism of Chris Wray of the people who Patel may be tapped to replace? Did the conversation extend

beyond Mr. Patel to negative things about the people that he might replace, at any time?

A You know, by nature of these conversations, I think it's fair to say that, you know, whenever you're thinking about staffing changes, you're going to point out positives, negatives, for those individuals holding the position and the people that are being considered for potentially replacing them.

Now, I recall positive and negatives being discussed about Mr. Patel's credentials if he were to fill that. I remember there being discussions of the positive and negative aspects if Mr. Wray and Ms. Haspel were to continue filling those roles, you know. And then, on that note, to the consequence of any staffing changes at this point in the administration, you know: Is it really a good thing? Well, here's some benefits. Is it -- I mean, we might not want to do it because of these negatives.

Q Yeah. I see. I appreciate that. I guess just two followups. One, what, if any, negative comments or facts did you hear discussed about either Mr. Wray or Ms. Haspel, issues that people identified with them that were on that column of sort of reasons that -- that they should move on?

A I don't remember.

Q Do you remember there being such discussion? You just don't remember specific facts, or do you not remember whether there was conversation about negatives with Wray and Haspel?

A I remember there being positives and negatives discussed about the three aforementioned individuals -- Mr. Wray, Ms. Haspel, Mr. Patel. I don't remember, during this period, at the time, any of the specifics involving those three individuals other than, if we do this, then X could happen or Y could happen, evaluating the chain of events that may or may not ensue should such a staffing decision of that magnitude happen at that point.

Q Yeah, okay. So, if you don't remember the specifics about Wray or Haspel, tell me about that last part. What did you hear about sort of the timing of this and whether that was a good or a bad thing if it were to happen in December or January, in the midst of all this election stuff and a potential transition?

A What I remember is more general, kind of -- it was more along the lines of: If this happens, we might have some people resign. It might not be portrayed in a positive light by the media. It could end up hurting us.

And then the flip side of that was, if it does happen, you know, the benefits to having somebody filling the spot that may be more -- less inclined to critique certain actions moving forward, whether we're going to have a second term or whether we're going to watch the transfer of power unfold on January 20th, 2021.

Q Well, from listening to that answer, it sounds like it was about loyalty. Was the discussion about whether Patel would be more loyal or faithful to the President or his agenda than some of the others that he might replace?

A I don't recall the phrase "loyal" being raised, and I don't want to falsely attribute that word to anybody or any conversations that happened. Now, a lot of this was above my pay grade and --

Q Yeah.

A -- I am aware of it because of my proximity because of the role that I played, and I'm happy to continue answering these questions should we continue to move in this realm. I'm really not trying to be difficult on this, but I am just very, very cautious about using particular phrases because I wasn't present for the extensive conversations where it could have been brought up, and I wasn't aware of that at the time.

But at the same time, it's also natural for people to want to be surrounded by people, staffers, that -- I'll leave it there.

Q Yeah. Ms. Hutchinson, I appreciate that, and I'm not trying to get you to speculate about what's natural or about what was in other people's heads. I'm just asking you what you've heard and whether there was discussion about installation of people, Patel in particular, who would be -- and don't get hung up on the word "loyalty," but who would do things more consistent with what the President wanted versus the other people that he might replace. Did you hear conversation like that, and if so, you know, who expressed those views?

A I'm trying not to get hung up on the word "loyal," although it is tricky in this situation. Again, I'm just going to revert to my earlier statements, and I apologize for that, but I recall Mr. Meadows raising this and entertaining this at his level, which is the highest level you possibly could entertain a staffing decision on the Cabinet level, because it was something that he thought could potentially be worthy of taking action. And whether he thought Mr. Patel was an appropriate replacement or if there could be somebody else or if he was happy with the current individuals fulfilling those roles, I can't speak on his behalf. That's something that you would have to ask him because I -- he doesn't explicitly state that to me, his very personal opinions.

But I do know, because I was present for some of the conversations and he did talk to me about it, but it was something that he wanted to entertain and think about pursuing. But I don't know what drove him or anybody else involved to, at the time, make the decision that happened.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. Ms. Cheney or anybody else have a followup on that?

If not, okay, [redacted], go ahead.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q All right. If we could pull up exhibit No. 22, this is a text message exchange that you provided from [redacted]

A A man.

Q So, in this exchange -- I'll wait for you to pull it up.

A Sorry. I can see it up there for now too.

Q Okay. Whatever's easiest for you, Ms. Hutchinson.

A I'm okay looking at it up here for right now.

Mr. Passantino. I'll pull it.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. Well, I'll start by, it's dated December the 16th, at 10 p.m., and the message, it starts, you say: Sorry we're trying to stall. Wasn't sure how much longer I had to stall him. Can you tell Mark to call Pat Cipollone ASAP? Can you tell me when they connect ASAP? It's a POTUS emergency. Not emergency emergency but very time sensitive.

And then [redacted] says he's about to dial. You say: Okay. Perfect.

Do you remember what this was about?

A Is that the end of the conversation?

Q It goes on and continues. From what you produced, it's just one page.

You say: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, thank you. I'm sorry. Did you catch any of the convo with him and Pat? And then [redacted] says: Not really, he was stressed and said something to the effect of we can't do that tonight. Looked mad.

A I apologize. I don't have a calendar in front of me, but I believe December 16th was a Wednesday, like it was a week -- a day of the week.

Q I can confirm that.

A -- yeah. Or I just wanted to make sure it wasn't the weekend and --

Q That the 16th, I'll represent to you, was a Wednesday.

A Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that. I can't speak to it. I don't definitively recall what this one was about. And these -- I don't want to say happened frequently, but it happened on more than one occasion where Mr. Meadows had already left the White House and Mr. Cipollone had come in and asked for him and he wasn't there and -- and asked to get a hold of him. So, if you have any followup questions, you know, I'm --

Q I do. And, maybe as a point of reference, I don't know if these two things are connected or not, but if you go to exhibit No. 23, which you don't have, and we'll put it up on the screen, it's a draft executive order about seizing voting machines, dated December the 16th, 2020, so the same date -- at least it's dated the same date as the messages with [redacted] Does that refresh your recollection at all as to what the messages you exchanged with [redacted] were about?

A Would your staff mind scrolling down on that memo, please?

Mr. Passantino. And so you understand, the question is whether that document --

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah, right.

Mr. Passantino. -- refreshes your memory --

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah.

Mr. Passantino. -- as to what this was about.

Ms. Hutchinson. Broadly speaking, yes.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. Can you explain a little bit now that this refreshes you a little bit with respect to the messages in exhibit 22 with [redacted]?

A Mr. Meadows had already left, but White House Counsel's Office was still in the Oval Office with Mr. Trump. I recall Mr. Cipollone coming back, coming over to my office -- it was just me in there at the time -- and he had asked if Mark was still there. I said no, he had just left. And if Mark had left the White House but Mr. Trump was still down, I would stay at the White House. But if Mark left and Mr. Trump was already in the residence, I would firmly go with Mr. Meadows, which is why I was still there. And Mr. Cipollone had said something along the lines of, to me: Well, I need to get him on the phone right now. Can you try to call him?

I tried to call Mr. Meadows. He didn't answer. And then they connected. Mr. Cipollone went into Mr. Meadows' office, closed the door, and they had a private conversation. And then Mr. Cipollone went back to the Oval Office. And I remember Mr. Cipollone asking if I had a copy of that or if I knew if Mark did. I said: I'm not sure but I can ask him.

He said okay, and then he went back to the Oval.

Q Did you have a copy by that point of this draft executive order?

A I don't -- I don't think so unless Mr. Cipollone handed one to me in that moment.

Q And was it your understanding that Mr. Trump was asking the White House Counsel's Office about this draft executive order?

A That was the topic of conversation.

Q Did you ever find out what Mr. Cipollone's concerns were with respect to this executive order -- draft executive order?

Mr. Passantino. And same instructions before, cautioning you not to discuss the content of a communication between White House Counsel and the President or Mr. Meadows, if there were non- -- unless there were non-executive office personnel in the room.

Ms. Hutchinson. I was the only executive office person in the room, staffer in the room.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. Fair enough. And this is more of a yes-or-no question, but did you ever find out what -- or from Mr. Cipollone what his concerns were with this draft executive order? And you can just say yes or no. I'm not going to ask you to get into substance for the reason that your attorney just said.

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you ever talk to Mr. Meadows about this draft executive order?

A Not on the night of December 16th.

Q All right. Did you ever talk to him about the draft executive order after the 16th of December?

A He had raised contents of the executive order with me in discretion and as part of larger discussions, but I was never a participant in conversations with him or in groups that he was also a participant of discussing the executive order at length and in detail -- and in detail.

Q Okay. And now I'm just asking for, at this point, what Mr. Meadows said to you, not necessarily what the White House Counsel's Office said to you. So what parts

of this executive order do you remember Mr. Meadows raising with you, specifically?

Mr. Passantino. And I would only add -- you can answer that question -- just don't put in that answer what perhaps Mr. Cipollone might've said, but everything else you can answer.

Ms. Hutchinson. Just broadly speaking, Mr. Meadows had raised whether or not this was viable and legal from his personal perspective and, you know, kind of asked people that I felt and perceived as individuals he trusted the opinions of, about whether some of these ideas or concepts were a good or a bad idea.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Did Mr. Meadows ever express his opinion to you about whether this executive order was a good or a bad idea?

A He had mentioned that it might not be completely out of the question, but he was very receptive to legal implications and -- which I felt tilted him more towards it's not a good idea because of the legal implications, but theoretically speaking, he had thought there would be some viability to it.

Q Okay. Do you know where Mr. Meadows got this draft executive order?

A I'm not sure.

Q Did you ever receive it directly from anybody?

A It's very possible that, you know, he would've asked somebody to email it to me, to have for him in case he needed it when we weren't at the White House or I was in something with him. But, you know, I -- there were times I -- and this was embarrassing, but there were times that I had 500-plus unread emails in my inbox just because I received so much, and I would just sometimes look for names of things I knew I needed immediately. So I -- I don't remember, but it's very, very possible that I had this in my inbox.

Q Do you remember who sent it to you? It sounds like you may not, and that's okay, but do you remember who sent it to you?

A I wouldn't, I don't.

Q Did you ever find out who drafted this?

A No.

Q Okay. Were you ever told about anybody who had a role in drafting this?

A Drafting the language?

Q Correct.

A No. Not as laid out on this.

Q Do you remember whether anybody associated with the campaign, including Mr. Giuliani or people he was associated with, had any role in coming up with the idea for this executive order or drafting the language in this proposed executive order?

A I knew that there were some individuals that Mr. Giuliani was affiliated with that had a role in the ideas outlined in this executive order, but I'm not sure whether they assisted in, you know, articulating the language as laid out on the exhibit on the screen.

Q Do you remember how many draft executive orders related to seizures of voting machines were circulating in the mid-December timeframe? It's been reported that there were at least, I believe, two. One related to the Department of Defense, and one related to the Department of Homeland Security. Does that sound right to you?

A More or less correct, yes.

Q Do you remember any others?

A I don't remember.

Q Okay. And, if we can go to page 4 of this exhibit, the very last page, we're going to test your handwriting analysis skills, but there's a sticky note -- this is a document we received from the National Archives, and there's a sticky note stuck to it. At least

that's how it's represented to us -- that says from the VP to Pat C. Does that handwriting look familiar to you?

A I believe it is either Sara Sylvester, who worked for the Vice President -- she was his assistant -- or Kate Lair's handwriting. They always had very similar handwriting. And I -- it could very well be neither of those, but they both had very nice handwriting, and, you know, sometimes they would leave notes on my desk, and I would get confused and have to call them for verification.

Q Fair enough. And we won't hold you to your analysis of the handwriting, but do you know whether this document actually did come from the Vice President's Office or whether the Vice President's Office received it as well?

A I'm not sure.

Q Okay.

A Off the top, I'm not sure.

Mr. [redacted]. This may be another good place to take a 5-minute break if you guys are okay with that.

Mr. Passantino. Sure. Can you give us a sense of what you think our timeline is for Ms. Hutchinson?

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah, why don't we go off the record.

Mr. Passantino. Okay.

Mr. [redacted]. So we're off the record.

[Recess.]

Mr. [redacted]. Excellent. Then let's go back on the record. It's 4:15, and this is the continuation of the interview with Ms. Cassidy Hutchinson.

[redacted] [Inaudible.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. We're going to talk about a meeting that took place in the White House on the 18th, with various outsiders, including Sidney Powell, Patrick Byrne, Eric Herschmann, and others.

But, before I do that, I just want to see, do you know why the executive order that we just looked at, exhibit No. 23, was never signed by the President?

A On the night of December 16?

Q Or at any point.

A I don't know why it was never signed. I know, on the night of December 16th, the guidance was: Let's have a more thorough discussion about this.

I don't know the outcome of that discussion.

Q And that does raise another question. Do you know whether this executive order was actually ever signed?

A I'm not sure.

Q All right. So, on December 18th, we understand that there's a meeting in the Oval Office that involves Sidney Powell, Mike Flynn, Patrick Byrne, who is the former overstock.com CEO, Pat Cipollone, Eric Herschmann, Rudy Giuliani. I believe Derek Lyons was there for a part of it, as well as others. And, at this meeting, there were numerous conversations, some of which involved seizing voting machines, declaring martial law, naming Sidney Powell as special counsel, and other things. Do you know the meeting that I'm talking about?

A Yes, sir. Sorry, I'm over here?

Q Were you at that meeting?

A I was at the White House for that meeting. I never stepped into the Oval Office for the Oval Office portion of that meeting. We can talk about my movements throughout that night if you want to entertain those. They're not that exciting, but --

Q Okay. How did you -- do you know what happened in the meeting?

A There were many conversations that happened.

Q How did you learn about what happened in the meeting if you weren't there?

A Because I was physically at the White House at my desk, which was 35 feet from the Oval Office.

Q So could you hear what was happening in the meeting?

A -- points, and there were points that I stepped into the Oval secretary's office because they were trying to -- I'm looking for the appropriate word -- trying to phone Mr. Meadows, and trying to conference him in on the conference line because he'd already gone home for the evening.

And then there were points that participants in the meeting had briefly left, come back to my office, had conversations with me, and then gone back to the meeting.

Q Was this meeting prescheduled, or was it impromptu?

A It was impromptu.

Q Do you know how it came about?

A So I knew that these individuals were trying to get a meeting with Mr. Trump. I say "these individuals" -- Mr. Byrne, Ms. Powell, Mr. Flynn -- had been trying to get a meeting with Mr. Trump, and his schedule was busy, and there just wasn't time in his schedule for it. You know, how they got into the Oval Office that night, I still don't know.

And, at the time, I really didn't know, but I had heard that they were in there after Mr. Meadows had already left, and then, you know, other staffers had gone in, and that's kind of when I learned a little bit more about it.

Q You said Mr. Flynn. Is that Michael Flynn?

A That's correct.

Q Did you see Mr. Flynn and Ms. Powell and Mr. Byrne all there at the White House that day?

A During this meeting? Because we said "this day," so I just want to make sure you weren't referring to, like, earlier in the day prior to this meeting starting.

Q Yeah, around the time of the meeting.

A Yeah, yes. I mean, the first time I had seen them was when I -- like, physically seen them with my eyes -- was when I stepped into the Oval -- outer oval secretary's office.

Q And I also understand that Mr. Giuliani showed up for at least part of the meeting, maybe after the meeting had started. Is that right?

A Yes. If we're talking about the Oval Office meeting.

Q Correct. Is there another meeting that you're thinking of at the same time?

A No. But the meeting -- and it's been widely reported on, but the meeting did progress and moved into the residence portion of the White House later this evening.

Q And were you at that portion of it, in the residence?

A I was not in the yellow oval in the residence -- in the residence, but I had gone over to the residence three or four times over the course of that meeting.

Q Okay. And, when you went over to the residence during the course of that meeting, did you hear what was happening while you were there?

A Bits and pieces. Just as I had when I was in the West Wing for that portion of it too. And Mr. Meadows had come back to the White House for the residence portion of the meeting.

Q All right. Can you tell us everything you remember happening during that meeting in the Oval Office and then in the residence?

A Now, I mean I wasn't an active participant in the meeting, so I don't -- you know, contextwise -- thank you -- contextwise, it's difficult to pinpoint what I heard at the time. I just -- I recall the same topics that you had mentioned, meaning voter machines, potentially martial law being discussed, overhearing some of that, and then, you know, as people had taken a bit of a breather and come to the office to see me or get some space, had discussed it a little bit more. Mr. Meadows ended up coming back because the meeting was about to continue through the night.

[4:20 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So there's a report on this meeting from Axios, and it said something to the effect of the "craziest meeting in the Trump Presidency" or something like that. Do you know the report I'm talking about?

A I believe -- Jonathan Swan?

Q Yes.

A Yeah.

Q Or Swain. Swan or Swain. That's right.

A Yes. Yep.

Q Okay. Have you read that? Do you remember reading that article?

A I remember reading it a couple weeks after. I remember reading the New York Times article the next day, on the 19th.

Q And when you read those articles, did you remember anything that stood out as being wrong about them?

A I don't remember anything standing out as being wrong.

Q Okay. You say that with some -- like there's something else to it. Were there details that weren't reported? Is there something else?

A I mean, it was a long night, and the report came out fairly quickly. So, I mean, nothing that I can recall, nothing struck me that came out as it being, like, factually incorrect.

I think that there were a lot of questions raised about how it would kind of portray these stories to people, but -- why were they not more thoroughly vetted internally or, you know, press outreach on our end before the stories had gone live?

But now I can't recall anything that I read and I was like, you know, that's not how it happened.

Q Okay. That's really helpful. I appreciate that.

So, just to drill down on some of the specifics, though, it's been reported that this meeting included discussions -- and you, I believe, have confirmed it now, but I don't want to put words in your mouth -- that this meeting involved discussions about seizing Dominion voting machines and, I believe, using an executive order to do so.

Do you remember that?

A I remember that being a topic that was raised.

Q Okay.

And, in this meeting, I understand that Eric Herschmann and Pat Cipollone and maybe others from the White House Counsel's Office were present. Do you know what their opinion was -- or what they expressed -- excuse me -- in relation to seizing voting machines through an executive order or otherwise as they stated in that meeting?

A To the third parties present, they stated that the idea, the notion that was being pushed by the outside individuals was a nonstarter and out of the question from their perspective.

Q And do you remember who first brought up the seizing Dominion voting machines that White House Counsel thought was a nonstarter or out of the question?

A I don't remember the very first person that had -- and I wasn't in the room. But I don't remember the very first time that I heard the phrase "seizing voting machines," and I don't remember if I ever heard that night who the person was that had first mentioned that --

Q Okay.

A -- phrase in the Oval Office.

Q How about this? How about, who were the people advocating for seizing voting machines during that meeting? Was Mr. Trump advocating for it?

A I wasn't physically present in the meeting, so I'm not sure whether he was personally advocating for that.

Again, it was a meeting where there were ideas being discussed, so he was listening to the individuals that were saying that it was a viable option, just as he was listening to those who were countering that suggestion.

Q Is it fair to say -- and I don't want to put -- again, don't want to put words in your mouth. Is it fair to say that the White House guests that night -- Ms. Powell, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Byrne -- advocated to seize voting machines, whereas the White House Counsel's Office and White House employees were against that idea? Is that generally accurate, as you understand it?

A Yes, sir.

Q What about martial law? Do you remember who was advocating for the use of martial law related to the 2020 election during that meeting on the 18th?

A I'm broadly attributing to it to Ms. Powell, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Byrne, but I'm not sure of the first individual to mention the phrase "martial law" or the concept of martial law. And I'm not sure if there was one during that meeting -- at the time, I was not sure or wasn't aware of one person pushing it harder than any of the other people.

Q And do you remember whether the President, Mr. Trump, expressed his thoughts on declaring martial law to have some effect on the 2020 election?

A I'll just reference my earlier statement, which -- there was a discussion where there was two primary groups of people who had two very different opinions, and he was willing to listen to both sides of that. And it was happening around his desk, so you can't really avoid it, to an extent.

But I wasn't in the room. I can't attest to anything he said at the time or -- I'll leave it there.

Q Okay.

What did Mr. Cipollone or others from the White House Counsel's Office say about the possibility of using martial law related to the election during that meeting?

A Similar to their expressions to the third parties about seizing Dominion voting machines, which was a nonstarter, it was out of the question. It was not something that, on their watch, in their official capacity, they were willing to entertain.

Q I also understood that somebody, maybe Ms. Powell, proposed that she become a special counsel to investigate election fraud claims and that Mr. Trump told Mr. Meadows at some point to essentially prepare some background or security-type forms.

Does that -- right, as far as you remember it?

A That's correct.

Q And do you remember what White House Counsel Pat Cipollone or others from the White House Counsel's Office said in response to that idea?

Mr. Passantino. In that meeting. Right?

Mr. [redacted]. In that meeting. Correct.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah.

Ms. Hutchinson. I wasn't in the Oval Office. I'm not sure what they had said to the President in that moment. I know that they had conversations with Mr. Meadows about it, but I wasn't present for the conversations that happened in the Oval Office between White House Counsel and Mr. Trump about potentially bringing Ms. Powell on as an official White House employee, executive branch employee.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Do you know if Mr. Meadows ever did anything to actually bring her on, whether sending her the security forms or anything else to actually make that suggestion happen?

A I don't know if he sent anything to her or ever started a paper trail about that. But I do know that he wasn't particularly thrilled about that prospect and it wasn't something that he wanted to entertain and he did push back on that.

Q Do you know why he wasn't thrilled with that prospect and pushed back on it?

A I think that he just thought that it was inappropriate and the fallout of a decision like that outweighed any benefit that potentially employing Ms. Powell would have on the administration at this time.

Q Okay.

So, if we can go to exhibit 6, these are messages that you exchanged with Mr. Ornato about this meeting --

Mr. [redacted]. Before you go there, [redacted], can I --

Mr. [redacted] Go ahead.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q In terms, Ms. Hutchinson, of you've got, sort of, the Powell, Byrne, Flynn folks and Cipollone, Herschmann, and the others on the other side, where was Mr. Meadows on that dynamic? Was he like the President, just willing to entertain it, not pushing in either direction, or was he on one side or the other, as far as you could tell from your observations when you popped in or out?

A As far as I could tell from my observations from both my conversations with Mr. Meadows and knowing how he approached these conversations with external interests and White House Counsel, he publicly, in my opinion -- and I believe that this is

accurate and others would attest to this too -- played more of a neutral bystander at most points and wasn't overly enthusiastic about just having it be a flat-out "no" to Mr. Trump. But, you know, privately, he understood the repercussions of this decision -- or any of these decisions would play and did recognize that.

Q So, on these issues specifically, did he say to you that he had reservations but didn't say that to the President because for some reason he was worried about saying "no" to Mr. Trump, is I think what you said?

A He reached a point where it became a definitive "no" to Mr. Trump. But I also recall and know, leading up to that, he was delicate in his approach, to try to ensure that the aforementioned parties were, you know, all informed of his conversations with Mr. Trump and the direction that he was taking it.

Q And was that sort of consistent, Ms. Hutchinson, over this period of time, with Mr. Meadows playing more of a neutral role when it came to discussions about these election issues with the President? Was that a regular, sort of his standard approach when these issues arose?

A When you say "neutral," are we comparing it to either him being fervently against something or very much a proponent of something, or is it him neutral versus him just being a proponent?

Q No, "neutral" to me means not pushing in either direction but simply flagging the issue but not weighing in.

Here you've got a meeting where you've got two clearly contrasting sides, right, different pushes to the President. And I'm just trying to get a sense if Mr. Meadows was in the middle, just listening, or whether he was picking a side in this or generally other meetings.

A I'd say, overall, Mr. Meadows was fairly neutral. And Mr. Meadows also

admires people with strong work ethics and that, in his words, are doers. And he wanted to at least exhaust all of his resources to make sure that the election was thoroughly evaluated. And that, for him at the time, meant communicating with individuals on the outside.

But maybe we can go into that. But I also feel like that's -- if we're focusing on this, on this context, you know, it was neutral, if not in this particular instance leaning a little bit more to siding with the "no" team, as in, you know, "We're not doing this."

Q Yeah.

Well, separate from this meeting, did he ever share with you his general approach to dealing with the President, right -- I can or I can't say this or that -- or share with you, sort of, strategy or his approach to those conversations, particularly with respect to these issues, anything having to do with the election, between the election and the end of the administration?

A I think it's pretty obvious at this point that he was willing to hear theories and he was willing to have meetings that the President asked him to have, he was willing to have phone conversations, he was willing to exhaust all of his resources necessary in order to say that he checked all the boxes and he vetted as much as he could in the limited time that he had.

Might've that came with him having more conversations than one might agree he should've had? That's not my judgment to make. And it's not his -- you'd have to ask him, like, whether or not he felt that he was too neutral or too much in one camp or in the other. You know, I can't speak to that. Then I'm factoring my personal opinion into it, and that's not what I'm here to do.

Q I understand that. And believe me, we'd love to ask Mr. Meadows those questions directly at some point, and hopefully we'll get the chance to do that.

But all I'm asking you is whether he ever shared with you directly -- a very close professional colleague -- anything about his approach to dealing with the President, the things that he kept in mind as he raised these issues or did not raise issues with the President with respect to the election.

A I mean, again, like, he -- Mr. Meadows always wanted the President to feel that his opinions were being heard and that everything that the President asked him to do was being fulfilled and it wasn't just a blanket "no" for anything. You know, if Mr. Meadows ever said "no" to something, it was, "Sir, I think that that's not the best way of approaching this, but how about we do it this way?"

You know, he always did his best to try to find a resolution even if he were to say "no." But his goal was to always act and produce a result. And I think that's his method of leading, that's his method of -- was his method of being the chief of staff. You know, if it's not "no," it's "let's find a different route."

And sometimes it took him getting creative, but he always wanted to produce results for the President. And that meant that he entertained a lot of things and that he addressed most, if not all, of the President's concerns and lists of to-dos or asks.

Q Yeah, Ms. Hutchinson, again, I'm not asking you to judge what Mr. Meadows did or didn't do. I'm just asking whether he ever shared with you directly any thoughts about how he should or shouldn't approach the President, deal with the President, manage this issue with respect to his communications with the President.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. So do you understand? He's saying, did you hear him specifically say his philosophy of being the chief of staff?

Ms. Hutchinson. I guess the best way I could concisely say what I've been trying to convey in the last four to five questions is that he wanted --

Mr. Passantino. No, but I think -- you've definitely said, like, five times, like, what

your view is.

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah.

Mr. Passantino. But I think the specific question is, did he, like, have a specific -- is there a quote that you can -- I mean, as opposed -- you've given your assessment. I think he's saying --

Mr. [redacted] Yeah, I know what he -- yeah, thank you, Stefan, and I appreciate that.

Ms. Hutchinson. If you want --

Mr. [redacted] Yeah, go ahead. Sorry.

Ms. Hutchinson. If you're looking for a specific quote, you know, he would frequently say, you know, I'm his doer, I'm his guy, I want to find a way to do this for him.

But that didn't mean acting on everything exactly as the way the President wanted it approached. Not that that would've been a negative, but, you know, the point of a chief of staff or any close advisors that you have is to have contrasting opinions and to reach a different conclusion sometimes.

So, yes, he was the doer, he was the chief of staff to the President of the United States during a very unique period, and he had to get creative sometimes with how he would approach it, but his goal was to never say "no" to the President.

He always wanted to fulfill what the President was asking him to do, knowing that if he wasn't going to do it, somebody could eventually backfill that role who wouldn't have the President's best interests in mind. And Mr. Meadows at the time felt that he had the President's best interests in mind. And he was fearful that somebody else wouldn't and they'd be more selfish in that role.

Now, it's not my role to judge the possibility or even if that's a viable concern on his end.

But -- yeah, I don't know if that helps answer your question any better, like, that phrasing --

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Is that your opinion, Ms. Hutchinson, or is that what he said to you? "My job is to never say 'no' to the President," or, "I've got to be his doer" or "his guy," did he say things like that?

A He frequently said things like that.

Q Did he ever contrast his approach to the job to prior chiefs of staff in this administration?

A Over the course of his tenure as chief of staff, or in this period as relating to election fraud and the 2020 election as a whole?

Q I'm asking you whether he ever contrasted his approach to the job to the way others who were his predecessors approached the job. He's going to be different than John Kelly or Mick Mulvaney or Reince Priebus or some of the others.

A Those were the three. But I -- yeah, he did. But that's not, in my opinion, anything that's egregious or out of the question. Because if you are backfilling a role of somebody else that previously held it, you're naturally going to evaluate how they did that job and what may have worked, what may not have worked, and how you could potentially fill that role a little bit better.

So, you know, like, when I've taken other jobs, I've thought about who had it before me and what I thought that they did well and what I would do differently in that role. So, you know, there's a natural evaluation point of view that you have to look at and that he did look at.

In this period, he never said anything along the lines of, "If Reince was chief, he would've done it like this," "If Mr. Kelly was the chief of staff, he would've done it like

this," you know, and I don't know if that thought ever crossed his mind. I would love for you to ask him that question.

But, yes, bluntly speaking, he did evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of his predecessors.

Q Uh-huh. And is it fair to say that he viewed his role as chief of staff to be more accommodating, more "never say no," than the predecessors? In other words, was he more accommodating to -- sympathetic to the President's ideas, however rational or not, than his predecessors?

Has he said this? I'm not -- to be clear, I'm not asking for your opinion. I'm asking for what he told you about how he approached his role. We're just trying to get a sense of how he approached his role.

A Mr. Meadows had said that he felt that Mr. Trump was better filled by the leadership style of finding a way and a route to a "yes" than just saying "no," as some or a few of his predecessors had at points.

So he had the goal in mind to fulfill the President's wishes and requests and asks because he is the chief of staff to the President and that is fundamentally the job. And he felt that Mr. Trump would benefit the most from somebody that would help him find a path to the "yes."

Q And did he feel that way about everything, regardless of what the "yes" was or the idea was? The default answer was, "Find a way to 'yes'"?

A When you say "everything," do you mean --

Q Every --

Mr. Passantino. I mean, we are getting a little far afield here, right? I mean, we've beaten this to death. I mean, I appreciate what you're asking her, and she's certainly given it in the context of this and -- I mean, it's a pretty unfair position to put her

in.

Ms. Hutchinson. Again, I'm happy to keep answering. I mean, if you have -- when you use the term "everything," like, that's very encapsulating, and I --

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. I guess all I'm trying to say is -- or all I'm trying to ask, Ms. Hutchinson, is whether or not his approach, essentially a default "yes," was the same regardless of the issue or whether there were certain issues that he himself thought, "No way, we can't facilitate that" or "We can't" -- he would have a different approach depending on the underlying issue that was involved. Or is his approach the same regardless? The answer should start with "yes"; give the President what he wants.

Mr. Passantino. Well, and in fairness, that's not what she's testified to, given what -- she said, you know, find a way -- you know, don't -- again, let her testimony speak for itself.

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah. No. I appreciate that.

Ms. Hutchinson. Generally and broadly speaking, his goal was always "yes," and I think I've been very clear with that.

Were there instances where it was just a "no"? I am sure there were instances where it was just a "no." And I'm sure that he didn't love delivering that message. I couldn't name one off the top of my head right now. I was not present for even 20 percent of their personal conversations, one-on-one conversations in the Oval, in the Oval dining room, on the phone, on the plane.

He never wanted to be the person that said "no," because he didn't feel that it was appropriate for him to say "no" to the sitting President of the United States. He always wanted the President to feel that he was being heard and that the President's thoughts were at least being explored, because that was a request that he gave Mr. Meadows.

So, generally speaking, yes, his goal was always "yes." But, for instance, the night that we have severely detracted from, he did say "no," you know? I wasn't present for him saying "no," but I know that he said "no" about appointing Sidney Powell as special counsel. Now, whether it was entertained more in the earlier days, I'm not sure. That is what you'll have to ask him.

But, you know, he didn't like saying "no." His goal was to never just say "no." It was always to find a path to a "yes," even if that meant completely tweaking something in the approach to that.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Thank you.

Dan, you can get back into your questions about that meeting or otherwise.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Sounds good.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q All right. So if we can pull up exhibit 6, please, these are the messages with Tony, who I believe you confirmed last time was Tony Ornato.

And the first page of these say, "Flynn is still here." "And Sidney. there's a brawl."

You go on to say, "The west wing is UNHINGED."

And then on December 19th at 12:11 a.m., so just after midnight, you say, "Still here, but Rudy, Sidney and Flynn have left."

I assume these text messages are in the context of the meeting that we were talking about that started on December 18th. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

And if you go to the next page, page 2, of this exhibit No. 6, it shows a photo, and you say, "I take one photo for Mark of each of his days. Tonight, it was him escorting

Rudy off-campus to make sure he didn't wander back to the Mansion."

Last time we talked about potentially getting exact times for some of these. Would this be a place that we could come back to you and ask for the time of this photo on this message?

A I can pull it up right now, if you want the time.

Q We can do it later.

A Sorry. Okay.

Q Yeah. If it's easiest, I'll just give a group of them to Mr. Passantino. And that way, we don't have to stop here.

A Okay.

Q And earlier you mentioned that somebody had been walking, kind of, to your desk or the area where you were during the Oval portion of this meeting. Who was that? Was it one person in particular?

A Mr. Herschmann came to my desk a few times and we had conversations, and Mr. Cipollone came back one time. And this is all prior to Mr. Meadows coming back to the White House.

Q Okay. And so they were relaying to you some of the things that were happening during the meeting with Mr. Flynn and Ms. Powell and Mr. Byrne and others?

A That's correct.

Q All right.

So, once the meeting shifts up into the residence, what happened up there, to your knowledge?

A So the Oval meeting -- I apologize for rewinding a bit, but [inaudible] context to discuss what happened at the residence. But Mr. Meadows did not make it back to the White House until the group collectively in the Oval Office agreed that, you know,

they needed a 15-, 20-minute recess.

After Mr. Meadows left his house, he got off the conference line that -- you know, he was in and out on the line a few times. He had come back to the White House.

He'd gone up to the residence to have a conversation with Mr. Trump prior to the whole group convening in the Yellow Oval. I don't remember who went over there first or if everybody went over there in a group. But this conversation explored what was being discussed in the Oval Office but it was a little bit more in depth.

And in addition to Mr. Meadows coming back to the White House, Mr. Giuliani also came back to the White House -- or came to the White House that evening. Sorry. He was not there earlier in the day, to my recollection, but he came to the White House that night for the Yellow Oval portion of the meeting.

And, broadly speaking, from what I recall, the topics that were discussed in the Oval Office were discussed at more detail and length in the Yellow Oval Office with a little bit more guidance and objective counsel from, you know, Mr. Meadows, who was in charge of making such staffing decisions.

Q Okay. And so the Yellow Oval, when you say that, that's in the residence?

A That's correct.

Q And the people that were there, that went up to the residence portion of the meeting, did that include General Flynn?

A Yes. Yes, sir.

Q Sidney Powell?

A Yes, sir.

Q Patrick Byrne?

A Yes, sir.

Q Pat Cipollone?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do their --

A Mr. Lyons, Mr. Herschmann.

Q Okay. Who else? Was Emily Newman there for the residence portion?

A I don't remember. I don't even remember -- I don't know who she is, to be honest with you. I remember the other individuals and seeing them, but, yeah, I didn't know who she was then, and I'm not even sure I would recognize her today.

Q You said that Mr. Meadows provided counsel from his perspective. What did he say during this meeting? What were his views?

A I wasn't there, but I remember him briefly meeting in our office and in the White House Counsel's Office with White House Counsel Mr. Herschmann and saying that, you know, "I hear the ideas, but, you know, let's do our best to push back right now. I think that's what's best."

Mr. Passantino. Wait. So this meeting was --

Ms. Hutchinson. That's Mr. Meadows saying this to --

Mr. Passantino. Okay. But it's still a content of communication between client and attorney. I'm going to instruct you not to -- unless there was somebody else present who was not a White House person.

Ms. Hutchinson. No.

Mr. Passantino. Okay.

Ms. Hutchinson. For this portion, no. But it's --

Mr. Passantino. I know, but communications either way are attorney-client.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q And who called Mr. Meadows back to the White House for this meeting?

A So people had asked Mr. Meadows for several hours before this to come

back to the White House, and he was reluctant because he could dial in and he had worked several long days and it was a Friday. He just wanted to get home. And I believe he had family coming in town that weekend.

But once I had heard that the meeting had recessed and it was going to continue upstairs, I called Mr. Meadows. He didn't answer his phone, so then I called somebody on his detail and had them connect me with him. Because I wasn't at his residence; I was still at the White House.

And I told Mr. Meadows, "I really think you need to come back for this." And he said, "All right, can you tell my guys I'm going to the White House?", which "my guys" would be the Secret Service detail. So I did, and they coordinated the motorcade around to bring him back.

Q Okay.

When you got upstairs -- or, excuse me -- in the Yellow Oval portion of the meeting in the residence, did Mr. Meadows, to your knowledge, push back on the claims that were being asserted about voting machines and martial law and appointing Sidney Powell as a special prosecutor?

A I'm not sure if he pushed back on the claims of Dominion voting machines, because I wasn't there. But I know that he had pushed back on Ms. Powell being appointed special counsel.

And I know that he was not particularly inclined or fond of the idea of invoking martial law. I don't know if he entertained it as a possibility, but I know that he was fairly, if not very, firm in his guidance during the Yellow Oval portion of that meeting. And when I say I don't know if he entertained it further, I mean earlier in the evening or in the days prior.

Q And do you know what Mr. Cipollone and the White House Counsel's Office

said during the residence portion of that meeting? I believe Mr. Giuliani was there with you -- or was there as well?

A The attorneys, Mr. Herschmann, Mr. Lyons, all were very clear, as has been reported, that they would resign if this was approved. And I know that that did factor into Mr. Meadows' decision. He didn't want to lose them.

Q When you say "if this was approved, they would resign," what do you mean by "this"?

A If Ms. Powell had been appointed special counsel, if they had considered invoking martial law more in depth, which -- I don't know if it was ever even something that was, like, on the table, legitimately on the table.

But once it became clear that there would be mass resignations, including lawyers in the White House Counsel's Office, including some of the staff that Mr. Meadows worked closely with, you know, I know that that did factor into his thinking that night.

Q And these issues that came up, including seizing voting machines and appointing Ms. Powell as a special counsel and potentially imposing martial law, is it your understanding that those were being considered or proposed in order to change the outcome of the election and have Mr. Trump start a second term on January 20th?

A So, like the Mr. Eastman theories, it was something that external individuals felt could potentially be a constitutional and viable option to either stall certification of the election or to delay the inauguration or to assert that Mr. Trump had actually won. And there were theories -- you know, I can't speak to if Mr. Trump -- yeah, I'll leave it there.

Q Okay. Fair enough.

So, at that time -- I just want to get, we'll call it "atmospherics," but just an understanding of what the discussions were like at the White House.

By then, you know, the election had happened in November. The electoral college met and cast votes that, when counted up, showed the now-President Biden had won.

And here we are on December 18th. We're talking about a meeting that goes into the 19th. And was the focus -- was Mr. Trump's focus, to the best of your knowledge, at that point, had it turned to January 6th? Was he focused on that date because that was maybe the next step in the election process and declaring Joe Biden the winner?

A Could you repeat the first part of that question, please?

Q Yeah, sure. And, again, this is just for context, but the first part was that, by this point, December 18th-19th, in this meeting that we're just talking about, the election had been run and Mr. Biden was declared the winner; the electoral college met and cast votes that declared Mr. Biden the winner.

And so was the focus in the White House and Mr. Trump's focus, to the best of your knowledge, insofar as you could tell, now focused on January the 6th as the next date in the election process, so to speak?

A Naturally so, yes, because that was the next date that there was a significant event that was going to happen. You know, you couldn't backpedal the decisions and the dates that had already passed and change anything that had happened then, so his attention had then turned to, what can be done between today and the 6th?

Q Do you remember Mr. Trump talking about January 6th around this time, December 18th, in this meeting that we've just been talking about?

A I don't recall Mr. Trump having -- being present for any conversations that Mr. Trump had about January 6th. Or -- yeah. I don't recall Mr. Trump having those discussions or me being physically present for him specifically speaking about

January 6th.

Q Okay.

What is it in your mind that makes you think that the focus at this point had turned to January 6th? Was there any particular discussion with Mr. Meadows or others about January the 6th around this time?

A Mr. Meadows began his discussions about how to approach January 6th.

Q Around the time of this meeting?

A Roughly. You know, maybe a day before, maybe 2 days after, but within this general timeframe.

Q Okay.

And if we could pull up exhibit No. 24, this is a tweet that the President sent out on December the 19th. So, actually, it was at 1:34 in the morning on the 19th, so just an hour or so, maybe 2 hours, after the meeting ended and Mr. Giuliani and others left the White House.

You can go down to the middle of the page. This is very hard to see, the way it's formatted here, but I will tell you that it says December 19, 2020, at 1:42 a.m. Eastern Standard Time.

The tweet reads: "Peter Navarro releases 36-page report alleging election fraud 'more than sufficient' to swing victory to Trump." And then it has a hyperlink. "A great report by Peter. Statistically impossible to have lost the 2020 Election. Big protest in D.C. on January 6th. Be there, will be wild!"

Do you remember that tweet coming out on the 19th?

A I had Twitter alerts pushed to my personal cell phone, so I remember a tweet being pushed out, but, to be honest, most of the time, I ignored the Twitter alerts on my phone. So I don't remember if I ever opened it this night, but I remember seeing

it come up on my phone when I was driving home. And I recall, I believe, ignoring it. And I would've seen it either later that night or the next morning when I was on my way to the White House, but --

Q Do you remember any discussions in the White House about this tweet, particularly the part that says, "Big protest in D.C. on January 6th. Be there, will be wild!", around this time, so the 18th, 19th, 20th of December?

A Do I remember any discussions happening about that portion of the tweet?

Q Right.

A Not around this time, no.

Q Okay. How about ever? Do you remember anything about the fact that Mr. Trump said there was going to be a protest that will be wild?

A Yes.

Q Can you tell us about that and who was involved?

A I'd call it more as, like, tongue-in-cheek comments or, you know, them discussing contents of tweets. You know, Mr. Meadows would sometimes weigh in on tweets that Mr. Trump was going to put out or tweets that Mr. Scavino had drafted.

I don't remember the term "wild" being thrown around at this time. I don't remember any specific phrasing in my immediate recollection right now that was, you know, phrasing that they explicitly wanted used. But I remember generally the discussions of, you know, we want people to turn out, we want to get the word out earlier; that way, people have time to coordinate their travel plans, et cetera.

Q But you don't remember any discussion specifically about what Mr. Trump meant when he said "will be wild." Is that fair?

A In the context of this tweet, no.

Q Okay. Is there another context where you remember Mr. Trump talking

about having the protest, will be wild? The only reason I ask is because you just said not in this context, so I want to make sure I'm not missing something.

A And, again, I'm not attributing it to the term "wild," but he was excited about the big crowd, he was excited that his supporters were coming out to the rally on the 6th, so, you know, take that comment as you will.

I know that there will probably be individuals that misconstrue what I am intending to say, and that's really my goal, for that not to happen, but he was looking forward to his supporters being here, just as he had for most of his rallies. And that's not anything criminal. He's not -- it's not out of touch for him to look forward to something like that. And he wanted his people to be there. He wanted them to be excited about seeing him on January 6th.

So, yeah, there was discussions about how large the crowd size would be.

Q Okay.

And so, at this point, though, on December 19th, are you familiar with any plans to actually have a rally on January 6th, when the President issued this tweet, again, on the 19th?

A The rally specifically, no. Now, as the days have progressed, that's when I started hearing about a rally. But I remember probably, like, 2 or 3 days before this Mr. Meadows talking about January 6th and, you know, we could have events or, like, what maybe we should do on that day if, you know, it came to that.

Q Did Mr. Meadows think, you know, around this time, that there should be a protest, whether wild or not, on January 6th in Washington related to the joint session?

A Mr. Meadows was supportive of considering a rally or an event in Washington, D.C., on January 6th. I think there maybe were more ideas thrown around that I'm not aware of, but I know rally was one of them.

Q Before we get off this tweet too, you know, the first part of it talks about Peter Navarro releasing a "36-page report alleging election fraud 'more than sufficient' to swing victory to Trump."

Do you know whether Mr. Meadows was involved in the preparation of that report in any way?

A I don't know, but I'm strongly inclined to say that he was not involved with any of Mr. Navarro's activities during this time.

Q Why do you say that?

A Mr. Navarro oftentimes operated on his own time and on his own prerogative, and there were often times he attempted to raise things of this nature to Mr. Meadows during this time period that, you know, Mr. Meadows respectfully declined.

Q Okay.

On December 21st -- if we could pull up exhibit 25 -- we briefly touched on this before, I believe, but there was a meeting in the Oval Office with Members of Congress, and Mr. Meadows ended up tweeting about it.

If we can go to page 5 of this exhibit.

This is a text chain that you produced with Eliza. I believe it's Elizabeth Thurston. Is that correct?

A Eliza, but yes.

Q Okay.

And on December 21st, at 1:22 -- it's actually on page 5 -- you asked, "Did matt gaetz come to our office?"

And she says, "Yes he's in with Mark." "Rudy is stuck at the gate bc he brought in an unscheduled guest. There are a number of other members in the lobby."

You say, "Oh my gosh ok."

And then she says, "Matt just walked out."

So can you tell us what was happening on the 21st at the White House as it relates to these messages?

A This is around the time that the meeting with the Members of Congress was set to begin in the Cabinet Room.

Q Okay. So this Cabinet Room meeting, who called the meeting?

A I don't remember who coordinated all the logistics for this meeting.

Now, 99 percent of the time, meetings with Members of Congress, whether Mr. Meadows would participate or Mr. Trump would participate, were elevated to me, and then I would disseminate any information to the Office of Legislative Affairs to coordinate logistics for the meeting.

But, this meeting, I don't recall if -- I know I didn't coordinate the logistics for it. I remember Mr. Meadows telling me about this meeting, telling me to come up with a group of Members. And then I remember reaching out to Mr. Jordan, Jim Jordan, to ask if they already had any in mind, and they said, yeah, they'll send those over to Mark.

And then I believe that I had told Mr. Haidet, the President's scheduler, you know, just put it on the calendar and we will, like, work from there.

So it was kind of a little bit more of a -- I don't want to say "impromptu," but not a very formally scheduled event.

Q My understanding is that the purpose of this meeting was to talk about what would happen during the joint session of Congress on the 6th. Is that right?

A That's accurate. Correct.

Q And we're going to get into exactly what happened with that, but I first want to go through some of the people who were there.

Did the President participate in this meeting on the 21st in the -- I believe you said

Cabinet Room?

A He briefly came in.

Q Just briefly?

A We might have contrasting opinions and definitions of "briefly," but he was not in there for the entire duration of the meeting.

Q Okay.

Was Mr. Meadows there for the meeting?

A He briefly participated. He didn't have a seat at the table, and he didn't participate in the entire meeting. He, I believe, stepped in and out four or five times and maybe possibly was in there for 15 to 20 minutes. I might be being generous with that --

Q So --

A -- timeframe, but --

Q I'm sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Hutchinson.

A I might be generous with the 15- to 20-minute timeframe. I don't know specifically, but, you know, roughly, possibly, that's probably how much time he spent in that meeting.

Q Was the Vice President in that meeting?

A He did go into the meeting, again, I don't believe from start to finish, but he did spend time speaking with the Members, listening to the presentation, listening to concerns.

Q Okay. Did he have his staff with him, like Marc Short or anybody else?

A He brought Marc Short in with him and his director of legislative affairs, Chris Hodgson.

Q Was Mr. Giuliani at that meeting?

A He was.

Q Who else from his team do you remember being there?

A I don't remember anybody else that was in there and had accompanied Mr. Giuliani to that meeting.

Q Was Phil Waldron there, somebody we talked about earlier, if you remember?

A I don't remember if Mr. Waldron was there.

Q How about John Eastman? Was he at that meeting, to the best of your knowledge?

A To my knowledge, he was not there.

Q All right.

And then we have a number of House Members. I believe they were from the House Freedom Caucus. Is that right, generally?

A That's accurate, generally.

Q Okay. So did that include Jim Jordan?

A Yes, Mr. Jordan was there.

Q Andy Biggs?

A Mr. Biggs was there.

Q Mo Brooks?

A Mr. Brooks was there.

Q Matt Gaetz?

A Mr. Gaetz was there, although I don't believe Mr. Gaetz is a part of the Freedom Caucus.

Q Okay. How about Marjorie Taylor --

A [Inaudible.]

Q Sure. How about Marjorie Taylor Greene?

A Was not at the time a member of the Freedom Caucus, as she was still Congresswoman-elect, but, yes, Ms. Marjorie Taylor Greene was there.

Q How about Louie Gohmert? Was he there?

A Mr. Gohmert was there.

Q Do you remember anybody else who was there from the House or the Congress?

A Mr. Hice, Jody Hice; Mr. Gosar, Paul Gosar; I believe Ms. Lesko, Debbie Lesko of Arizona.

And there was also a handful of others that were there that I -- Mr. Perry definitely spoke. I can't remember if he was dialed in or if he was physically present though. They dialed in a few Members over the course of that meeting.

Q Okay.

What do you remember -- were you in that meeting the whole time?

A Not the entire time, no.

Q Okay. What do you remember from that meeting? What happened?

A A few Members expressed their opinions and their thoughts on January 6th, what they believed that the Vice President's role could potentially be --

Q Can I stop you there?

A Yes.

Q On that issue in particular, the Vice President's role and what they thought it would be, what was it? What was the conversation like?

A They felt that he had the authority to -- pardon me if my phrasing isn't correct on this, but -- send votes back to the States or the electors back to the States, more along the lines of the Eastman theory. I'm not very well-versed on it, and I

apologize for that.

Q That's quite all right. That's exactly right. So Mr. Eastman said that the Vice President would have, among other things, the authority to count certain votes or to delay the certification and send votes --

A Right.

Q -- back to the States.

A Okay. To send the votes back to the States, not the delegates or the electors, but, yes, send the votes back.

Q Okay.

And did both of those things, either the Vice President's power to count or not count and also his power to send the votes back to the States, did they come up in that meeting on the 21st?

A They did.

Q And did anybody in that meeting disagree with the idea that the Vice President had the authority to do that, either of those options?

A I don't recall anybody speaking out and definitively expressing disagreement with that theory. I believe I am not out of line for -- I don't want to say "speculating" -- for saying that the Vice President's team appeared slightly skeptical.

But, you know, again, I wasn't present from start to finish, but I don't recall in my presence or immediately afterwards hearing feedback from Members, anybody, you know, saying anything that would have been perceived as controversial, which would've been, "No, actually, the Vice President doesn't have that theory, and here's why."

Q Okay.

Do you remember the Vice President or Mr. Short saying anything about this idea during the meeting?

A I don't remember any specifics of what they said. I remember Mr. Pence asking a few questions here and there. I remember Mr. Short pushing back a little bit on some of the theories. I don't recall the specifics of what he pushed back on, and it wasn't anything that I had interpreted as him -- as Mr. Short trying to start a heated debate over it. It was more just rhetorical.

Q Was anybody from the White House Counsel's Office present for that meeting?

A Not that I can remember, but it's possible that they stepped in when I wasn't there. They were sitting along the back of the wall.

Q It sounds like earlier you mentioned a presentation or a PowerPoint that came up related to this meeting. Was there somebody presenting on this idea, or was it more of an open forum for discussion?

A I remember there being a few paper copies of a PowerPoint on the table. I remember Mr. Giuliani having conversations about the contents of those PowerPoints, but I don't recall if it was -- how formal those discussions were. You know, "Everybody turn to page 3, and let's discuss the content on this page."

Q Okay.

So that's one topic that came up, the power of the Vice President on the joint session of Congress on January the 6th. I stopped you as you were going through other things that came up. What were some of the other things that came up during that meeting?

A You know, honestly, I believe that was the bulk of the meeting. Mr. Trump came in, and Members talked to him about how they felt people in their States were receiving it, you know, what they were hearing in their States, had they heard anything that was worthy of elevating to him. And Members love to engage in

conversation -- loved to engage in conversations with the President, so it was a -- everybody kind of battled for their time with him in those moments.

But, you know, I perceived the primary bulk of that meeting to be about the Vice President's role and what that might look like on January 6th.

Q Did the topic of objections and needing to have a Member of the House, along with a Senator, make an objection to a State's electoral colleges votes, did that come up?

A I don't remember. And there weren't any Senators present for that meeting.

[5:20 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. But you don't remember any House Members talking about making objections or debate about a certain State's votes?

A I remember House Members discussing how they would approach it on the House floor, but I don't recall them discussing a Senator's or multiple Senators' role. Now -- but, again, I wasn't in there for the entire duration of the conversation. So possible that that came up, I just -- I wasn't there and I don't recall.

Q What do you remember about that discussion about how the House would proceed during the Joint Session?

A That the Members present for the meeting on December 2lst were planning to object to the electoral college and that they would enforce speeches about social media posts, make sure that they were being -- media circuits that were all on message with what -- with what the -- I'll leave it there.

Q Okay. Did they talk about the need to provide evidence of fraud in the election as part of the Joint Session?

A We talked -- there were some Members that mentioned evidence of fraud in their own individual States, which was, oh, we heard X from these individuals, we'll get you the data, and having that be sent over to the campaign or Mr. Giuliani or Mr. Meadows.

Q Did any of them think that they wouldn't be able to prove fraud during the Joint Session to change any -- the outcome of the Joint Session?

Mr. Passantino. You mean did they say it or did they think it?

Mr. [redacted]. Say it. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't remember any Members mentioning at that time that there might not be a sufficient amount of evidence to change anything on the 6th during this meeting.

Mr. [redacted]. During this meeting, did any of the Members talk about or say that they wouldn't have the votes to actually do anything during the Joint Session; there would just be an objection that would get voted down? Did that come up?

Ms. Hutchinson. No. I don't recall any Member saying anything along those lines, but --

Mr. [redacted]. Let me ask it a different way. Did the Members who were present for that meeting on December 2lst think that their objections would be successful and that it would change the outcome of the Joint Session on the 2lst?

Mr. Passantino. Did they say it or think it?

Ms. Hutchinson. They said that there was a possibility that it could.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q That it could have an effect on the outcome?

A That's correct.

Q Who said that, if you remember? And did anybody push back on that?

A Let me think if there was -- they all said something along those lines. I don't recall anybody adamantly pushing back in the context of, you know, this is hypothetical, but Mr. Gohmert saying, you know, This is going to work, and Mr. Short saying, No, it's not, and this is why.

Although it's possible those exchanges happened when I wasn't in the room, I don't recall anything of that nature. The most explicit thing that I recall is, you know, the members were saying, It's possible, it's possible, it's possible. You just have to get the right people on our team. We have to make sure that we have a coordinated effort

here. And, you know, people saying like, yes, you know, this could go wrong, but we can maybe encourage that bump in the road with this method, you know. And I don't recall the specifics beyond that. But it was more just conversational, preliminary discussions, from what I recall, during the portion especially when it was just the Members with Mr. Giuliani. It was a little bit more formal when Mr. Pence and Mr. Trump came in, but --

Q In that meeting on December the 2lst, do you know if Mr. Pe- -- or excuse me -- Mr. Trump told Mr. Pence that he had the power and the ability to count or not count certain votes or send the votes back to the States?

A I don't know if he said anything like that during this meeting.

Mr. [redacted]. Anything else on this meeting before we move on?

Okay. I am going to have exhibit 25, please, page 6.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q This is back to the text messages with Ms. Thurston. And this is from December the 22nd. She asks you if Roy Blunt called you. She says, I missed him, then called him back and said he talked to another young lady.

You send a laughing response. And you say, Yes, I did. He just said have Mark give me a call when he has a few minutes. I texted him and left him a voicemail. Nothing time sensitive. Just want to catch up.

So Mr. Blunt, that's a U.S. Senator, correct?

A That's correct.

Q Do you know why he wanted to talk to Mr. Meadows on December 22nd?

A Mr. Blunt and I would personally communicate a lot. You know, he knew that Mark was difficult to get ahold of a lot of the time. If I recall correctly -- now, December 22nd was a Sunday, right? Maybe it wasn't a Sunday.

Q I think you have a better sense of dates, quite frankly, than I do. But let me look it up if it's helpful.

A It might be just a little helpful just because --

Q The 22nd is a Tuesday.

A Okay. A Tuesday, 8 a.m. It wasn't anything about the election, but this --

Q Okay. Then I can stop you there.

A [Inaudible] the NDAA or -- but it was about other pending legislation in Congress.

Q Okay. Not the election and not the Joint Session?

A Correct.

Q Very good. So I think we can move on.

I understand around that time Mr. Perry may have introduced the President to Jeff Clark. Do you -- what do you know about that, if anything?

A I don't know anything about Mr. Perry's introduction of Jeff Clark to Mr. Trump.

Q Do you know approximately when Jeff Clark started coming around the White House? I understand he was there quite a few times in late December.

A [Inaudible] I do remember him coming to the White House frequently in late December, especially after Mr. Meadows had gotten back -- Mr. Meadows and I had both gotten back to the White House from a very, very, very brief Christmas.

Q Okay. So that's post-Christmas. And to be clear, do you know if Mr. Perry introduced Mr. Clark to the President or you don't know?

A No, I'm not sure. I'm not sure. To be honest, that's the first time I've heard of that. I know that Mr. Clark was at one point introduced to the President and that's when he started coming around more, but I'm not sure that Mr. Perry made that

introduction or would have gave that introduction. Sounds odd to me, but --

Q I understand that there's a meeting that Mr. Clark had in the residence with the President and potentially Scott Perry as well. Do you know anything about that meeting?

A No.

Q Okay. Do you know --

A I don't think Mr. Perry ever went to the residence.

Q I'm sorry?

A I don't think Mr. Perry ever spent time in Mr. Trump's residence.

Q Do you know if Mr. Meadows was in touch with Jeff Clark?

A Frequently.

Q Okay. Do you know how that started or why it started, what the purpose of it was?

A No. I just came -- recognized Mr. Clark as somebody that was assisting the efforts with the ongoing election investigation litigation in the White House.

Q Do you know if Mr. Clark was working with Mr. Giuliani and his team?

A Mr. Clark came to meetings that Mr. Giuliani was also in that also met -- meeting with Mark, Mr. Meadows. And I remember Mr. Clark's frequent presence and his frequent outreach and communications, but I don't remember specific meetings or know who he would have come with for what meeting. He was around a lot of people in a time when there was -- I'm not trying to be vague, but there was a lot of people around and present and were in and out of rooms, so --

Q Do you know what Mr. Clark -- or were you present for any meetings between Mr. Clark and the President?

A Not in the room, no.

Q Okay. Do you know what happened in any meetings between Mr. Clark and the President, other than January 3rd? That was with a lot of leadership with the Department of Justice, and we don't need to get to that one yet.

A Yet.

I'm sorry. Could you restate your question?

Q Yeah, sure. Other than January 3rd, are you aware of any meetings that Mr. Clark had with the President?

A I remember him coming to the White House for meetings with Mr. Trump. And, you know, I -- all -- almost all -- almost all, if not all, meetings Mr. Trump had, I had insight on. So, yes, I remember him coming to meetings with Mr. Trump. But, again, just bringing it back to what I previously said, I don't know if it was Mr. Giuliani who had brought him, if it was Mr. Trump who had personally called him, like, who had coordinated all these efforts and who was in the room for these meetings. But I do remember he might have had a meeting with Mr. Trump or Mr. Trump and Mr. Clark having communications because Mr. Meadows was then involved in those conversations.

Q Okay. And on that point, how would Mr. Meadows communicate with Jeff Clark, do you know?

A Like on cell phone or by snail mail?

Q Sure. Cell phone, text messages, Signal application.

A I've only known Mr. Meadows to communicate with Mr. Clark on his official work phone and -- definitively his official work phone.

Q Okay. And do you know what happened in the meetings between Jeff Clark and the President, or Mr. Meadows, for that matter? And specifically I'm interested in learning why -- or what the President or Mr. Meadows thought Mr. Clark could do in his role at the Department of Justice.

A I don't know specific actions that they thought he might be able to take or that they wanted him to take, but I know that there were conversations about him being -- having his position elevated at the Department of Justice and whether or not that was a viable possibility, if there was any grounds to make that happen.

Q What would be the point of elevating him? Why did they contemplate it? Kind of like the Kash Patel conversation that we had earlier. What did they say the reason of elevating Jeff Clark would be?

A [Inaudible] conversations between Mr. Meadows, Mr. Trump, Mr. Clark, I'm not sure. I wasn't physically present in the Oval Office for those conversations.

Q Okay. Well, what was your understanding, just from working at the White House and with Mr. Meadows, about why Mr. Trump or others were contemplating elevating Jeff Clark in the Department of Justice?

A I believe that the way to phrase it is just that the idea at some point had been mentioned, and when there was an idea mentioned either to the President or to Mr. Meadows and that it could be elevated to Mr. Trump's level, it was worthy of vetting internally. And I know that there was -- I recall there being controversies and opinions about Department of Justice staff that DOJ officials had raised with me when they came to me, with Mr. Meadows. Prior to meetings with him, you know, people at the Department of Justice have reached out to me, got ahold of Mr. Meadows when he was in Georgia for Christmas. In terms of elevating Mr. Clark specifically, I'm not sure because I wasn't present for those conversations.

Q To the best of your knowledge, did the White House -- anyone in the White House consider elevating Mr. Clark so that he could have a role in election-related investigations?

A Mr. Clark having a role in election investigations would have been a natural

role for him to take on had he been elevated at the Department of Justice, given what was happening at the time, so yes.

Q Was that one of the reasons he was contemplated, though, as being elevated to a leadership position at the Department of Justice, to the best of your knowledge?

A I'm not sure how -- I'm not sure how legitimate that reason was as opposed to others that may have been entertained that, you know, I wasn't aware of, but I remember that one being mentioned.

Q Okay. So that was one of the reasons that he was contemplated for elevation?

A And just to be clear, because he would naturally have insight on that, if he were to be elevated, given what was happening at the time.

Q I guess I just want to make a clear distinction, though, Ms. Hutchinson, because you're right, I think anybody who sits a top of the Department of Justice would have that role. But being considered for that role because of the fact that he may take some actions in election-related investigations or otherwise is a little bit different.

So is it your understanding that the President or others considered elevating Mr. Clark because he would have -- he would take a different approach to election-related investigations or litigation?

A I'm not sure if that was the intention or the sole reason.

Q Okay. You're saying sole reason. But was it a reason that was discussed?

A It was -- it was absolutely mentioned, but I'm not sure if that was the goal or the intent in elevating him because I wasn't present for those discussions and I wasn't let in on how extensive those conversations were. I just remember Department of Justice officials talking to me about Mr. Clark being elevated and that being one point of concern

for them, and those conversations being elevated to Mr. Meadows and Mr. Meadows discussing that with me and with others in the West Wing at the time.

But there could have been a different reason. There could have been 15 reasons that this was being entertained. That's the one that I remember right now, but, you know, I -- I wasn't in charge of staffing departments and agencies, so -- and to be frank, I wasn't really paying attention that much to that. So I don't recall many specifics about those conversations.

Q Okay. Fair enough.

If you could pull up exhibit 35, please, specifically page 2.

What we're going to show you is a letter that Department of Justice provided. We understand Mr. Clark had a role in drafting a letter, and it's addressed as a proof of concept, essentially, to various State legislatures -- the one that's mentioned here is Georgia -- and asking them to call themselves into special session and look at issues related to fraud in the election and, if appropriate and necessary, take action.

Do you remember whether anybody at the White House asked Mr. Clark to draft a letter like this to State legislatures that would be sent by the Department of Justice?

Mr. Passantino. Hey, having nothing -- I'm kind of at the break point here, and I think Ms. Hutchinson would like to take a break.

Mr. [redacted]. Sure.

Mr. Passantino. I'm sorry. Do you mind if we take a 5-minute break before we get into a new topic?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course. This is the last little bit on this Department of Justice topic, but we can do it now. It's totally up to you guys.

Ms. Hutchinson. Again, I'm not trying to be difficult or mess with you all. I just -- I want to make sure I like -- I just need a minute to walk around for a second.

Mr. [redacted]. Of course. Take your time, Ms. Hutchinson.

We'll go off the record.

[Recess.]

Mr. [redacted]. All right. So let's go back on the record. It's 5:46 in the interview of Ms. Cassidy Hutchinson.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q So we left off on exhibit No. 35, which is a letter that Jeffrey Clark was involved in drafting. And it's kind of a proof of concept letter where the Department of Justice in theory would ask various States to call themselves into session -- State legislatures, rather, to call themselves into session and look at issues related to purported fraud in the election and then take any appropriate actions as necessary.

The question to you is, Ms. Hutchinson, do you know whether anybody at the White House, including the President or Mr. Meadows, asked Mr. Clark to draft a letter like this that would be sent on behalf of the Department of Justice?

A I don't remember anybody at the White House asking to draft this letter. I remember Mr. Meadows asking to see a copy of the letter.

Q Who did he ask for a copy of the letter?

A I believe Mr. Clark.

Q Do you know what Mr. Meadows did with the copy once he got it?

A I'm not sure.

Q Do you remember if there were any discussions about this letter or the ideas discussed in this letter about calling -- having the Department of Justice effectively send a letter asking State legislatures to call themselves back into session?

A Could you repeat the last part of that question again?

Q Yeah. Do you remember if -- well, let me back up.

You said you don't know what Mr. Meadows did with this letter once he received it, correct?

A Correct. That's correct.

Q And do you remember, were there any discussions about this letter or the ideas in the letter about having the States call them -- State legislatures call themselves back into session to evaluate issues related to the election at DOJ's request?

A I remember the ideas -- that concept being discussed, broadly speaking. I remember Mr. Meadows mentioning it in meetings and once or twice in passerby conversation with me, but nothing that would indicate his opinion on it, just as something that, you know, was outlined in this letter and, you know, was the topic of conversation at the time. But I wasn't privy to any of those conversations extensively.

Q Do you know whether the President advocated for this idea to have the Department of Justice send a letter like this?

A At the time, I'm not sure whether the President advocated for DOJ to send a letter like this.

Mr. [redacted]. Any questions on the Department or this letter?

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. All right. So on December 22nd, I understand that Mr. Meadows went to Cobb County in Marietta, Georgia, specifically, where an audit was being conducted of signatures related to ballots cast in the 2020 election.

Did you go with Mr. Meadows on that trip?

A I did not. I was at the White House that day. He asked me to stay behind because he left before Mr. Trump left for Florida, and that way at least I was there in case he needed anything on our behalf and he couldn't get ahold of Mr. Meadows.

Q Did you at any point go to Georgia while Mr. Meadows was on this trip in

late December?

A I did not.

Q Do you know what the purpose of Mr. Meadows going to Georgia was during this signature review?

A The primary purpose of this trip was to visit family. His son lives in Georgia, and they went down to see his son for Christmas. Conveniently, his son lives in close proximity to Cobb County, and Mr. Meadows had discussed at length coordinating any visits with Georgia State officials during this trip.

Q I understand that he did meet with some Georgia officials, including Jordan Fuchs, I believe is how you pronounce her name. What was the purpose -- your understanding of what was the purpose of him meeting with Ms. Fuchs?

Mr. Passantino. Which one? Okay.

Ms. Hutchinson. He met with Ms. Fuchs at Cobb -- at the Cobb County when he went to see the ballots being counted. I'm trying to pull them up here. There was a few other officials there too.

He agreed -- can you guys hear me okay?

Mr. [redacted]. Yeah, we can hear you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Sorry. We got a warning notification.

I'm sorry. I lost my train of thought.

Mr. Meadows and Mr. Trump had conversations about what Mr. Meadows could potentially do down in Georgia. Now, there was a point where I was going to go with him because he was going to conduct a few more meetings, but then it was decided that he would make it a little bit more informal and casual, which is when he decided to go watch the ballots being counted.

I'm not sure if he reached out to Ms. Fuchs directly to coordinate that. However,

I got a call from her later that day, and he went there with the intention of speaking to the volunteers and the staff members that were counting the ballots and reevaluating the ballots cast on November 3rd.

And then there were a few other Georgia State officials that were present at that time. Now, whether they were present because there was official business going on or because they knew that he was going to be there, thus, they wanted to meet with him, I'm not sure. But that's the overall gist of this particular visit.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q What did he think he could accomplish, if you know, by speaking to the people who are doing the signature verification on ballots?

A He wanted to do more of a status check to see where they were at with things, if they had thoughts that they needed any more resources, if there was anything that the White House could do to help ease the process along. If they needed, like, bodies, there were campaign officials that had been, you know, off-boarded and were looking for jobs, so -- our campaign officials -- the Trump campaign officials, I should say. But -- and then just had conversations with the Georgia State officials about what they were hearing from the State about status of the election and, you know, if there was significant evidence to their knowledge at that point.

Q Significant evidence of fraud or irregularities in the election?

A That's correct. I apologize for not specifying.

Q No. That's quite all right. That's my job.

So if you go to exhibit 27, please.

This is a text exchange that you had with somebody named [redacted] with the initials [redacted] Do you know who that is?

A Yes. [redacted] -- I'm trying to remember his appropriate title. He

was [redacted] on Mr. Meadows' Secret Service detail. He was traveling with him on that trip.

Q Do you remember his last name?

A [redacted]

Q So on December 22nd at 4:20 -- 5:20 -- I'm sorry -- you asked, Any clue why Mark is asking for 50 POTUS challenge coins, question mark.

[redacted] responded, The GBI team that was here doing the signature match comparisons. It's the OTR site we went to today.

And then if you go to page 2 of this exhibit, it's messages you exchanged with [redacted] on December 30th, 2020, at 10:34 in the morning, and you say: Side note - but remember when he did the drop-by of the ballot-counting place in Georgia? Do you remember the address or anything about who he saw?

I'm supposed to get a shit load of POTUS stuff together, parenthesis, coins, actual autographed MAGA hats, et cetera, close parenthesis, to mail to them, but he has given me no further guidance. LOL.

I figured I'd ask you before I ask him again.

Can you tell us about this conversation that you had with [redacted] first on the 22nd when Mr. Meadows was in Georgia and then on the 30th about challenge coins and memorabilia that you were supposed to get together?

A Yes. I apologize for asking this question, but would you mind being a little more specific as to the context you're looking for?

Q Yeah. I guess, it sounds like you received a message from Mark asking for 50 POTUS challenge coins. So, I guess, tell us about that and what you understood the ask to be and what the purpose of it was.

A Yeah. Mr. Meadows had reached out to me, which I guess requires me to

give a little bit more context just generally speaking. But whenever we would travel, I would pack a bag that we would bring with us or the military aide would bring to our sites, and it would have Mr. Meadows' challenge coins, you know, little things that he would like to pass out to people. He would do this at rallies. He would do this at official events.

And this was just part of the President's philosophy of always wanting people to feel included, and it does make people feel special. We gave things to Democrats as well. It's not a partisan thing, I don't believe. But, you know, every White House -- not every White House top official gets to give out.

But, you know, in this particular instance, when he reached out to me and asked me to start getting things together, he would be bringing it to Georgia or we'd be sending it to Georgia. And I believe at this time he had maybe discussed doing one more trip before the 6th that him and I would do together after he had gotten back from Christmas. So I don't know if he said bring or if he -- it might be on my official text messages, but -- if he said bring or, you know, but I took that as more of a we're going to send things to them as a sign of gratitude for everything they're doing, working overtime to count the ballots and make sure everything's taken care of before the election is certified.

Q And when you say send it to them, you're talking about the people who are actually on the ground doing the signature verifications and counting the ballots?

A Right. And I remember having a conversation with Ms. Fuchs -- I remember one conversation I had with Ms. Fuchs about this. There was a distin- -- there were two distinguished groups. There was one of, I believe, paid staff or paid government officials that were there supervising, and there was a larger team of volunteers. And Mr. Meadows wanted the gifts to go to the volunteers. Also, I believe he wanted to send a few things to the paid staffers. But he was primarily focused on making sure that the

volunteers who were there working for free to have something from the White House as a sign of gratitude and thanks.

Q Earlier you mentioned that the chief of staff would often pack bags with things like chief of staff challenge coins and otherwise. This is specifically about Presidential challenge coins.

Do you know if the President wanted you or others to make sure Presidential challenge coins and autographed memorabilia made their way to the volunteers in Georgia?

A So this is in the context of this text message too. The President challenge coins were a little bit more coveted and difficult to come across, where we had dozens, if not hundreds, of Mr. Meadows'. So it wasn't something that I needed to be concerned about. Mr. Trump only had a finite number of challenge coins, which is why 50 was a lot for Mr. Meadows to ask for.

I know that Mr. Trump was on board and supportive of the idea of, you know, sending thank you care packages down to Georgia, but I don't believe Mr. Trump named anything specifically of what he wanted to send.

Q Do you know if he sat there signing MAGA hats, for example, in order to send to the volunteers in Georgia?

A He didn't because we didn't end up sending the packages.

Q Okay. That was going to be my next question.

Did you send any of the coins, hats, or otherwise down to the volunteers in Georgia?

A No. Mr. Meadows and I talked about it more extensively, and nothing was sent to them.

Q Why did you decide not to?

A Why did I decide not to?

Q Or why, in that conversation you had with Mr. Meadows, did you collectively decide not to?

Mr. Passantino. Is that even true? I'm sorry. I didn't mean --

Ms. Hutchinson. It's not an accurate -- in my conversations with Mr. Meadows -- now, I stalled this for several days because I was -- had a few concerns, most of them being -- I'm sure [inaudible] would be able to talk about some of this too, but there are limits in the White House with gift amounts, and that's all not relevant to this, but I wanted to make sure that if we're going to send things, that it was within the financial parameters of what you can send to people and have it not be, like, unethical.

But, you know, I also expressed to Mr. Meadows that I was concerned that what I understood to be an act of gratitude and kindness from him and the President would be taken out of context. And for me it wasn't an if; it was a when it became public that the White House had sent these very gracious but very thorough gift packages down to people in Georgia. I knew it was bound to end up on Twitter or in the media in some capacity, and I was concerned of how that could be perceived, and I didn't want it to be misconstrued as anything other than an act of kindness.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q It sounds like Mr. Meadows ultimately agreed with you. Is that right?

A Ultimately.

Q Was there a point at which he kind of pushed back or fought?

A I think it's fair to say that I don't think that he was convinced of my reasoning, but eventually, after I pushed back hard enough, realized it just wasn't something that he -- a topic that he had the bandwidth to sustain conversations with, so he just let it go.

Q Do you know if he was getting pressure from the President to send these things out? Like, was he between a rock and a hard place, so to speak?

A No, he was not.

Q Something that also happened on December 30th, exhibit 6, page 5 in your messages with Tony Ornato. At 10:24 p.m. on December 30th, you sent a text to Tony -- or Mr. Ornato -- excuse me -- saying, Mark agreed to hold USSS doc till next week, with the clapping hand emoji.

Do you remember what that's about?

A I do. Can I have one moment to consult with my attorney?

Q Of course.

A Thank you.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Passantino. You all back?

Mr. [redacted]. I see you're back, yes.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. No, she just had a concern about whether this is potentially something that we need to treat as sensitive. I don't think it is, but I'll let her --

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

Mr. Passantino. I'll let her answer, but just be conscious I might be wrong; her answer might be sensitive. So if you could just mark this section as something --

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Let me -- yeah. Before we mark it, let me show you a document that we have and see if that answers the question.

If you could pull up exhibit 41.

There's a report from the Secret Service, Protective Intelligence and Assessment

Division. Is this it or is it something else?

A No. It has to do with post-Presidential protection.

Q Oh, okay.

So let's go back to exhibit 6 then.

That comment about Mark agreed to hold Secret Service document till next week, with the clapping, that's not related to the Joint Session or the inauguration. Is that what you're saying?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Unless there's a reason that we need to get into it, then I don't think we need to.

A No. This is logistical for the post-Presidential operation --

Q Okay.

A -- if it had come to that. I guess it's December at this point, so it hadn't yet, so --

Q Very good. Okay. Then we can just skip over that.

A Thank you.

Q I do want to go to page 5 here, though. I think we're just on it, actually.

Mr. Ornato sent you a message on that same page, unclear to me when. I think it's probably the 29th. It says, Doesn't that play into the whole thing that CoS has given up? Like the Florida convo?

And you say, I sort of felt similarly, especially since nearly every call he's fielding from DJT is related to fighting the election results.

But I'm also trying to see things -- excuse me -- see the other side where he may be coming from, which is giving him something he asked for that he knows will make him happy? And in parenthesis, 6 months/1 year.

Do you remember what that's about?

A It's about the document that I referenced on December 30th at 10:24 p.m. And, I mean, if it helps to give any color to it, I'm happy to do so. I just have one brief --

Q Yeah, certainly. I would appreciate that.

A So, essentially, in a post-Presidential operation, a former President's children are typically given 6 months of Secret Service protection. Now, Mr. Trump was a little bit more of a unique case given that most of his kids were older. So we were working through that, Mr. Ornato and I.

Mr. Trump had wanted to extend Secret Service protection to all of his children for 1 full year, when in the past, for children over the age of 18, has it only ever been exercised for 6 months. Now, children under the age of 18 get it until they're 18.

So, with that, that's what Mr. Ornato and I were talking about. Mr. Meadows had wanted -- Mr. Ornato and I had the Office of the Staff Secretary draft two executive orders, one for 6 months of protection, one for 1 full year of protection. Mr. Meadows really wanted us to have him sign the 1 full year protection document because that's the one that he knew the President wanted to sign, and he wanted to give him something that the President would perceive as a small win at that time.

But Mr. Ornato and I were pushing back for two reasons. We were tag-teaming this issue together. The first reason was because 1 year was a little -- it was out of the ordinary and wasn't entirely necessary. But number two was that no -- Mr. Ornato didn't want it to eventually be perceived negatively by Mr. Trump of just being a small win that wasn't just to make the President temporarily happy.

Q Okay. So you said a lot there. I want to unpack one of them.

But there was -- I guess one of the topics of conversation about this document is that it could be seen as, I don't know, an acknowledgment that Mr. Trump had lost the

election? Is that accurate or am I misunderstanding?

A That's accurate, although, you know, Mr. Meadows' perspective of that was it wasn't going to become public until after it had been signed.

Q I see. Okay.

Mr. [redacted]. Any questions on that?

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q What's the Florida convo that's referenced there on the top from Mr. Ornato?

Doesn't that play into the whole thing that the CoS has given up? Like the Florida conversation?

Do you know what he's referring to there?

A The preliminary conversations about where Mr. Trump had wanted to live and run his post-Presidential operation, if/when Mr. Biden moved into the White House on January 20th.

Q Okay. And had the President engaged in such conversation with Mr. Ornato or Mr. Meadows about this issue where he would conduct his post-Presidential operations?

A There were discussions about it, yes, although he didn't want to finalize anything or push the conversations along too far until, you know, it was more concrete, from his perspective.

Q Okay. And then the reference to the CoS has given up, do you know what he means by that? Is there discussion about Meadows somehow not fighting hard enough or giving up and acknowledging a transition at this point?

A There were some people with that perspective.

Q Had the President then ever expressed that perspective and that caused

concern with Mr. Ornato and Mr. Meadows or anybody else?

A Let me make sure I heard you correctly. Had the President ever or never expressed that?

Q Had the President ever expressed that view, an impression that Mr. Meadows has somehow given up?

A He had expressed at times that he felt Mr. Meadows might not be doing everything that he could using the tools and resources Mr. Meadows had in his role as chief of staff.

Q Do you remember anything in particular that prompted the President to say that, that somehow Mr. Meadows wasn't doing everything he could? Any specific example that triggered that comment?

A The first time I remember that being mentioned was the night of the Oval Office/Yellow Oval meeting.

Q The December 18th meeting we talked about before?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And, again, what was it that Mr. Meadows had done or not done that made the President say he wasn't -- was it just him pushing back on the issues? We don't have to go over it again if that was the predicate for that comment.

A Yeah. I mean, that's pretty much the reason he made that comment.

Q Okay. So when Mr. Meadows weighed in with Cipollone and others, the President was mad or the President said something like you're not doing enough or you're not using all of the tools at your disposal as chief of staff?

A I don't want to attribute the President's emotions to how he felt towards Mark in that moment, but it's fair to say that he may have been frustrated with Mr. Meadows' leadership style at that point in time.

Q Well, what did he say, best that you can recall?

A I wasn't present in the Yellow Oval when he made that comment, but --

Q What did Mr. Meadows tell you he said?

A That Mr. Meadows needs to keep doing everything that he can and he needs to keep looking forward and focus on the mission and do what was being asked of him as the chief of staff.

Q Okay. Were there other times where the President said, either in your presence or to Mr. Meadows, that Meadows has given up or made an observation like what's in Mr. Ornato's text here?

A You said that the President said in my presence or that Mr. Meadows had discussed with me, correct?

Q Yes; either one.

A Mr. Meadows had discussions about not wanting it to be perceived that he is giving up because, in his perspective, he wasn't giving up and he was doing everything that he could, given the unique circumstances and a limited bandwidth. He wanted to make sure that, you know, if anybody ever felt like he was losing sight of that, that it was brought to his attention so he could recalibrate and continue moving forward in his role, in the capacity that he was expected to operate in.

Q Okay. Did he ever tell you that the President expressed that concern directly that he has somehow given up, after that meeting on December 18th?

A I don't remember the phrasing that he had expressed to me, so I don't want to say giving up or anything. But Mr. Meadows expressed to me that he didn't want to be perceived as weak as we had kept, you know, progressing through these weeks and that they were going to be trying, going to be busy, but just to kind of keep him focused on like what was at stake.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Were you involved in any meetings at the White House in the postelection period where Steve Bannon was present?

A Not where he was physically present, no.

Q Okay. Or did he dial in to some meetings?

A I remember he had dialed in to a couple meetings with Mr. Meadows or somebody had called him. I don't remember which meetings these were, though. I just remember -- I remember one instance where Mr. Meadows was meeting with Mr. Perry, and Mr. Meadows shouted out to me, because I think I ducked out of his office at this point, and he said, Cassidy, do you have Mr. Bannon's cell -- or Steve's cell phone number? And I think I said, Steve? Who's Steve? And Mr. Perry had said, I have it. I have it, Cassidy. Don't worry about it.

I just figured that at the end of the night, later on Mr. Perry gave me Mr. Bannon's cell phone number so I'd have it. Really didn't need it.

But, yeah, I don't recall anything immediately that it was on the Presidential level with Mark -- or Mr. Meadows, yeah.

Q Are you aware of any discussions that Mr. Bannon had with anybody in the White House, including Mr. Meadows or the President, about January the 6th?

A I know that Mr. Meadows spoke with him, but I'm not sure if it was specifically about the 6th or the days leading up to the 6th or the overall election results as a whole.

Q What about Roger Stone? Are you --

Mr. Passantino. Hold on one second. Hold on.

You all right?

Ms. Hutchinson. I apologize. Yes, I'm fine. Trying to get ride of the hiccups.

Mr. Passantino. Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

Mr. [redacted]. Of course.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q What about Roger Stone? Are you familiar with any meetings or phone calls that Roger Stone had with anybody in the White House, including the President or Mr. Meadows, related to January 6th first?

A I remember a staffer recommending Mr. Meadows to call Mr. Stone. I don't know if Mr. Meadows ever did or not.

Q Do you know when that was, roughly?

A Early January. I believe it was after New Year's Day. Perhaps it was --

Q And you don't know what -- don't know what it was about or what happened on the call?

Mr. Passantino. Or if it happened, right?

Ms. Hutchinson. I don't know if the call happened.

Mr. Passantino. Sorry.

Ms. Hutchinson. I know that Mr. Meadows had communicated with Mr. Bannon. I'm not sure if it was at the direction of the staff member that had recommended it or if, you know, they had -- or I'm sorry. Mr. Stone. I apologize. Mr. Stone. Whether they had connected at some point, either in late December, early January, but I'm not sure.

You know, I understood that to be more of a quick touch base, like, I think Mr. Stone had called him a bunch of times and Mr. Meadows was trying to, like, temporarily appease that general communication and, you know, redirect it to other people who had

already been in contact with him.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q I understand that Mr. Stone was in touch with the White House around that period, maybe for a few reasons, but one including pardons.

Do you know if the contact that you're referring to referenced pardons?

A It could have been about pardons. He did call about pardons a lot. He called -- he had also been in touch with the White House about January 6th too, though, so I don't know.

Q Okay. So you say he was in touch with the White House about January 6th. What do you remember about that?

A I remember Mr. Meadows saying in the days leading up to the 6th that Mr. Stone was in town and wanted to be a speaker, you know, who was working on that. And more in that context as we discussed earlier today with, you know, Ms. Pierson, Ms. Wren. I don't recall any specifics of this conversation with Mr. Stone. I recall one specific instance where they talked for maybe 2 minutes, but I don't know how frequently, if at all, they communicated on the phone after that.

Q Going back to the call where Scott, Mr. -- excuse me -- Representative Perry asked to call -- or I may be making this up -- but that Mr. Perry ended up connecting Mr. Meadows with Steve Bannon, or at least called out to connect with Mr. Bannon, do you remember when that happened, roughly?

A I believe it was the meeting -- I don't have the text in front of me, but I sent you all texts -- or my attorney sent you all texts that I had with Mr. Perry. Either late December, early January --

Q Okay. Let's pull those up. That's exhibit 29.

And it's from December the 29th. It looks like there was a meeting with Mr.

Perry that may have also eventually involved Phil Waldron and some others.

Do you think it was related to that meeting?

A I believe so, yes.

Q What happened in that meeting that you are aware of?

A I'm not -- let's make sure I'm not being overly broad in my response and being overly broad with this, but -- so December 29th.

I just recall the purpose of this meeting now, Mr. Meadows had said, Hey, Scott's going to reach out to you, Cass. Can you make sure that him and his group can get in? I want to meet with them this afternoon.

It was just the text exchange that I had with Mr. Perry prior to the arrival, and then Mr. Perry and I briefly spoke as he was coming up to our office. And I understood it to be about the election, any materials that they had that they wanted to discuss with Mr. Meadows.

Q Do you remember specifically what happened in the meeting and what they discussed about the election?

A I remember them discussing January 6th and topics/theories that I now attribute to Mr. Eastman. And I remember they came with briefing materials, but I didn't have a copy of them, but they had copies for myself and Mark, if I was going to participate.

So I was in and out of Mr. Meadows' office during this meeting. I was working on other things at my desk, and I had to run around for a few meetings upstairs at the White House this day.

Q The people on the text message on page 2 from Mr. Perry's texts include Phil Waldron, John Robert Maguire, II, Richard Higgins.

Do you remember if all three of them showed up with Mr. Perry that day?

A They did.

Q And when this issue about the Vice President's authority on January 6th came up, do you remember what Mr. Meadows said in response?

A Would you repeat that question?

Q Sure. When this issue about the Vice President and his authority on January 6th came up during this meeting, do you know what Mr. Meadows said in response?

A His exact words, I don't know. I mean, it was a fairly long meeting where that was discussed extensively. Do you have a more specific question --

Q Yes. I don't need the exact words, but just generally, was he pushing back on this idea about the Vice President's authority related to the Eastman theory generally or was he receptive to it?

A To my recollection, he was receptive of it at this time.

Q And you say "at this time." Did that change, to the best of your knowledge? Did at any point he stop being receptive to this idea and push back against it? And that is the Eastman theory about the Vice President's authority on January the 6th.

A There were points Mr. Meadows had been a little more vocal about potential legal implications, although I don't remember that being a topic of conversation for this meeting.

Q Okay. I do want to go back. You said that a staffer, a White House staffer had recommended that Mr. Meadows call Roger Stone. Who was that staffer?

A I deliberately [inaudible] the staffer because I -- I believe it was Mr. Navarro, but it could have been somebody on Mr. Navarro's team. And I don't remember the names of any of Mr. Navarro's staffers.

[6:25 p.m.]

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. But you think it was either Mr. Navarro or somebody on his team who recommended that Mr. Meadows call Roger Stone?

A That's correct.

Ms. Cheney. [redacted], can I ask another question?

Mr. [redacted]. Of course.

Ms. Cheney. Ms. Hutchinson, so can you tell us what the -- what the topics were in the December 29th meeting, to the best that you recall?

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah. No, of course. I remember the materials they brought. They brought the PowerPoint, or a variation of the PowerPoint. There could've been edits made to it that was presented on, I believe, December 21st in the Cabinet Room when the Members came.

And I remember they had a few briefing memos, all in relation to January 6th, how they believed the Vice President could exercise his role in a constitutional reasoning that they felt was sound for him to exercise that and, you know, how to approach that with Mr. Pence's team, if Mr. Meadows wanted them to strategically have communications with Mr. Pence's team, if Mr. Meadows should do any outreach. It was more of, yes, sir, this is what we have, what do you think we should do, what are your opinions on this. Mr. Meadows had time that afternoon, so wanted to have the meeting in person.

Ms. Cheney. And so it was -- it was focused on the Vice President's role on January 6th?

Ms. Hutchinson. Overall meeting was, yes. Now, there are topics that -- I'm trying to be careful in distinguishing in my head all this, because the Vice President's role

was discussed at length, but also so was sending the votes back to the States, if there was any -- I just want to make sure I'm using the right terminology there. But in just their overall point of view on any constitutional reasoning, that there could be a more unique way of approaching the events on the 6th than had historically happened.

Does that help answer your question? I'm happy to --

Ms. Cheney. It does, yeah. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q We're going to pull up an exhibit, we'll mark it as 42. This is a PowerPoint that we've obtained during the investigation. And you'll see there, it says election fraud and foreign interference and options for 6 Jan. It's dated January the 5th.

If we can just scroll through a few, go to the second slide.

It's talking points about Chinese potentially interfering with the election.

Go to the second page -- third slide.

Issues about domestic voter fraud. And it's a fairly lengthy PowerPoint.

Does this look like the PowerPoint that Mr. Waldron and others brought to the meeting on December the 29th?

A Context looks familiar, but I recall the PowerPoint having a blue background, that he brought to the meeting on the 29th.

Q Can you go to the next slide, [redacted], please.

That's not a blue background, per se. It's a screen capture, it looks like, of a CNN newscast.

A No, this was more of a -- they had set the background to blue and there was white and red font on it --

Q Okay.

A -- on the slides.

Q That's very helpful. I appreciate that.

You can take that down, [redacted].

A This one -- yeah.

Q Oh, go ahead.

A I was going to say that the context of that looks familiar. I don't -- I recall seeing that PowerPoint at some point but not on the 29th.

Q Okay. When do you remember seeing that PowerPoint?

A Earlier in January perhaps, maybe the 1st or the 2nd.

Q What was the context in which you saw that, if you remember?

A Somebody had brought it to Mr. Meadows and asked if we could make photocopies of it, and then had said never mind. Sorry. He had handed a copy of it to me, and I don't recall who would've handed it to him. I'm trying -- so we talked about the meetings on the 1st and 2nd earlier. Then he had realized that there was already copies of it circulating, he didn't need any copies it made, and he was fine with the copy that he had.

Q When you say he was fine with the copy he had, you're talking about Mr. Meadows?

A That's correct. I'm sorry for not being specific.

Q No, that's all right.

So I understand that Mr. Meadows also received a copy of this on January the 5th, and the email talked about that PowerPoint being the briefing that was going to be given to Members of Congress.

Do you remember anything like that with respect to the PowerPoint we just showed you?

A On the 5th?

Q Correct.

A No. I don't recall Mr. Meadows volunteering to give a briefing to Members of Congress on the 5th.

Q And to be clear, it wasn't Mr. Meadows who's saying they were about to brief; I believe it was Mr. Waldron and maybe others as well?

A I don't remember that context being brought up with that PowerPoint specifically, but I recall briefing that you're referring to.

Q So did Phil Waldron actually go and brief Members of Congress on the 5th, to the best of your knowledge?

A I'm not sure.

Q Okay. Well, what do you -- what do you remember?

A I remember -- I remember Mr. Meadows saying that there was a potential that he would participate in an event with Members that evening or that afternoon and he would let me know. And at one point he had asked me to reach out to Mr. Perry and I hadn't. So later in the day, he had asked me if I had heard from Mr. Perry. I said, I haven't heard back from him. Said just press pause, and I don't think I'm going to go to the thing tonight. I'll call -- or I'll talk with somebody if they think it's necessary for me to figure out or know anything that happened in that meeting. I'm just going to stay here.

Q Okay. One last thing to cover, which, if we can pull up exhibit 25, page 20, these are messages with Ms. Thurston again, and this is dated January the 1st, 2021.

Okay. So -- oh, sorry about that.

A Okay. Oh --

Mr. Passantino. It's all right.

Ms. Hutchinson. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

You can go ahead and -- I apologize.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. So we're looking at the messages from January 1st, 2021, at 2:22 p.m., and Ms. Thurston asks you, Are you tracking the Graham/Rudy meetings? And then it says, tomorrow's 6 p.m. is actually a call, not a meeting at CPI.

And then you say, in a couple messages down, Yes, tracking! Good to know about 6 p.m. call.

Is this referring to a meeting that -- or a call that actually takes place on the 2nd, the next day?

A Can you scroll up to the top again, please?

Yeah, sorry. That is referring to events on January 2nd.

Q Okay. So these messages were kind of planning, anticipating the meeting on the 2nd, it sounds like?

A Correct. Correct.

Q On the next page of that, still on January the 1st, though, you say, POTUS gave Molly and I a behemoth of a binder with legal documents he wants every Member to have before the call.

Do you remember that binder?

A I do.

Q Did he give it to you directly?

A He gave a copy to me and he gave a copy to Ms. Michael.

Q And what did you or Ms. Michael do with the binder, if anything?

A I don't remember what Ms. Michael did with the binder. I brought it back to our office. I was in the Outer Oval as he was wrapping up that evening and brought

out the binder. And then Molly already had a copy on her desk that he gave her earlier. He had handed it to me and said, We need the Members to have this tomorrow night. Can you send this to them, can you make copies for them? I said, I'll talk to the chief about it, sir.

Do you have any --

Q Yeah. And you said that he wanted the Members -- he being the President -- wanted the Members to have it in anticipation of the call or meeting. Are you referring to Members of Congress?

A Yes.

Q And is this the call or meeting on January 2nd that we talked about, whatever it was, a week ago or so, where it was Senator Graham, Rudy Giuliani, Mr. Meadows, with some House Freedom Caucus members who joined by phone?

A Yes. Mr. Graham met with Mr. Giuliani and Mr. Giuliani's colleagues prior to this call. Mr. Graham had left and then this call began. Mr. Meadows was originally going to participate in person, but they moved it to conference call just to cover a wider breadth of people that weren't in town and hadn't been able to participate had it not been a call.

Q And we talked last time that during this call there was a discussion about encouraging people to march to the Capitol on January 6th. Just from a timing perspective, is this the same call?

A It is.

Q Okay. Did the President join that call?

A He did.

Q Did the President say anything about encouraging people to march to the Capitol during that call? I don't think that's something we covered before.

A Mr. Trump was supportive of the overall message that most Members, if not all Members, participating on that call were advocating for it, which was encourage your constituents, use your social media platforms to encourage Americans to come to D.C. that day and attend the rally and have a presence at the Capitol on January 6th.

So he was supportive of that idea and concept that the call was broadly discussing. But I can't -- I can't recall whether he was, you know, individually advocating for that. It was more like he knew that the Members on the call were -- had already put out statements with context along those lines and on par with that message.

Q Okay.

BY MS. [redacted]:

Q Ms. Hutchinson, just a couple of follow-up questions. On this exhibit that we're looking at, exhibit 25, regarding the binder, it says, a binder -- you know, POTUS gave Molly and I a behemoth of a binder with legal documents.

Do you recall what those legal documents related to?

A Some of them were listing individuals that had passed away and allegedly casted votes. Some of them were, if I'm remembering correctly, I don't know if they were from the PowerPoint, but it was memos something along the lines of the potential role that the Vice President could play that day. It was nothing that -- you know, I didn't comb through everything. We didn't -- I didn't take any action on it. Sorry, I didn't look at everything, but it wasn't anything that I -- you know, just had flipped through and seen that I -- that wasn't familiar, hadn't been discussed internally. But it was fairly large, like, I mean, I didn't look at every page.

Q Understood. So just to clarify, you recall seeing some documents relating to, sounds like, potential voter fraud in the binder?

A Yes. That's correct.

Q And then also some memos about the potential role of the Vice President on January 6th?

A That's correct.

Q Do you know where -- because it sounds like the President gave Ms. Michael and you a copy of this binder. Do you know where President Trump received this binder or received these documents?

A I'm not sure.

Q And did you say that you made copies of these documents for Members of Congress in connection with this January 2nd meeting or phone call?

A I personally took no action on the binder.

Q And did you say you don't recall whether Ms. Michael did?

A I don't know what she did, if anything at all. She would've resorted to guidance from myself or the chief of staff. To my knowledge, he didn't give her any, because I kind of had told him I wasn't going to take any action on it. It was -- there were a lot of documents, and it just wasn't feasible to have Members go through every one of the documents prior to the call, so -- that answers your question.

Mr. [redacted]. When you say a lot of documents in the binder, are we talking like hundreds of pages, Ms. Hutchinson?

Mr. Passantino. Describe it in --

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah. It was probably -- I don't know.

Mr. [redacted]. Be a 2-inch binder full of documents?

Ms. Hutchinson. Two and a half inches, three and a half inches, yes, yeah, that's correct.

Mr. [redacted]. And it was full?

Ms. Hutchinson. Not overflowing full, but it was very full to where, you know, if

you were to open it to take documents out, some would have spilled out with it.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

Ms. [redacted]. And I just want to understand what you said, Ms. Hutchinson. Did you say you didn't take any action because it just wasn't feasible due to, like, the size of the binder?

Ms. Hutchinson. I just didn't -- I knew it would be very time consuming, either to scan everything in and send it electronically to Members of Congress or to make physical copies of it. It was -- it would take a lot of time, and I knew Members wouldn't spend the next 12 hours combing through these hundreds of pages of documents personally. So I just didn't see it as something that was worthy of my time or anybody else's time to, you know, spend that night making copies of that binder. Now, whether somebody else did, I'm not sure, but it just wasn't really something that I felt I needed to use my time and resources and allocate them towards that.

Mr[redacted]. Do you have any reason to believe that the binder came from Mr. Giuliani, Mr. Kerik and his associates?

Ms. Hutchinson. Many of the documents in there were documents that Mr. Giuliani, Mr. Kerik, Mr. Waldron had brought to the White House's attention during this period, but I don't know whether they assembled the binder.

Mr. [redacted]. Understood. Thank you. That's helpful.

BY MS.[redacted]:

Q Ms. Hutchinson, are you familiar with individuals named [redacted] or [redacted]?

A No.

Q Do those names ring a bell?

A No.

Q How about an [redacted]? I might not be pronouncing that correctly.

A Oh, could you -- could you name the first few people again, please?

Q Sure. Sure. So it's in reference to a January 3rd meeting, that refreshes your recollection, that we're aware of. It's [redacted].

A I recognize those names.

Q Do you recall a meeting involving those individuals around January 3rd, 2021?

A I do.

Q Okay. Did that meeting have anything to do with the 2020 election or January 6th?

A Can I have one moment with my attorney, please?

Q Absolutely.

A Thank you.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Passantino. Okay, thanks. So this meeting, she'll talk about the meeting, but it was a -- there was some classified stuff talked about that had nothing to do with January 6th but maybe January 6th was discussed. So if you want to like limit the conversation of January 6th discussions.

Ms. [redacted]. Absolutely.

BY MS. [redacted]:

Q So for this January 3rd meeting that you recall involving [redacted], what do you recall being discussed with respect to January 6th, you know, including the Joint Session in Congress?

A I don't recall -- I don't recall many specifics about January 6th. I remember [redacted] mentioning it to Mr. Meadows and Mr. Meadows saying, well, why don't you all come in here and let's -- let's talk about this.

I remember going in at one point and hearing them talk about January 6th and how Mr. Meadows anticipated the events would happen on the day, which nobody else had any, like, commentary of for the duration that I was in there. The conversation wasn't like overly long. They weren't there for several hours. Maybe 45 minutes.

But if you have more specific questions and want me to elaborate further, I'm happy to try to do so.

Q Sure. So let's just step a bit back. Do you know who [redacted] is?

A No. I just -- I remember -- I remember [redacted] just giving a list of names of people that he wanted to bring, and I remember the name [redacted]. I didn't look into his background, and I didn't, like, question any -- any recommendations that [redacted] made at that point.

Q Okay. And who's [redacted]? What's his -- what does he do for a living, to the extent you know?

A At the time, he was this -- forgive me if the title isn't correct, but I don't know -- it's different for the committee, but it's -- I believe he was the Republican staff director for the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, if I'm putting the order of those words in the correct format.

I don't recall if January 3rd was the first time they came to the White House. I'm trying to see, and I know I had texts with Ms. Thurston about it a few times, but -- if you have any further questions, I'm just looking through my texts with Ms. Thurston.

Q Sure. Do you know how January 6th was -- was brought up in the meeting?

A No. I just recall [redacted] seeing Mr. Meadows in our office. He had

met with them, and they -- Mr. Meadows had gone off to the other meetings too, so he was a little in and out while they stayed and waited for him to come back.

And [redacted] at some point had, you know, just casually mentioned to Mr. Meadows something about the 6th. Mr. Meadows said, well, why don't we -- why don't we actually talk about that now. Come into my office again, like, let's talk about this [inaudible].

Q And what exactly -- or what do you recall exactly was discussed with respect to January 6th, just more specifically?

A I don't remember many specifics of the conversation because I didn't -- I maybe ducked in twice. I remember one time definitively I ducked in. That's when I remember hearing Mr. Meadows just elaborate a little bit more on what he had thought could happen that day just in terms of the order of events and the individuals present, hadn't said anything else at that point.

The conversation went on for a little while longer, but I had shut his office door and I didn't stay and participate. And I -- I'm inclined to believe, like, I think the first time they all had met was the 2nd, so that conversation might have happened on the 2nd, and then discussed more on the 3rd or -- it was at least over a 2-day period.

Q And I understand [redacted], by your testimony, he works in the House of Representatives. Do you know whether objections on January 6th was discussed and, you know, potentially having Members of the House of Representatives object on January 6th?

A I'm not sure if [redacted] really raised those concerns with Mr. Meadows or if it was a concern of his at all.

Q Okay. And just to clarify, not really a concern but just talking more generally about potential objections on January 6th.

A I'm not sure.

Q Okay. Is there anything else that you recall with respect to January 6th, including, you know, the Vice President's role on January 6th being discussed in this meeting involving [redacted]?

A I remember Mr. Meadows talking to them, when I briefly stepped into the room, about potential ways that Mr. Pence may or may not have in his role as the President of the Senate on January 6th, and discussing a little bit more about, you know, the -- those theories that were being widely discussed in the West Wing at the time. But, yeah, I wasn't in there for much of the initial meeting.

Ms. Cheney. Ms. Hutchinson, can you -- you just mentioned a moment ago that this same group met on January 2nd. So as I recall, the 2nd was a Saturday and the 3rd was a Sunday. Can you elaborate a little bit on the meeting on the 2nd? Was it the same group of individuals?

Ms. Hutchinson. So I just want to be careful because I know that this group came to the White House on two separate occasions. I'm inclined to believe it was the 2nd and 3rd just because they wouldn't have come in on a Monday. But I -- it's not on my texts with Ms. Thurston and I don't have any way of [inaudible], so I just want to make sure that I'm not, you know, jumping to conclusions on that. It could have been the 1st and 2nd, 2nd/3rd, 3rd/4th, but it was the same group that came to the White House both times.

And I remember the first day that they were there is when [redacted] had mentioned the 6th to Mr. Meadows towards the second half, roughly, of their time at the White House. And I remember [redacted] and I briefly talking the next day about January 6th, if I had any thoughts about it. I just, you know -- there's a lot of people that have their thoughts, and, you know, what are yours, sir. Just kind of deflecting back to

him.

Then they had lengthy meetings with Mr. Meadows the second day too, but I'm not sure if it was, you know, about the other topics, not -- nothing to do with the 6th or if it was about -- about the 6th or, you know, days leading up to the 6th, or if they had, you know, more opinions that they had developed over the course of the 24 hours -- or 12 hours since they had left our office about what Mr. Meadows had to say.

Ms. Cheney. And do you recall [redacted], did you have any discussions with him on either of those days?

Ms. Hutchinson. My recollection, no. I mean, I'm sure that I wasn't unfriendly and had ignored him, but I don't recall. Although maybe I had been. I -- I don't remember anything substantive. I mean, frankly, I hardly even remember the name, but I -- I do very vaguely remember it being a name that [redacted] had sent me.

Ms. Cheney. Okay. And maybe we can arrange and -- we can talk to counsel about how to do this -- in terms of the topic of the meeting that -- that may have been classified, obviously, we don't want you to share it here. Maybe it's something that we can arrange to just have you share the topic with current White House Counsel.

There are some issues around this time that may not seem like they're related that could be. So to the extent that we can work something out for you to share the classified topic, that would be very helpful.

Mr. Passantino. Sure, yeah.

Ms. Cheney. Great. All right. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

BY MS. [redacted]:

Q Ms. Hutchinson, do you recall whether voter fraud was discussed in this meeting with [redacted], and others, whether on the 2nd or the 3rd?

A I remember [redacted] talking to me about voter fraud and trying to elaborate on the conversations that he had earlier tried to elaborate on about my opinions. And I don't believe it's professional to, in that setting, for me to state my opinions. It wasn't the nature of my role. And so I remember him mentioning it to me.

Now, I don't -- I don't know if it was with the intention of raising it with Mr. Meadows because it was a topic that they had planned to discuss with him. You know, I'm -- I'm confident -- I'm very confident that Mr. Meadows discussed it with them, but I'm not sure in what context.

Q Do you recall what exactly [redacted] said to you about voter fraud?

A I believe [redacted] had asked me something along the lines of whether or not I thought there was significant evidence of voter fraud, in light of him saying that it was something that the White House was looking at closely during this time.

Q Do you recall whether there was any sort of ask of Mr. Meadows in this meeting with respect to, you know, voter fraud or anything happening on January 6th?

A I don't know if Mr. Meadows had an ask that would've caused them to take action on it -- on anything. I -- I just don't remember right now.

Q And just to clarify, like, I'll make my question a little bit broader and then ask either way. So Mr. Meadows asking these individuals to take any action or these individuals asking Mr. Meadows to take any action or maybe even consider any action with respect to January 6th or voter fraud.

A Again, I don't remember him proposing an ask that would require them to take action right now. I'm just trying to work through the conversation that I remember having with [redacted] and Mr. Meadows after the fact, but I can't remember Mr. Meadows ever saying, let's make sure we follow up with them, which is normally what he'd ask me to do if there was, you know, something that he wanted to maintain

insight on.

Right now, I don't remember [redacted], you know, expressing to me that they had delivered the results of anything that Mr. Meadows had asked for, so -- but it's possible. You know, I don't want to blanket that as a no. I just I don't -- I'm not sure. It could've happened behind closed doors without my insight --

Q Do you recall --

A -- but not that I recall.

Q Excuse me. Apologies.

A No, you're fine. I'm just saying not that I recall. It's difficult to draw the distinction between the other intention of the meeting from this, if that makes sense.

Q Yeah. Understood. Do you recall whether any documents were discussed or shown or shared during this meeting either on the 2nd or the 3rd?

Mr. Passantino. Relating to January 6th, right?

Ms. [redacted]. Excuse me. Yes, relating to January 6th, or voter fraud.

Ms. Hutchinson. I remember Mr. Meadows had PowerPoints and memos in his office that he showed them, and that's what he was referencing to when I had walked in. But it -- I took it as more, oh, he had it up as, like, to refresh his memory and walk through what he had in front of him with them.

Ms. [redacted]. And understanding that you likely can't recall the specific context of those documents, is it your general recollection that there -- I think the PowerPoints and memos we've discussed a few times today, that -- you know, the memos of which related to the Vice President's authority or purported authority on January 6th, for example?

Ms. Hutchinson. Yeah. It wasn't -- I was not under the impression that it was anything new.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Quick followups on that. Do you know if the voter fraud conversations or irregularities conversations during that meeting had anything to do with foreign interference in the election?

A I don't know specifically that was the direction that Mr. Meadows intended to take on that topic.

Q Okay. But that, for example, wasn't the purpose, as you understood it, of calling that meeting, necessarily?

A Not the purpose of calling the meeting, no.

Q Okay. And then one of the things circulating around that time was this idea that an individual in Italy had hacked the voter systems in the United States through a satellite. And I understand that that was widely discussed at some point. But was that a topic of conversation during this meeting with the HPSCI folks and Mr. Meadows on either the 2nd or 3rd?

A [redacted] and Mr. Meadows talked about -- I think it was referred to as Italygate --

Q Right.

A -- but -- and I had overheard that part in the, you know, main area of our office. But I don't know, like, how extensively they discussed it in portions behind closed doors that I actively did not participate in.

Q Do you know if Mr. Meadows or others in the White House did anything to investigate that Italygate, including, but not limited to, sending people to interview the purported perpetrators in Italian jail?

A Mr. Meadows was willing to hear theories to try to vet the best he could whether there was anything viable or substantive to any of the assertions or claims made

in the theories.

Q Do you know if he took, or anybody else in the White House, took actions to interview folks in Italian jails about this theory in particular?

A I don't -- I don't know if he took any actions about interviewing individuals in Italian jails. I know that he had a lot of conversations about Italygate, and there were some interesting ways that he had thought maybe it was okay to approach it. But the interviewing people in the Italian prisons doesn't, right now, jog my memory on anything with Mr. Meadows.

Q What were the ways that he thought he could approach it?

Mr. Passantino. You answered the question that way. You can't blame him on that. You got to -- you answered -- you could've just said no.

Ms. Hutchinson. Well, I'm trying to remember if we did [inaudible]. I remember him talking a lot about Italian satellites and if we could get data from satellites, if I'm thinking of the right country. I believe the Italian satellites were part of this too.

Mr. [redacted]. That's right.

Ms. Hutchinson. I apologize. I'm blushing. I mean, that's what immediately jumps out as something that I remember him discussing with me as a topic for a meeting at a different time but nothing to do with HPSCI, if we're talking about it in light of HPSCI. Now, Italygate did come up in that meeting, but I don't know. I think we were kind of past the point of, as you said, Italian prisons or satellites.

BY MR. [redacted]:

Q Okay. And related question. Do you know if Mr. Meadows or anybody, including the President, took any steps to obtain information from satellites as part of this Italygate investigation?

A I'm not sure if they, like, thought through the whole steps to obtain that

information.

Q Okay. All right. I think at this point just some final wrap-up questions, unless you have anything else right now. Final wrap-up questions is: Have you talked to the President about your appearance before the select committee or your production of documents to the select committee?

A I have not.

Q And if I didn't say it, I should've been clear, the former President, Mr. Trump.

A Right. I assume that's who you meant, and I have not, or the current President either.

Q Thank you. What about Mr. Meadows, have you talked to Mr. Meadows about your appearance before the select committee or documents you're providing to the select committee?

A No.

Q Okay. Have you talked to him at all since you've been subpoenaed?

A No, I've not spoken to him since January 20th, 2021.

Q Why is that?

A The day both of our tenure at the White House ended.

Q No further need to talk with him, in your view?

A Our jobs were completed.

Q Other than your lawyers, have you talked to anybody about your test- -- and specifically your testimony or the documents you're producing to the select committee, not just the general fact of you being --

A No.

Q -- subpoenaed?

Okay. Has anybody tried to contact you about your testimony or your document

production to the select committee?

A CNN reporters a couple weeks ago.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah. The day after she testified, somehow they found out about her testimony.

Mr. [redacted]. Understood. Other than -- other than reporters and, specifically, in an effort to chat with you about what you might say or the documents you might produce?

Ms. Hutchinson. No. A few people had asked if I had a date yet, and I -- I mean, I haven't -- I haven't texted anybody back really for the last -- besides my attorney and a few family members -- the last couple weeks.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay.

Ms. Hutchinson. Just getting through.

Mr. [redacted]. Okay. Very good. Well, I'll stop here and see if Ms. Cheney or anybody else on the Webex has anything else to add.

Ms. Cheney. I just want to say thank you very much, Cassidy, for the just really impressive and responsible way you've dealt with this. And I know it hasn't -- it has not been easy, but really hugely important for the country. And so I just want to tell you thank you very much for doing what, you know, what citizenship requires in coming in and answering all of our questions. We appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Ms. Hutchinson. Thank you.

Mr. [redacted]. Very good.

Mr. Passantino. If I could also, just following up on the conversation before, again, sort of implore, whatever we can do to not have her -- Ms. Hutchinson's name put in reports as to things that are beyond the scope of like her actual knowledge. I mean, obviously we prefer her to not be collateral damage at all, but, again, today she was

asked a number of questions about her opinion about whether, you know, Mr. Meadows should or shouldn't have taken different opinions as the chief of staff. I, again, would request that's not a fair opinion to put in her mouth in a report, and I would just -- please be conscious of the fact that she's -- she's got to work in this town for a long time, and just be responsible for that.

Mr. [redacted]. Thank you for putting that on the record, Mr. Passantino. Yep, we will proceed -- at this point, I think we should go off the record.

Mr. Passantino. Yeah.

Mr. [redacted]. So let's go off the record.

[Whereupon, at 7:09 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

I have read the foregoing ____ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

_____

Witness Name

_____

Date